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**Meeting #10**

**University Senate Meeting**

**Monday, 21 May 2018**

**2:00 PM – Visual Arts Building (V08)**

**Minutes**

Meeting called to order by President Shamburg at 2:05 p.m.

**I.       Audience Response Voting System Test**

 Successfully completed.

**II. University Senate Meeting Agenda**

Motion (made and seconded): to approve agenda.

 Motion to amend (made and seconded): to add under new business, Election of Department Chairs, if time permits.

 Motion to amend (made and seconded): passed.

 Main motion as amended: passed.

**III.     University Senate Meeting Minutes of the May 7, 2018**

 Motion (made and seconded): to approve minutes.

 Motion: passed.

**IV.     Announcements**

 1. Congratulations

Congratulations to Vanashri Nargund-Joshi and her husband Harshad Joshi on the birth of their daughter Ni-hira on May 3rd, 2018. She may be the first sitting NJCU senator to give birth while in office.

2. Temporary Course Approvals

Beginning September, 2018, we will be sharing with the Senate, either orally and/or in writing, a list of all courses that received temporary approval since the previous Senate meeting. We’ll be sharing that list monthly.

3. Search for the Associate Provost

Seven faculty members and two professional staff members volunteered to be on the search for the associate provost: They are:

 Faculty:

 1. Zhixiong Chen, Mathematics - CAS

 2. Marilyn Ettinger, Finance – SOB

 3. Hanae Haouari, Chemistry – CAS

 4. Mary McGriff, Literacy Education - COE

 5. Erin O’Neill, Health Science - CPS

 6. Lilliam Rosado, Health Sciences – CPS

 7. Ivan Steinberg, Economics - SOB

 Full-time Professional Staff:

 1. Denise Serpico, Dean’s Office – CPS

 2. Cynthia Vazquez, CTPP – COE

Motion (made and seconded): to approve these nine people to serve on the associate provost search committee.

 Motion: passed.

**V.  University Senate Standing Committee Reports**

**1. Curriculum & Instruction Committee** (C&I) -Dr. Wanda Rutledge

Curriculum & Instruction Committee

April 27, 2018 Report

(2017-2018 membership)

Dr. Cindy Arrigo, Co-Chair

Professor Elizabeth Ann Galetz, Co-Chair

Dr. Adrian Martin

Dr. Michelle Rosen

Dr. Wanda Rutledge

Ms. Kimberly Aguilar, Student Rep.

I. On March 29, 2018 the Committee received four BS program proposals from the Senate Office. To prepare for review of bachelor-level program proposals, the Committee reviewed relevant portions of the *2017-2018 Academic Issues Committee Manual* published by New Jersey President’s Council, and relevant University Senate forms including *Procedures for the Creation of Programs, Program Approval Flow Chart 2010, Program Approval Form 2010*

II. At the April 11, 2018 meeting, members reviewed the publically available *Consultant’s Report* for a recently proposed program from NJCU. Excerpts from a transcript of Dr. Roberta Harvey’s March 2, 2018 workshop on *How to Write A New Academic Degree Program Proposal* (YouTube video) were shared. Committee members agreed to complete their review of the four BS program proposals by April 18th.

