



**University Senate**  
**Professional Studies Building, Room 336; Extension 3459**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**November 30, 2015**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Presiding:** Dr. Joseph Riotto, University Senate President

**DEPARTMENTS PRESENT:** Accounting, Jeanette Ramos-Alexander; Alumni, Jane McClellan; Biology, Ethan Prosen; Chemistry, Robert Aslanian; Computer Science, Mort Aabdollah; Criminal Justice, Bill Calathes; Early Childhood Ed., Regina Adesanya; Educational Leadership & Counseling, Vaibhavee Agaskar; Educational Technology, Chris Carnahan; Elementary/Secondary, John Bragg; English, Joshua Fausty; Finance, Rosalyn Overton; Fire Science, Anthony Avillo; Fitness, Exercise and Sports, Amy Rady; Health Sciences, Gail Gordon; History, Jason Martinek; Library, Min Chou; Literacy Education, Fran Levin; Management, Wanda Rutledge; Marketing, Melissa M. Martirano; Mathematics, Freda Robbins; Media Arts, Kathryn D'Alessandro; Modern Languages, Grisel Lopez-Diaz; Dept. of Multicultural Ed.,; Music, Dance & Theatre, Amparo Fabra Crespo; Nursing, Gloria Boseman; Philosophy/Religion, Sabine Roehr; Political Science, Joseph Moskowitz; Professional Security Studies, Richard Cosgrove; Psychology, Frank Nascimento; Sociology/Anthropology, Max Herman; Special Education, Patricia Yacobacci; Women's & Gender Studies, Jacqueline Ellis.

**DEPARTMENTS ABSENT:** A. Harry Moore, Darlene Britt; African/Afro American Studies; Art, Brian Gustafson; Economics, Ivan Steinberg; ESL; Geography/Geoscience, Anna Cieslik; Latin American Studies;

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Cindy Arrigo, Deborah Bennett, Natalia Coleman, Marilyn Ettinger, Audrey Fisch, Siyu Liu, Robert Prowse, Leonid Rabinovich, Joseph Riotto, Michelle Rosen, Rubina Vohra, Timothy White.

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** None.

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Queen Gibson, Asheenia Johnson, Cynthia Vazquez.

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:**  
Betty Gerena.

**STUDENT SENATORS PRESENT:**

**STUDENT SENATORS ABSENT:** Leman Kaifa, Daniel Outar, Richard Pastrana, Jeniyah Wilkins.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Alvert Hernandez, Harold Daniels III, Arijean Feliciano, Corinne Reilly-Ferretto, Ana Pena.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** None.

**University Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**University Senate Meeting #4 for AY 2015-2016**  
**Monday, 30 November 2015, Gothic Lounge (H202)**

Senate President, Dr. Joseph Riotto, called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM

**I. Clicker System Test: Passed**

**II. Approval of Agenda**

Motion made and seconded to approve agenda.  
Agenda approved

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes.  
Minutes approved

**IV. Announcements**

President Riotto made the following announcements and referred Senators to the back of the agenda for additional announcements

- A. 20<sup>th</sup> Annual Gifts from the Heart Project ends today, November 30, 2015. It's still not too late to donate and/or help. For more information, please contact Mr. Sergio G. Villamizar, extension 2170.
- B. On behalf of the Caroline L. Guarini Department of Music, Dance, and Theatre, the "Children of Eden" performance will be at West Side Theatre starting December 3-5 and December 10-12 at 7:30pm.

**V. University Senate President's Report**

- A. Based on last Senate meeting, we sent a reminder to Public Safety and we are happy to report that they have a number of initiatives that they are working on which include educating students, faculty and staff and they are partnering with local law enforcement to address and react to specific emergencies and threats. In addition, we will have a possibly a member of public safety on the agenda in the future.
  - B. Report on SACC meeting of Monday 23 November 2015
    - The Agenda had 4 Items
      1. General Education Administrative Structure
      2. Faculty Handbook Revision
      3. Senate Resolution Regarding Development of Plan for Evaluation of Administrators
      4. Role of Senate as it relates to the AFT
    - The Provost indicated the meeting was meant to be informational, allowing us to know the position of the University and allow for constructive dialogue.
    - Senate Executive Committee (SEC) members acknowledged this and welcomed the meeting and dialogue.
    - The agenda items were taken out of order.
3. Senate Resolution Regarding Development of Plan for Evaluation of Administrators
- NJCU's Legal counsel:
    - Presented University's legal issues:
      1. President only directly reports to the Board of Trustees

