

401.874. FACULTY SENATE OFFICE

GREEN HALL, 35 CAMPUS AVENUE, KINGSTON, RI 02881

5176 URI.EDU/FACSEN

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 21, 2019**

1. The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 3:04 PM by Senate Chair Leonard. All members were present except for Senators Byrd, Chandlee, Dekker, DiCioccio, Djurdjevic, Greaney, Harris, Hicks, Hume, Kovoov, Loose, Rollo-Koster, Sartini, and Taveira.
Ex-officio in attendance: President Dooley, Provost DeHayes, Vice Provost Bodah, Vice Provost Libutti, Vice Provost Beauvais, Vice President for Research & Economic Development Peter Snyder, Chief Information Officer Karlis Kaugars, Interim Chief Diversity Officer Mary Grace Almandrez, Dean Zawia, Dean Ebrahimpour, Dean Boughida, Dean Riley, Associate Dean Rusnock, Associate Dean of Nursing Leveillee, Associate Dean Veeger, Associate Dean Seitsinger, Associate Dean Reynolds, Associate Dean Quilliam, Senior Associate Director of Enrollment Services Jack Humphrey, Director of Learning, Assessment & Online Education Diane Goldsmith
2. Disposition of Minutes: minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting # 5 of [January 24, 2019](#) were posted with the agenda. Senate Chair Leonard asked if there were any additions, corrections to or questions about the minutes. As there were no corrections or questions, the minutes were approved.
3. **REPORT OF OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
 - a. Senate Chair Leonard thanked Dean Maling Ebrahimpour of the College of Business for sponsoring the reception after the Faculty Senate meeting and encouraged Senators and guests to attend.
 - b. Senate Vice Chair Nassersharif presented the minutes of Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meetings January 16, 2019, January 24, 2019, January 31, 2019, and February 7, 2019. There were no comments.
 - c. The Report of the Nominating Committee, Senators Derbyshire, Krieger and Melanson was presented by Senators Derbyshire and Krieger. They placed in nomination for Vice Chair/Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate for the 2019-2020 academic year the following names: Senator Megan Echevarria from the College of Arts and Sciences and Senator Sandy Hicks from the Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Education and Professional Studies. Senators Derbyshire and Krieger asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor. There were none. There was a motion that the Faculty Senate cast ballots for Senate Vice Chair/Chair-Elect position. The motion passed. Ballots were passed to Senators and collected. Once ballots were tabulated it was determined that the Vice Chair/Chair Elect would be Senator Echevarria who was then congratulated.
4. **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

The President graciously waived his remarks to give time for full Committee Reports discussions.

5. REPORTS OF SPECIAL AND STANDING COMMITTEES

a. Report of the Accelerated Bachelors to Masters (ABM) Special Review Committee:

Associate Professor Kristin Johnson and Associate Professor Michael Greenfield presented the Final Report Recommendations on the Accelerated Bachelors to Masters (ABM). The four recommendations were the following:

- Recommendation #1 Double counting: Allow double counting of credits from a Bachelor's to a Master's degree
 - Committee found many examples of other universities who had accelerated programs that allowed for double counting.
 - They also found examples at URI that currently include double counting - Speech/Language Pathology, Kinesiology, etc.
- Recommendation #2 - Double counting $\frac{1}{3}$ of total credits: Allow double counting up to one-third of the total credits required in the master's program.
 - Committee sought clarification of the double counting of $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the total credits. Per Dean Zawia, the difference between the $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ is to account for the difference in the total credits needed for the master's program.
- Recommendation #3 - Time limit: Students enrolled in an ABM program are to follow the same rules and procedures that apply to all graduate students including the opportunity to pursue a thesis or non-thesis option without a more restrictive time to completion.
 - The Committee feels that once accepted into the ABM program the time-limit should be the same as graduate students in non-ABM programs.
 - The Committee also discussed clarification of coding for plans/sub-plans by Enrollment Services for the ABM program.
 - The time restriction on double-counted credits that is stated within the Graduate Manual Appendix K should be removed.
- Recommendation #4 - Procedures:
 - The Committee recommends that a Notice of Change form be processed for those programs where no changes (or less than 25% of the credits) to requirements or resource requirements for either the bachelor's or master's degree.
 - If a change of more than 25% of the program's credits are going to change, a Modified proposal form will be required.
 - Reviews by the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council should be coordinated so conflicting recommendations are minimized

A discussion followed. There would be coordination between Curriculum and Standards and the Graduate Council in approving future ABM programs. Dean Rusnock clarified that enrollment registration would be through a sub-plan. Senator Sodhi of Engineering asked about the merits of double counting, and if it would be required of all programs. The response from the committee was that each program would have to need or want to apply for double counting. This does not make any changes to existing programs and it is not mandatory for Departments to double count.