III. The committee approved the following program proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal Initiator | Dr. J.D. Jayaraman |
| Originating Department | Finance |
| Program Title | **Bachelor of Science in Business Analytics and Data Science** |
| Program Objective | The Bachelor of Science program in Business Analytics and Data Science is being proposed to satisfy current trends in business needs and to give students career opportunities in the lucrative field of Data Science. As the head of Gartner Research, Peter Sondergaard, said "Information is the oil of the 21st century and analytics is the combustion engine". This quote succinctly captures the importance of data and data analytics in the 21st century. The amount of data produced every day is exploding. The Executive Chairman of Google, Eric Schmidt's quote "There were 5 Exabytes of information created between the dawn of civilization through 2003, but that much information is now created every 2 days." captures this meteoric rise in data generation in eye-popping fashion. Big Data and Data Analytics is transforming the world that we live in. Thus it is imperative that academic institutions prepare students for the data revolution. The Bachelor of Science in Business Analytics and Data Science program will prepare students with the skills needed to gather, store, analyze and interpret large amounts of data in order to make business decisions. The program is designed to cater to the burgeoning need for analytics and data science professionals in various industries such as finance, marketing, retail and accounting. The business analytics and data science bachelor's program at NJCU reflects the university's commitment to empower a diverse, underserved population and be an institution of higher education nimble in its response to dynamic 21st Century opportunities and challenges. The program also underscores the resolve of the NJCU School of Business to be a data-driven institution. The program will be fully geared towards practice. Students learning experiences will be grounded in real world contexts. Students will learn analytical skills and use software tools that are currently popular in the industry, to find solutions to business data analysis problems that are commonly encountered in practice. Students will also learn the ethical responsibilities of working with large amounts of data, which in many cases could be private. Graduates of the program will be thoroughly prepared to take on the role of a data scientist in the industry. The program will also prepare students to take the Certified Analytics Professional (CAP) certification. |
| Program Curriculum | 33 Credits In Common Core For Business24 Credits Specialization Requirements18 Credits Electives |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal Initiator | Dr. Wanda Rutledge |
| Originating Department | Management |
| Program Title | **Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship** |
| Program Narrative | New Jersey City University (NJCU) is proposing a Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, is one strategy for promoting economic growth in Jersey City and beyond. Every year, U.S. entrepreneurs start in excess of three million businesses, and the level of interest in pursuing entrepreneurship as a career remains high among people in all age groups. Entrepreneurship education provides a pathway to economic vitality. A properly developed entrepreneurial idea creates jobs (not just for the entrepreneur, but for those she or he employs as well) and creates sustainable wealth for our communities.  |
| Degree Requirements | Students in the Entrepreneurship program will need to successfully complete with a C or better MA TH 164 Pre-Calculus for Business, MATH 200 Business Calculus, ECON 207 Macro-Economics, ECON 208 Micro-Economics, MGMT 211 Principles of Management. Candidates must have and maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.5 out of 4 to enter and remain in a business degree program. |
| Program Curriculum | 45 Credits in General Education33 Credits In Common Core For Business27 Credits Specialization Requirements15 Credits Electives |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal Initiator | Dr. Wanda Rutledge |
| Originating Department | Management |
| Program Title | **Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management** |
| Program Narrative | New Jersey City University (NJCU) is proposing a Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management. The hospitality industry is broad with tremendous career opportunities for professionals with a college degree. And, job growth is on a notable upswing. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), job growth in the hospitality industry has increased by 17 percent over the past decade, generating more than two million new jobs in the U.S. with 12.4 million people working in the hospitality industry today, making about 8.6 percent of all employment. The hospitality industry spans the leisure and hospitality sectors of arts, entertainment, and recreation, as well as accommodations, and food services. For New Jersey, and Hudson County, this sector includes other hospitality industries, such as gaming, resorts, cruise lines, stadiums and arenas, meeting and event planning, real estate, and more. The focus of courses taught in the hospitality management program is interdisciplinary and involves statistical analysis, accounting, marketing, and organizational behavior, strategic thinking and planning, sales, promotions, and operations, or any area in which one makes business decisions that affect employees, guests, and company profits. |
| Degree Requirements | Students in the Hospitality Management program will need to successfully complete with a C or better MA TH 164 Pre-Calculus for Business, MATH 200 Business Calculus, ECON 207 Macro-Economics, ECON 208 Micro-Economics, MGMT 211 Principles of Management. Candidates must have and maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.5 out of 4 to enter and remain in a business degree program. |
| Program Curriculum | 45 Credits in General Education33 Credits In Common Core For Business24 Credits Specialization Requirements18 Credits Electives |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal Initiator | Dr. Wanda Rutledge |
| Originating Department | Management |
| Program Title | **Bachelor of Science in Sports Management** |
| Program Narrative | New Jersey City University (NJCU) is proposing a Bachelor of Science in Sports Management. Sports are big business. According to the most recent Plunkett Research data (2015), the estimated size of the entire sports industry in the U.S. is $498.4 billion. The estimated size for the global sports industry is $1.5 trillion. To put it into perspective with other U.S. industries, note that the restaurant industry accounts for $400 billion, real estate $310 billion, the auto industry $220 billion, and education $50 billion. A sport management degree provides students with a basic foundation of the "business" of sport. The focus of courses taught in the sports management program is interdisciplinary and involves statistical analysis, strategic thinking and planning, understanding behavior, marketing, sales, promotions and more. all possible disciplines for their professional lives, not only enabling them to deal with ethical questions and challenges in a reflective and theoretically grounded manner, but also to provide some of the tools needed to participate in professional ethics bodies. |
| Degree Requirements | Students in the Sports Management program will need to successfully complete with a C or better MA TH 164 Pre-Calculus for Business, MATH 200 Business Calculus, ECON 207 Macro-Economics, ECON 208 Micro-Economics, MGMT 211 Principles of Management. Candidates must have and maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.5 out of 4 to enter and remain in a business degree program. |
| Program Curriculum | 45 Credits in General Education33 Credits In Common Core For Business27 Credits Specialization Requirements1. Credits Electives
 |