- President is appointed by the Board
    - The Board evaluates the President
  - 2. No high-level administrator can be appointed without a recommendation from the President
  - 3. This mix of power between President and Board is in conflict with the resolution;
  - 4. No express provision in the Constitution of the Senate for the resolution
    - Mr. Ramey recognized that it is not expressly precluded;
- SEC acknowledged and clarified that President Henderson is not part of this resolution.
- Discussion
  - Administration is open to idea of faculty input in the process of administrator evaluation
    1. Administration has concerns that need to be addressed to make participation in new evaluation possible
      - 96+ people eligible to be evaluated
      - Possible legal issue
  - Administration very interested in preserving administrative input into process;
  - SEC agreed and indicated that the Ad Hoc committee would be encouraged to solicit input from all parties and entities;
  - Administration presented four requirements for administrative buy-in or participation
    1. Those being evaluated must be involved in establishing the framework and criteria by which they are being evaluated
    2. Look at best practices
      - 96 individuals are eligible to be evaluated under this resolution
      - What are other Senates doing? Other universities?
    3. Confidentiality and Bias
      - This is a major issue that needs to be discussed
      - University is concerned about conflicts of interest
        - Admin says individuals who have sued the university, are facing disciplinary action, or generally have an axe to grind should be excluded from an evaluation committee
    4. Administrators are already evaluated using PMP
      - Members of Administration are confused about how this motion relates to current evaluation process
      - Is this a parallel process or to be included in the present one?
      - Issues need to be addressed
  - “Worst case scenario”
    - The administration doesn’t participate in the process, the work is done, and nothing results from it.
    - Admin wants to avoid “worst case scenario”
  - Consultation on a charge for the committee before the charge is given was suggested.

- The SEC indicated that the Ad Hoc Committee would charge the committee in person to indicate the importance of their work.
- President Henderson commented:
  - 4th/5th year President reviews usually include a 360-degree review
  - People on the Board have lots of expertise in area of Administrative review
    - That expertise should be used
  - The SEC welcomed this offer and will convey this to the Ad Hoc Committee.
- Provost is willing to write an email detailing the framework/ideas that could work
  - The SEC welcomed this offer and will forward to the Ad Hoc Committee.

#### 4. Role of Senate as it relates to the AFT

- Presented the administration's and SEC perspective
  - Need to separate the AFT and Senate
  - Provost indicated that the practice at NJCU is to blur the lines between the 2; however, SEC indicated that academic issues pertain to the Senate with compensation issues pertaining to the AFT; however, at times, the two issues do overlap and rightfully so i.e. some topics have multiple dimensions and elements;
  - The SEC indicated that the Senate Executive Committee would meet with the AFT to discuss topics and have a separate meeting with Administration. The SEC strongly held that Academic issues belong in the Senate.
  - Administration seemed to agree
  - Pointed out that Senate resolutions could be seen as unfair labor practice
  - Provost seeks a framework to give meaning to Senate Constitution wording
  - May need to reconcile the differences
- Suggested that Senate President has the power to reject motions that are outside the Senate purview as out of order.

#### 2. Faculty Handbook Revision

- This was an update
- Provost believes we are 85% agreed on protocol for revision process of academic portion of the handbook.
- SEC and the Provost agreed that we still have some issues to iron out
- Protocols need to be in place before the process begins

#### 1. General Education Administrative Structure

- Administration wants to be pro-active
- Provost requested a meeting be scheduled with himself, Deborah Woo, and Joshua Fausty before committees get too far into their work;

#### Outside of Agenda

- Provost agreed to provide his language for getting item #19 (suggested course cap sizes) back on the course approval process forms.
- The SEC thanked the Provost for agreeing to do this and await his language.

Request from the floor to expedite the dispersal of the hard copy format of the report.