Dean Zawia said everything is for graduate credit. Time limit may be punitive for students in accelerated programs. He will be more than happy to look into and consider solutions for fairness. Professor Johnson responded that the accelerated piece be determined by the program. Senator Opaluch remarked it will be difficult to put together accelerated program

for Resource Economics majors. There needs to be a reconciliation of Manuals, and the Graduate Manual Appendix K will need to be cleaned up.

There is a sub pool of strong students who would partake in these the accelerated programs according to Professor Johnson. Senator Echevarria of Arts & Sciences said double counting is creating a space in programs to double count. Programs are not forced into double counting. There is an existing process where students going from BA to MA can petition for double counting. Not an end point of what an ABM program can be, it is a chance to keep best students for URI graduate programs which will improve quality of students.

Dean Zawia commented that the design from Graduate Council is non-thesis. The response was that it was not really excluding thesis students, but it works much better for nonthesis students. It would save time for nonthesis students.

Dean Zawia stated that Accelerated programs would not preclude double counting, but it is much more suitable for non-thesis counting. Thesis Masters would still be considered.

Senator Martin of CELS remarked that the Accelerated Bachelor to Masters programs would help in recruiting students.

Senator Gindy of Civil and Environmental Engineering remarked that language in the University Catalogue, University Manual and Graduate Manual need to be reviewed in order to align with one another. She commented about the various ways graduate students can earn credit including advanced standing, transfer, and credit by examination. She considered double counting of credits from the B.S. degree to M.S. degree to be part of advanced standing credits. She suggested reducing the number of credits allowed to double count from 33% to 20% to align with the other credit limits imposed. She also suggested that double counting of credit be extended to students outside of an established ABM program.

Dean Zawia would be happy to revise Appendix K to avoid confusion.

The Accelerated Bachelor's to Master's (ABM) Committee stated that it should consider some students may need Advanced Standing and double counting especially if courses are on a multi-year cycle. In addition, there is an advantage to keeping the Advanced Standing and Double Counting distinction.

Dean Zawia said that students are admitted as juniors but are not counted until they are seniors. The thesis/nonthesis requirement will be up to the Department.

Senator Kovarsky of Communicative Disorders has seen no difference in employability of thesis versus non-thesis students. One does not seem higher than another. In his department students are accepted as juniors. He can attest that the program has had a positive impact.

Seen through a marketing lens, Senator Ashley said, all should have accountability for successful learning outcomes.

Dean Zawia said that one third (1/3) double counting is really the maximum. Departments and programs can make the decisions to combine all sources.

Senator Bide called for a vote to accept the recommendations of the Committee whose recommendations are: 1. To allow double counting of credits from a Bachelor's to a Master's Degree; 2. Allow double counting up to one-third of the total credits required in the master's program. These credits would be counted within the two-fifth limit earned by transfer credits, advanced standing credits, or credits by examination or equivalent; 3. Students enrolled in an ABM program are to follow the rules and procedures that apply to all graduate students; 4. Use Notice of Change form when a proposed ABM program does not change the requirements or resource requirements of either the bachelor's or master's

degree. Coordinate the reviews by the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council so conflicting recommendations are minimized.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Final Recommendations of the Accelerated Bachelors to Masters (ABM) Special Review Committee. The motion carried and was approved with two nays and one abstention.

b. Senator Ohley Chair of the Technology and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee presented the report on the Committee to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Ohley discussed the purchase of software and hardware on campus and the fact there are many ad hoc technology committees purchasing various types of technology. He spoke of the desire to create one central place for information on technology affecting faculty.

Chief Information Officer Karlis Kaugars has proposed a reorganization of Information Technology (IT) in an effort to make it responsive to faculty and student needs.

The Technology and Infrastructure Committee recommends any technology purchases over \$25,000 be approved through the Technology and Infrastructure Committee and be responsible for beta testing.

Director Goldsmith of Learning, Assessment & Online Education asked if the proposal meant that the Committee would write the RFP's of purchases over \$25,000. Senator Ohley said yes.

Provost DeHayes thanked the committee for making sure that needs of Faculty are being met. He stated that ad hoc committees are working to make sure the needs of the faculty are met and that faculty input part of technology discussions. Two examples of committees that included Faculty input on technology purchases are the Learning Management Systems (LMS) Committee which surveyed faculty of the needs and the Council for Research which determined the needs of a new grant management system. He made the argument for ad hoc committees which can focus on specific expertise relevant to the technology under consideration. A positive step forward and one method to enhance communication would be more interface between the Committee and the CIO. Senator Ohley would like to see this institutionalized. Student Senate President Wilding asked if Senator Ohley brought the report to the chair of the IT Governance (ITGOV)? Senator Ohley responded no, they had not discussed their report with ITGOV.