IV. The Committee also approved three courses.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Initiator | Dr. Mary E. Fortier |
| Originating Department | Nursing |
| Course Title | **Population Health Nursing** |
| Catalog Description | The course focuses on assessment and interventions to protect, promote and provide high quality nursing care of vulnerable populations across the lifespan. Emphasis is placed on evidence-based strategies to reduce healthcare disparities, promote social justice and optimize the health of local, national and global communities. |
| Credits | 3 cr. |
| Course Level | 400 |
| Prerequisites | New Jersey Registered Nurse LicensePSYC 150 Development: Birth through AdolescencePSYC 152 Development: Adolescence to AdulthoodSOCI 114 Sociology of the FamilyNURS 310 Contemporary Professional Nursing for the Baccalaureate NurseNURS 303 Information & Technology NURS 466 Culture and Diversity in Nursing |
| Degree Requirements | This course is a new required course in the Nursing Major, replacing NURS 451 and NURS 452. The total number of credits in the major has not been changed. |
| Enrollment and Scheduling | The course will be offered twice per year in-person or in a blended format. The maximum number of students per section is 30. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Initiator | Dr. Wanda Rutledge |
| Originating Department | Management |
| Course Title | **MYOB: Mind Your Own Business** |
| Catalog Description | This course provides students with the concepts and tools to assess, discover and unlock the potential for seeing opportunity, and to translate the opportunity or idea into a business. Students will explore what skills, knowledge and behaviors are useful to the entrepreneur and engage in community-based research. |
| Credits | 3 cr. |
| Course Level | 200 (General Education Tier 2) |
| Prerequisites | None indicated |
| Mode of Inquiry | Creative Process and Production |
| University-wide student learning goals | Critical Thinking and Problem Solving and Civic Engagement and Intercultural Knowledge |
| Enrollment and Scheduling | This course will be offered in each term (e.g., Fall, Spring, SU1, SU2). The maximum number of students per section in Tier 2 Gen Ed courses is 25. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Initiator | Dr. Michelle Rosen |
| Originating Department | Literacy Education |
| Course Title | **Raising Literate Voices** |
| Catalog Description | Public schools are the mechanism through which US residents attain literacy and gain access to the socioeconomic opportunities it affords, even though access has varied by student race, income level and/or ethnicity. This course explores the history of US public school education tracing the role of literacy through major historical eras and it examines how literacy has continued to serve as the route to empowerment. |
| Credits | 3 cr. |
| Course Level | 300 (General Education Tier 3) |
| Prerequisites | 24 credits across Gen Ed Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses |
| Mode of Inquiry | N/A |
| University-wide student learning goals | Written Communication and Critical Thinking and Problem Solving |
| Enrollment and Scheduling | The recommended maximum enrollment for Tier 3 Capstone courses is 15 students. It should be offered each Fall and Spring semester. |

Motion (made and seconded): to approve the four B.S. programs as received from the C&I committee:

a) Bachelor of Science in Business Analytics and Data Science

b) Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship

c) Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management

d) Bachelor of Science in Sports Management.

Discussion: It is terrific that new programs are being proposed and the proposers should be applauded. However, there are several issues with these proposals. The cover pages with the approval signatures do not show the total number of credits needed for the degrees but instead only show the total number of major credits needed. Some of the course descriptions are missing at the ends of the documents. There are multiple “cut and paste,” typographical errors. How is it that C&I, the dean of the SOB, and the provost’s office signed and approved these documents with all the errors? Let’s have these documents cleaned up and then consider the revised documents for approval. The programs’ objectives combine multiple objectives into one which creates assessment problems. The content of these programs is supported but not these documents. The majority of the C&I passed these proposals without changes though a co-chair noted 15 issues that needed to be addressed. Some of the needed changes have been made already but the updated documents are not the ones the C&I sent to the Senate nor were they distributed to the Senators. Thus, they are not the documents being considered at this time. The motion includes all four programs and there are concerns about each of the program documents.

Motion: not passed (yes – 10; no - 21).

Motion (made and seconded): to return the four B. S. proposals to C&I for additional review and changes, and then return the amended proposals to the full Senate for reconsideration.