- C. The Separation of Counseling Program from the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling is moving as scheduled. The document now resides with the Senate and

is an agenda action item under the Senate Planning, Development and Budget Committee. On target to achieve this by the end of the academic year.

- D. Having reviewed the documents, the Senate Executive Committee came to the consensus that the Provost acted in good faith and was following what he understood to be the appropriate process to move the Economics department to the School of Business. It should be noted in the future that these sort of changes should be brought to the Senate. Any changes in the membership of committees will be implemented at the next reorganization meeting.
- E. Change in the membership of General Education committees.  
Dr. Sabine Roehr has resigned from the GECAP creating an opening in that committee. According to the Senate constitution, the next highest vote-getter in the election would fill the opening. Dr. Barbara Hildner accepted the position.  
This resulted in an opening in the GECC. There was one volunteer from the floor (Dr. Sabine Roehr). The sense of Senate was to leave the position open for a few days to give people a chance to nominate.

## **VI. DRAFT: AUR's Approval Process**

The Senate Executive Committee presented a proposal for a process/draft form to add new curricular AUR based on the process for proposing new minors. The process is meant to be for any new AURs and is not meant to solely apply to the language proposal. This is not meant to be an action item at this time, but an informational document to review and bring comments back for discussion. Please see attachment #1 for details.

Discussion: This is quite an involved process because in recent memory (going back decades) there have been no new AURs proposed outside of a General Education program. Therefore, so there had to be a process established for the kind of All University requirement that would require any undergraduate student to do certain things, pass certain tests, or take certain courses. Essentially everyone would have to approve it because it involves/effects everyone.

The role of General Education was discussed. Although the current proposed requirement is not in the General Education program, it does have provisions for substituting requirements in the General Education program. In our history, AURs have always been a part of General Education.

If the requirement is a new course it would still need to go through the normal course approval process. It was noted that based on the signature page anyone of the signatories could delay the process.

The role of the Provost's signature and the number of signatures were discussed. Concern was expressed about doing all the work of getting a proposal down to signature line #18/#19 and finding out that it is something that the Provost or University is not interested. The Provost feels that he only needs to sign a document once. He is willing to assume the committees/chairs/deans will do their job and develop good programs. Noted that changes made by consultants would go back to the committee.

Language was suggested to make sure that the form indicates that the graduation requirement is specifically for undergraduate baccalaureate degree programs.

## **VII. University Senate Standing Committee Reports**

- A. Curriculum & Instruction Committee – Dr. Erin O'Neill and Dr. Michele Rosen, Co-Chairs

Motion and seconded to delay the report and so that the committee can go back and modify the report.

Motion passed

Discussion about increasing the size of the C&I committee membership to double. This would require a constitutional change.

B. **Graduate Studies Committee** – Dr. Rosilyn Overton, Chairperson

The committee met on 23 November and recommends the two following programs from the College of Education to the senate for approval.

- a. Separation of the Department of Education Leadership and Counseling into the Department of Counsel Education and the Department of Educational Leadership

Motion passed

Discussion revolved around two points. When would the separation be enacted and when the new senator would become effective.

It was recommended that the separation be made effective Spring 2016 for marketing and other separation reasons. It was noted that the separation would be effective immediately after all the appropriate signatures are acquired. However, the separation requires the signature of the Provost and the approval of the Board of Trustees and this won't get done until the middle of the Spring.

It was suggested that past practice indicated that the new senator would become effective during the May reorg meeting. Several Senators expressed their discomfort with this solution, indicating that that new senator should become effective as soon as elected by the newly formed department.

Motion and seconded that department senator become effective when the department becomes effective. Motion was ruled out of order because it goes against the wording of the Senate Constitution which states in Article 2, Section 2.a.: "All elections, with the exception of senators from the freshman class, shall be held in April of each year."

- b. NJCU Principal Certificate

Rationale: This certificate program will enable candidates who successfully complete the New Jersey state granted principal certification program called LEAD to receive a complementing university granted certificate. Individuals will be able to receive financial aid and will include notation of the completion of a New Jersey certificate program. This will allow the Department of Educational Leadership to be better able to track and retain program candidates.