Senator Nassersharif explained the reason that the Faculty Senate's Committee on Information Technologies, Infrastructure, Computing, Communications, and Networking (CITICCN) was created was exactly to address the issues of the multiple ad hoc committees and lack of communication across the URI community without a central clearing point for information. CITICCN was the Faculty Senate Committee that predates the current Technology and Infrastructure Committee and it retains the same responsibilities. Senator Nassersharif thinks the idea is a good one. Vice Provost Beauvais suggested reconsidering the words "consultation and approval" in the proposed recommendation. She is concerned as to how the Senate Technology and Infrastructure Committee will interface with all other committees including the IT-Gov. Student body President Wilding asked if the proposed process would make the timeline for purchasing longer. Senator Martin remarked she had served on several ad hoc committees and sees the Technology and Infrastructure Committee as a clearing house. Not a committee to micromanage, but to know what is going on to be reported back to the Faculty Senate. It would know what Faculty needs are. The Faculty Senate committee is the faculty voice.

Ben Leveillee from IT thanked the committee for bringing the issue of improving ITS and Faculty communication. They are working towards mechanisms for increased communication. Improving communication is important; the RFP process is problematic, it would be a shame for a new gate to inhibit the process.

Vice President of Research and Economic Development Snyder agrees with Provost DeHayes that the ad hoc process is effective. There is a need to identify the right expertise to drive the

RFP process for technology. If the Technology and Infrastructure Committee were to oversee all RFPs it would be a major commitment of time with an enormous workload and would slow the RFP process down.

Senator Cardany Chair of the Curriculum and Standards Committee said the ad hoc Curriculum Management Systems (CMS) Committee grew out of the Curriculum and Standards Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. She does not see the ad hoc nature of the committee as an issue. The Charge of the Committee includes keeping the Technology and Infrastructure Committee informed about its work. How can the Committee help us move through the process quickly? Senator Ohley commented there are lots of different committee structures in place that could be good. There is a need to institutionalize some things. A motion was made by Senator Nassersharif and passed to send the Technology and Infrastructure Committee Report back to the committee for further discussion and consultation with additional stakeholders.

c. Graduate Council - Senator Rusnock presented the Curricular Report 2018-19-7 from the Graduate Council. Dean Zawia requested the program change on the report to be removed as a portion of the Notice of Change. The motion was approved. The remainder of the report was approved.

d. The Curriculum and Standards Committee

1. Curriculum and Standards Committee - Senator Cardany, Committee Chair, presented the Curriculum and Standards Committee Report #2018-19-8. The report was approved.
2. Academic Calendar Subcommittee Report was presented by Committee Chair Senator Meenach

a. A motion was made and approved to change the order of business to allow Senator Meenach to discuss calendar related items in an order of her determination. Senator Meenach explained that due to the specificities of the 2020 calendar year, and the requirements of the University Manual #2018-19-9 Revised 2020-2021 calendar would give Election day off but requires classes to be held on Veterans day.

A motion was made to suspend the requirement in the University Manual that all calendars be approved 18-months in advance in order to allow the Calendar Subcommittee time to make additional changes to the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar.

Senator Meenach explained that the subcommittee was exploring changing the final exam schedule by going from 26 to 25 exam slots; shortening the exam period from seven to five days; going from 3 hour to 2-hour exams and eliminating the weekday reading day.

Vice Provost Beauvais said that a student could have 5 exams in one day and changes will be needed to the language for the University Manual.

Senator Ruemmele inquired if a common exam time slot can be removed. Ken Sisson, Enrollment Services, confirmed that two common exam slots could be deleted. Jack Humphrey, Enrollment Services, reminded the Senate that it would not allow for much flexibility.

More universities have 2-hour exams and a five exams per day schedule versus seven-day final exam schedule.

Senator Martin opposes the shorter final exam time because of student presentations in her final exams. There was a question regarding the need to have Student Accommodations to be brought into this debate. The Committee has already addressed this; the Academic Testing Center under the Office for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning stated that as more students are offered double time on exams as an accommodation, meaning that a

three-hour exam extends to six hours. A two-hour exam that extends to four hours is easier to accommodate.

Senator Nassersharif asked if we go to the two-hour model can Faculty be given two slots if they need. Senator Meenach said yes, she thought so.

A Motion was made to send the revised calendar back to the subcommittee to consider a new calendar for Fall 2020 that would not hold classes on Veterans Day or classes on Election Day, and adjustment to the exam schedule by one day by changing reading day and exam period length. The motion was approved.

b. Academic Calendar Subcommittee - presented by Senator Meenach:

#2018-19-10 Accelerated Online Programs Calendar for 2021-22 and 2022-23. Calendar was approved.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Leonard asked if there were any Unfinished Business. There was none.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Leonard asked if there were any New Business. There was none.

8. Chair Leonard asked for a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4: 57 p.m.