Discussion: The next Senate meeting is in September and thus the proposals could not be considered for several months. A year would be lost in starting these programs. Concern was raised about the stated University-Wide General Education Learning outcomes, since they not identical in the four program documents. The needed changes are only “cosmetic.” The corrections should have been made before these documents reached the dean’s and provost’s offices. Substantive changes are needed not just cosmetic changes and, as presented, the proposals appear sloppy and would potentially embarrass the administration if shown to outsiders. C&I needs to be vigilant and not approve programs with these types of errors and problems. Members of C&I need to take their work very seriously and not just join to advocate for their own proposals. Could the Senate Executive Committee be empowered to approve revised programs? Is there a list of changes and concerns about these proposals that could be used to improve the proposals? A year will be lost if these proposals are not approved due to all the steps needed after Senate approval. An outside consultant said an 18 month approval process is common. C&I could consult with the program proposer and, if the committee wished, also with some of those senators raising concerns and then C&I could potentially approve improved documents for submission to the full Senate.

Motion: passed (yes – 22; no – 11).

Motion (made and seconded): to send the proposals back to C&I and for C&I to work with the proposers to make the appropriate changes and to return them back to the Senate and/or to determine whatever mechanism is needed to complete this during the Summer of 2018.

Discussion: The president of the University or the president of the Senate or 1/3 of the senators could call a Senate meeting. Can the Senate tell C&I to meet during the summer? The Senate cannot require a committee to meet but the committee could do so voluntarily; but some senators may not be available. Is a provisional approval possible? Could the presidents call a Senate meeting during the summer given the recent arbitration ruling about not being required to work following commencement?

Point of order ruling: the motion cannot be withdrawn even by proposers after it has been seconded and thus must be voted upon.

Motion: not passed (yes – 15; no – 18)

Motion (made and seconded): for the Senate to conditionally approves the 4 B.S. programs contingent upon C&I reviewing the proposals and approving the proposals with the needed changes.

Point of order ruling: The Senate can approve proposals conditionally.

Discussion: Since the Senate just passed a motion not to approve these proposals how can the Senate then vote to conditionally approve them? Agreeing to this motion would return the proposals to the committee which had approved the proposal with the errors. The C&I committee will make the needed changes and should consult with those who pointed out those items which need to be improved. The SEC’s approval would not be needed nor would the full Senate need to approve the proposals again. What does the program approval process specify about proposals that are not approved? If the Senate does not approve a proposed program it is returned to the proposer.

Motion: tied vote (yes - 16; no - 16).

President Shamburg voted yes to break the tie vote.

Motion passed (yes – 17; no -16).

**2. Faculty & Professional Staff Affairs (FPSA) –** Dr. Donna Farina

(2017-2018 membership)

Mr. Ira Thor (chair), Professional Staff

Dr. Donna Farina, Multicultural Education, COE

Ms. Debra McClary, Business, SOB

Dr. Joseph Moskowitz, Political Science, CAS

Ms. Denise Nash, Nursing, CPS

 Carolina Espin, Student Representative

**Faculty & Professional Staff Affairs**

**May 7, 2018 Report**

I. Introduction

The administration did not follow the FPSA’s sabbatical recommendations. Ira Thor, in his role as committee chair, met with the provost and was told that the administration uses rubrics to assess and determine which sabbatical applications will be recommended to the president and the BOT. The provost’s office “thumbed its nose” at the committee. Ira asked to receive a copy of the rubric(s) and was told he would receive it but, in fact, never received them. A motion about the rubrics is in today’s agenda under new business.

II. Sabbatical Leave recommendations to the Provost

During the discussion at the Senate meeting of April 16, 2018, senators requested additional information from the Senate Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs (FSPA) committee concerning its evaluation of sabbatical leave applications.

The FPSA committee initially sought information as to the number of available sabbaticals, but was not provided with this information. Subsequently the committee reviewed—thoroughly and exhaustively—thirteen (13) applications for sabbatical leave at its meeting of March 12, 2018. The committee sent the Provost its recommendations on March 14, 2018.

The committee based its recommendations strictly on the official sabbatical leave guidelines; it used no other document during its deliberations. The committee’s decisions were based on the quality of the applications: Did the application thoroughly address all of the information requested in the guidelines?

The committee divided the thirteen (13) applications into three distinct categories:

• Strongly recommended;

• Recommended, should University funds permit it;

• Not recommended

(a) Strongly Recommended

The committee strongly recommended that **six** applicants be granted sabbatical leave. It reported to the Provost:

The overall quality of these proposals is excellent. The candidates have demonstrated the value of the sabbatical to the department, University, individual, and field/profession. The candidates have provided detail on planned activities and have explained how the activities meet the criteria for the application.

Of the six applicants who were determined by the committee to have excellent proposals, only **two** were granted sabbatical leave; four were denied leave.