Discussion revolved around the difference between this certificate program and the LEAD program. NJCU no longer runs the LEAD program (which came as a cohort), this certificate will replicate that program content without the cohort aspect. The principal certificate is a 30 credit program. Many students enter the program not needing another Master's degree only these 30 credits. The Department of Educational Leadership would like to be able to use another code to track these students for retention/graduation because they are not going for their Master's degrees.

Motion Passed. Adoption of the NJCU Principal Certificate program was approved.

C. **Planning Development & Budget Committee** – Dr. John Laski, Chairperson

A brief report to present the results of the 11 November meeting of the committee.

- A. The committee reviewed and endorsed for approval by the full senate the following applications:
  - 1. Minor in Military Science hosted by NJCU Professional Security Studies. Submitted by Dr. John Collins. Related to ROTC program. Courses taken at Seton Hall and there is a transportation element (see below).
  - 2. Minor in Marketing submitted by the Marketing Department of the School of Business
  - 3. Minor in Social Media Marketing submitted by the Marketing Department of the School of Business
- B. The PDB is inquiring via the Senate regarding the transportation aspects associated with the Minor in Military science. Specific question is: If the transportation costs as indicated in the program application had been approved, what is the application of same to other programs not the least of which is the transportation issue related to the School of Business at the Haborside campus?
- C. Minor in Public Relations has been held over pending some additional financial impact review.

Discussion: There is a law suit against the University with regard to the University potentially violating an agreement that the university signed concerning the health of students, staff, and faculty when it comes to the West campus. Specifically, the law suit says that the University would be violating that agreement if it builds the buildings as originally planned and as presented to Senate on multiple occasions. The violation would include breaching the cap that protects us from the chromium in the soil under the cap. Two potential violations may have already occurred. Why this is an issue and why there needs to be a lawsuit are things we should all hear about. Our physical safety is at stake.

Request: The Planning Development and Budget committee look into this matter and report back to the Senate, especially with regards to the safety and well-being of our students, staff and the faculty.

The request was passed on to the Planning, Development and Budget committee.

**VIII. Elections Committee: General Education Standing Committees**– Dr. Chris Carnahan, Chairperson

The following individuals were elected to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean of Continuing Education

- 1) Five full-time faculty (all colleges must be represented; no more than 2 individuals from each college).
  - a. Barbara Blozen, Nursing, CPS
  - b. Grace Wambu, Counseling Program, COE
  - c. *three positions empty*
- 2) One member from the Professional Staff
  - a. Karyn Alexander, Senior HR Specialist, Professional Service Specialist 2

Discussion: Why this position is a Dean? The Department of Continuing Education has moved back under Academic Affairs. There was a director. The change to Dean is to better align with

how things are done in Academic Affairs. It is a very common title in education. This individual should be doctorally prepared and needs to be able to run all kinds of non-degree programs as well as interact with Deans, Chairs, and departments. The Provost is more comfortable with the Dean title. The title would be beneficial in recruitment. Question was asked about what peer institutions are doing.

The role of credit bearing/non-credit bearing courses was also discussed. Currently there are both credit and non-credit bearing courses in the Department of Continuing Education. The Provost's intent is for there to be non-credit bearing courses. However, there may be cases in the future where the department and the dean and the chair decide that the Continuing Education Office is the right office to offer some type of hybrid and doesn't want to rule that out. The Provost would like to see the department as revenue generating. This revenue could go back to the departments and schools.

The Provost was asked about the possibility of certificate or degree programs in the Department of Continuing Education. The Provost replied that we are now, but suggested that he is not comfortable with our current model. His intent is for there to be non-credit bearing courses. The Provost ruled out the possibility of an executive MBA as an example, but allowed that perhaps alternative certification programs might do well.

Discussion of the eligibility/appropriateness of candidates occurred. Is a person who directly reports to the hired position eligible/appropriate to be on the search committee? There are ample parallel situations. Faculty report to Deans, President, and Provost but serve on search committees for these positions.