(b) Recommended, Should University FundsPermit

The committee recommended that **five** additional applicants be granted sabbatical leave—should University funds permit it. The committee reported to the Provost:

The overall quality of these proposals is fair to good. The candidates have somewhat demonstrated the value of the sabbatical to the department, University, individual, and field/profession; however, the proposal may be weak in one or more of these areas. The candidates have provided some detail on planned activities and have explained partially how the activities meet the criteria for the application; however, the detail and/or explanations provided may be weak or not fully complete.

Of the five applicants who were determined by the committee to have fair-to-good proposals, **two** were granted sabbatical leave—over and above the four applicants with excellent proposals who were denied, as discussed in **(a)** above.

(c) Not Recommended

The committee **did not recommend** sabbatical leave for **two** applicants. It reported to the Provost:

The overall quality of these proposals is fair to poor. The candidates have not fully demonstrated the value of the sabbatical in more than one to several of the following areas: value to the department, University, individual, and field/profession. The candidates have either provided inadequate detail on planned activities, or have not explained fully how the activities meet the criteria for the application, or both.

The Senate Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs (FSPA) strongly encourages these candidates to improve their proposals and apply again during the next academic year for sabbatical leave.

Of the two applicants who were determined by the committee to have poor-quality proposals, **one** was granted sabbatical leave—over and above the four applicants with excellent proposals who were denied, as discussed in **(a)** above.

III. Proposed Motion for the Senate

Given that:

• There is a long tradition of shared governance at NJCU, and that

• Fair evaluation based on explicit guidelines and criteria is a shared value of the faculty and administration at NJCU, and that

• The review process for sabbatical leave applications conducted by the Senate FPSA committee scrupulously followed the guidelines and provided a fair evaluation of applications,

The Senate requests that the four applicants for sabbatical leave who were not approved, but whose proposals were deemed “excellent” by the FPSA committee, be immediately granted sabbatical leave for the period they requested.

Motion (made and seconded): to pass motion proposed by the FPSA [in its above report].

Discussion: The FPSA reviewed all the sabbatical applications exactly in accordance with the sabbatical guidelines. The committee did not evaluate which research projects were more valuable but just according to adhering to the guidelines. Provost Julius asked whether the motion is asking to override the BOT’s decisions so he can convey the intent of the motion to the BOT. The provost was asked whether the BOT just receives the names of those people recommended by the president or whether they also receive the names of those who were not recommended. In other words the proposed resolution would be calling for adding names not opposing a BOT decision. The provost did not respond to the specific question, but repeated wanting to know whether the Senate is calling on the BOT to approve sabbaticals for those that the BOT previously did not approve. He said there is an entire process for approving sabbaticals.

Motion: passed (yes – 31; no-2)

Motion (made and seconded): to change the agenda to consider the resolution which appears under new business concerning sabbaticals and specifically about the administration’s use of rubrics in its review of sabbatical applications.

Motion: not passed.

3. **Senate Graduate Studies Committee (GS) -** Dr. Lorraine Chewey & Dr. Carrie Robinson, Co-chairs

Graduate Studies Committee

 April 27, 2018 Report

(2017-2018 membership)

Dr. Lorraine Chewey, Co-Chair

Dr. Aaron Ho

Dr. Jayadhurganandh Jayaraman

Ms. Tatiana Reyes

Dr. Freda Robbins

Dr. Carrie Robinson, Co-chair

Dr. Christopher Shamburg

I. Introduction:

1. Request for program modification: Department of Management – School of Business

The Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the proposal for program modification for the Master of Business Administration degree in the School of Business.

**Action Item #1:** The Graduate Studies Committee supports and recommends that the Senate approve the request of the School of Business to modify the graduate programs leading to the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree. See Rationale on pages 2 and 3 [below].

2. Proposal for change in number of credit hours for course: Department of Management, School of Business

The Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the proposal submitted by the Department of Management in the School of Business to change the number of credit hours for

***BUSI 599 Graduate Business Essentials.***

**Action Item #2:** The Graduate Studies Committee supports and recommends that the Senate approve the request of the Department of Management in the School of Business to increase the number of credit hours for *BUSI 599 Graduate Business Essentials* from six to nine credit hours. See Rationale on page 4 [see below].

3. Course Proposals

**Action Item #3:** The GSC recommends that the Senate approve the six (6) courses listed below:

Department of Management – School of Business: 2 course proposals (see p. 5 [below])

a) Business Analytics in Supply Chain and Logistics Management

b) Operations and Management of Transportation

Department of Mathematics – College of Arts and Science: 2 course proposals (see p. 6 [below])

a) Advanced Numerical Analysis

b) Numerical Linear Algebra

Department of Nursing – College of Professional Studies: 2 course proposals (see p. 7 [below])

a) NURS 670 Nurse Educator Practicum I

b) NURS 671 Nurse Educator Practicum II

II. Rationales for GSC’s Recommendations [pertaining to the three action items listed above in the committee’s report]:

**Request for program modification: Department of Management – School of Business**

The Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the proposal for program modification for the Master of Business Administration degree in the School of Business.

**Action Item #1:** The Graduate Studies Committee supports and recommends that the Senate approve the request of the School of Business to modify the graduate programs leading to the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree.

**Catalog Description:** The Master of Business Administration prepares graduates to lead and manage organizations, through mastery of broadly applicable core disciplines in global management and leadership, finance, and marketing, gaining skills tailored to the ethical solution of complex problems, integration of information technology, leading a diverse workforce, and competing in a global marketplace.

**Rationale:** According to the Director of Graduate Business Programs in the School of Business, the request for proposal modification is designed to provide a stronger and more comprehensive degree program offering to the MBA seeking student. The proposed MBA program modification includes a reduction in the number of required courses in the core and an expansion of the guided electives (see table on page 3).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA Requirements**  | **Current Program**  | **New Proposed Program**  |
| **Core Requirements**  | 21  | 18  |
| **Specialization\***  | 12  | 15  |
| **Capstone Requirement**  | 3  | 3  |
| **Total Credits**  | **36**  | **36**  |

**\*Specialization options: Finance (FINC), Management (MGMT), & Marketing (MKTG)**

In each MBA specialization, there are advanced knowledge course requirements of 15 credits. These advanced knowledge courses can be focused in areas such as Accounting, Data Analysis, Finance, Financial Risk Management, Organizational Management and Leadership, Marketing, and more as market demand and student need dictate. The specific course of study and final selection of courses is determined by the student in consultation with appropriate MBA representative to be certain of any pre-requisites required to take a course outside of the student’s primary focus.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MBA Program** | **Course** |
| General MBA Program  | *MKTG XXX Crisis Communications Marketing*  |
| Specialization in Organizational Management & Leadership  | *ACCT7XX Advanced Negotiation and Conflict Resolution*  |
| Specialization in Marketing | *MKTG XXX Consumer Behavior Analysis*  |
| *MKTGXXX Integrated Marketing Communications*  |
| *MKTGXXX Brand Management*  |
| *MKTG XXX New Product Development and Innovation*  |

The proposed modified MBA program aligns with the overall accreditation standards of NJCU’s School of Business accrediting body, the Accreditation Council of Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP).

**Proposal for change in number of credit hours for course: Department of Management, School of Business**

The Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the proposal submitted by the Department of Management in the School of Business to change the number of credit hours for BUSI599 Graduate Business Essentials.

Action Item #2: The Graduate Studies Committee supports and recommends that the Senate approve the request of the Department of Management in the School of Business to increase the number of credit hours for BUSI599 Graduate Business Essentials from six to nine credit hours.

Rationale: According to the Director of Graduate Business Programs in the School of Business, The course content of BUSI599 is enhanced through the adoption of materials from Harvard Business School through their online 3-course module in (HBX) known as the Credential of Readiness (CORe). The HBX Credential of Readiness (CORe) is Harvard Business School’s primer on the fundamentals of business thinking—a three-course online program designed to prepare students to participate fully in the business world. CORe was developed by HBS faculty members to instill a deep understanding of essential business concepts and problem-solving skills. Mastering the three CORe courses—Business Analytics, Economics for Managers, and Financial Accounting—will give students fluency in the language of business.

This is the program that Harvard Business School offers to incoming students to prepare for the MBA classroom, and the materials help students contribute to business discussions and decision making. As such, this platform and the course materials enhance our Graduate Business Essentials course and provide our students access to some of the best practices available in the delivery of fundamental business concepts necessary to perform well in an MBA.

NJCU students have the advantage of two faculty coaches who meet with them each week in person while they learn alongside a global cohort of peers—sharing perspectives and surfacing insights as they progress through the program on the HBX course platform. They also have an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the material by passing the required, in-person final exam.

This blended delivery method and enhanced course materials are good examples of best practices trends in accredited business programs. By taking advantage of the extensive analytical tools employed by HBX through the delivery of these three modules, NJCU now has some of the most powerful tools for assessment of learning in its entire program. Weekly detailed analytics on student performance in the quizzes, in online discussion boards, and networking allows for early and often intervention on the part of the NJCU faculty coaches directly with students for more personalized attention.

The time that the NJCU faculties spend with the students is not greater, but rather it is more targeted and personalized. While the students use the online platform to access content, take exams, and do homework, the in-person faculty provide grounded support and individualized attention.