**IX. Ad hoc Committee to develop a plan for the evaluation of the University's Administrative leaders including, but not limited to, Dean's, Vice President's, and Provost(s)**

There were seven volunteers all of whom were appointed to the committee:

1. Betty Gerena, Assistant to the Chair of Computer Science
2. Alina Gharabegian, English
3. Gail Gordon, Health Sciences
4. Mince John, Mathematics
5. Joseph Moskowitz, Political Science
6. Zandile Nkabinde, Special Education
7. Jeanette Ramos-Alexander, Accounting

The committee is charged with developing a plan with various inputs from various sources.

Discussion of the wording of the resolution occurred. The accuracy of the wording of the motion was confirmed.

The Provost encouraged the committee to look at the guidelines/comments provided to the Senate Executive Committee by the administration. These issues must be addressed if the process is to go forward. It was agreed that this should be a collective, open, constructive, joint endeavor. The SEC agreed that the administration's information would be shared with the committee.

## **X. Online Course Cap Sizes**

Motion for a Resolution: The Administration's unilateral increase of on-line course caps during this past summer directly violates the Senate standing committee report of May 7, 2012 which states that "Potential increases or decreases of course CAPs constitute changes to course approval documents and as such require submission, and approval through the governance process, using the 'change to an existing course' option on the submission form for 'permanent course approval'".

Motion seconded.

Discussion: Changes were made during the Summer for Fall on interim basis to accommodate more students. We have some the smallest, if not the smallest, class sizes in New Jersey.

Question was asked if we were discussing online course caps which not the same as the approval system. Most courses are approved as courses and the course caps could be different than the online course caps.

Discussion occurred about whether this is a labor matter or Senate matter. It was argued that this is about plain English interpretation of the wording of the report and the violation is of the advice provided by the Senate. The argument was made that changes in course caps is a faculty (pedagogy) issue as having a class increased in size 10-20% one to two weeks before the semester can significantly change how you can teach that class.

Provost believes the issue is negotiable and has questions about whether this is a Senate or AFT issue. Provost cannot allow a situation where we have the union negotiating a piece of something and the Senate negotiating another piece of the same thing. Provost does not want to be crossing with both the AFT and the Senate. If it is negotiable, then the Provost believes that they should be presenting a proposal to the AFT.

Question was asked: If the course caps were raised to 25 in the Summer and were 25 in the Fall and are currently 25 in the Spring, when does this stop be "interim" and go back to the appropriate committees? It was also noted that we do have the benefit of 3 semesters of data that we can look at for the effects of the increase.

It was argued that the issue of the resolution is NOT the raising of the course caps, but that the issue was consultation. Who was consulted? Provost indicated that his policy is to talk with the Deans who talk with the chairs and he expected the discussion to pass down the chain to faculty.

Provost noted that he is in favor of and working with the SEC to put the course caps language (item #19) back into the course approval forms. Discussion of criteria for setting course caps has taken place with the chairs.

Motion to call the Question.

Motion passed; Question called.

Original motion passed.

Meeting Extended

**XI. Presentation of language to put Item #19 back into the Guidelines for Requesting New Course Approval and Changes document**

Language for putting item #19 back was presented (see attachment #3).

Discussion: If something is sent through the process and the Provost changes the course cap number, 1) what happens and 2) Once established can we count on that number? Provost has stated that he will send any application with course cap numbers he disagrees with back to the Senate. The process is the Process, so at any level if something is sent back it goes to the prior level. In the discussed situation this would go back to the Senate C&I committee. There was also discussion of the criteria used to establish the course caps. It was suggested that the course cap criteria from the FPSA committee report of 7 May 2012 should be considered.

Quorum call  
Quorum is present

Motion and seconded to approve the language presented and insert back into the Guidelines for Requesting New Course Approval and Changes document.

Counter-motion and seconded to recommit to the C&I committee.  
Counter-motion passed.

**XII. Economics Department move to the School of Business**

Motion and seconded to table discussion for next meeting and request to be placed early on the agenda

Motion to call the question.

Motion passed: Question called

Motion passed

Motion to Adjourn made and Seconded.

Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned by President Riotto at 4:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Ethan Prosen, Ph.D.  
Secretary of the University Senate

Attachments

#1 New Jersey City University Request for All-University Undergraduate Graduation Requirement Addition/Revision

#2 PDB report to the University Senate

#3 Language to put Item #19 back into the Guidelines for Requesting New Course Approval and Changes document