**Action Item #3: Course Proposals**

The GSC recommends that the Senate approve the six (6) courses below based on the information for each course:

**Department of Management – School of Business: 2 courses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. EunSu Lee**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***Business Analytics in Supply Chain and Logistics Management***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***Supply Chain Analytics***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 600  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course will address supply chain, logistics, and transportation strategic, tactic, and operational considerations in planning, controlling, organizing, and measuring using analytical skills. The course will also discuss risk management and sustainability. A variety of analytics techniques and tools will be used in the course.  |
| **Course Pre-requisites**  | NA  |
| **Enrollment and Scheduling**  | This course will be offered each semester, and the maximum number of students recommended per section is 20.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. Amit Mokashi**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***Operations and Management of Transportation***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***O & M of Transportation***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 700  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course provides an introduction to transportation systems. The fundamental principles utilizing multiple modes of transportation to include air, maritime, and ground transportation will also be explored in this class.  |
| **Course Pre-requisites**  | *MGMT612 Global Strategic Management*  |
| **Enrollment and Scheduling**  | This course will be offered each term. The enrollment cap suggested for this course will be 25.  |

**Mathematics Department – College of Arts and Sciences:** 2 course proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. Debananda Chakraborty**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***Advanced Numerical Analysis***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***Advanced Numerical Analysis***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 600  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course examine the theoretical foundations of numerical methods and studies in detail existing numerical methods for soling many standard mathematical problems in analysis, algebra, theory of chaos and nonlinear dynamics. Error analysis will be developed for all methods. A very recent advancement like polynomial chaos will also be presented.  |
| **Course Pre-requisites**  | One semester of graduate level real analysis or the permission of the department.  |
| **Enrollment and Scheduling**  | The course will be offered once a year. The maximum suggested enrollment per section in 25.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. Debananda Chakraborty**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***Numerical Linear Algebra***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***Numerical Linear Algebra***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 600  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course examines the theoretical foundations of linear algebra and studies in detail the related numerical methods for analyzing linear algebra problems. Students will learn how to solve large systems of linear equations using different numerical methods, and computer software with the understanding and knowledge of underlying mathematical concepts.  |
| **Course Pre-requisites**  | One semester (3 credits) of graduate level numerical analysis and 3 credits linear algebra.  |
| **Enrollment and Scheduling**  | The course will be offered once a year. The maximum suggested enrollment per section in 25.  |

**Department of Nursing – College of Professional Studies:** 2 course proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. Debra Scardaville**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***NURS670 Nurse Educator Practicum I***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***Nurse Educator Practicum I***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 600  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course examines the role of the nurse educator. Precepted clinical experiences provide advanced direct-care role development and education experiences in undergraduate academic and/or clinical settings. Completion of 120 hours are required in an educational arena; with an additional 30 hours for direct role care development through advanced practice nursing care  |
| **Course Pre-Requisites**  | All Nursing graduate courses except *NURS679, NURS671, NURS620*  |
| **Course Co-Requisites**  | *NURS620 Measurement and Evaluation Methods*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Originator**  | **Dr. Debra Scardaville**  |
| **Full Course Title**  | ***NURS671 Nurse Educator Practicum II***  |
| **Abbreviated Course Title**  | ***Nurse Educator Practicum II***  |
| **Credits**  | 3  |
| **Course Level**  | 600  |
| **Catalog Description**  | This course expands the role of the nurse educator and direct care roles examined in N*URS670 Nurse Educator Practicum I*. 120 clinical hours are required in an educational arena; with an additional 30 hours for direct care role development. Population health and education experiences in academic and/or clinical settings are provided.  |
| **Course Pre-requisites**  | *All Nursing graduate courses except NURS679*  |
| **Course Co-Requisites**  | *NURS679 Capstone Program Evaluation*  |

Motion (made and seconded): to approve the modification of the MBA program [GS Action Item #1 above].

Discussion: BUSI 599 is part of the proposal. Why is there a discrepancy between the number of credits students receive and the number of lecture workload credits a faculty member would receive for teaching this course? This is a policy/governance question not a compensation question since the course cover sheets ask for this information. For all other courses, there has always been a one-to-one ratio between the lecture component of a course and the faculty member’s teaching responsibility for the course. This proposal lists 9 credits for the student but 6 lecture work-load teaching credits for the faculty member and therefore is contrary to well established practice. This issue will be addressed under the next action item #2 of this report.

 Motion: passed

Motion (made and seconded): to approve the increase in the credits for BUSI 599 from 6 to 9 credits [GS Action Item #2 above].

Discussion: Why are the outcomes in the expanded course proposal exactly the same as the current course with fewer credits? Why does the course change the ratio of student credits to faculty, lecture work-load credits? Who pays the tuition HBX charges for these online courses which would be infused in an expanded BUSI 599? BUSI 599 prepares MBA students without prior business training for their subsequent courses. The 6 credit course was not adequately training students in quantitative skills and needed to be expanded. The outcomes of the expanded course are the same as the current course because the goal of the proposed course is to better prepare students for their subsequent courses. All the HBX charges are included in the NJCU tuition our students pay. The structure of the revised course differs from other courses in that NJCU faculty serve as faculty-coaches and students are taking three online Harvard University HBX courses. Last semester seventeen students took the three HBX courses which will be part of the revised BUSI 599 and 6 students passed all three HBX courses, one student with honors. NJCU is also covering the cost of students retaking the HBX courses without charging additional tuition. The entire 9 credit NJCU course consists of three online HBX classes. How does our students’ lack of success in the current BUSI 599, along only a pedagogical change, justify a change in the graduate credits students earn? Whether a faculty member developed and/or proposed a course is not relevant in determining workload. Why not just have another 3 credit course in addition to the original 6 credit BUSI 599 class? Changing the ratio of student credits to a faculty members lecture credit work-load is a very big deal.

Motion to amend (made and seconded): amend the proposal so that the workload - lecture component is 9 credits rather than the 6 credits currently in the proposal.

Discussion: The original proposal may violate the University’s current credit policy.

Image other 3 credit lecture courses, a fee of 3 tuition credits, but only 2 teaching work-load credits for the faculty member. That would be a very significant problem. Deviating from the one-to-one ration of student credits is a major issue.

Motion to amend: passed (yes - 27; no - 5)

Main motion as amended: passed (yes – 26; no – 4)

Motion (made and seconded): to approve the six graduate courses recommended by the GSC. [GS Action Item #3 above]

Motion: passed.
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**Executive Summary**

Pursuant to the Senate Resolution of November 2, 2015, the Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluation proposes a policy to incorporate faculty/professional staff/librarian feedback into the University’s procedures for formative and summative assessment of individual administrators. The Ad Hoc Committee proposes the bi-annual use of the IDEA survey “Feedback System for Administrators.” The policy proposed is designed to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of individual faculty/professional staff/librarian feedback as well as the confidentiality and privacy of findings about individual administrators.

**Introduction**

Pursuant to the Senate Resolution of November 2, 2015, the Ad Hoc Committee proposes the following policy to incorporate faculty/professional staff/librarian feedback into the University’s procedures for formative and summative assessment of individual administrators.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s proposed resolution is offered in the spirit of *Transforming Lives: Strategic Plan 2013-2018,*Goal 3.1: “Advance core NJCU values of individual and institutional caring, growth, and excellence” (p.10). Three of the strategies for this goal are: “a) create and implement robust professional development programs to enhance administrative and academic quality … c) support individual development in reflection, self-assessment, and perspective-taking to further that academic enterprise, [and] d) increase campus engagement in continuous quality improvement initiatives” (p.10).

The Ad Hoc Committee also acknowledges that a regular and systematic process of assessment is consistent with the expectations of the Middle States Commission. To comply with Standard VII, an accredited institution will have "an administration possessing or demonstrating" (part 4.f) "systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units and for using assessment data to enhance operations; and ..." (part 5) "periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance, leadership, and administration." [Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2015). *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements for Affiliation*, 13th ed. (Standard VII, Governance, Leadership and Administration), p. 14].

The Ad Hoc Committee concurs with the notion that continuous improvement is the responsibility of all of the University’s constituencies, including the faculty, staff, and administration. The proposed resolution advances the values conveyed in the University’s Strategic Plan and responds to the implementation strategy of “continuous improvement initiatives.” The proposed resolution also provides a mechanism to satisfy external review by Middle States and other accrediting bodies.

The Ad Hoc Committee concludes that accountability in the form of evaluation on the part of both the administration and faculty will lead to a University-wide environment of greater transparency, resulting in a climate of mutual trust. The faculty and administration are partners in the education of our students, and the change, something of a sea change, will foster the belief in shared governance that has underscored the University’s mission from its beginnings.

**I. Proposed Resolution to the University Senate**

The University Senate calls upon the president of the University to establish an ongoing policy which provides that:

1. The IDEA survey “Feedback System for Administrators” (or a comparable instrument) be distributed bi-annually to all full-time faculty, librarians and professional staff.
2. The president of the University, in collaboration with the president of the Senate, provide orally and in writing (i.e., 2-3 pages) a joint report that summarizes, in aggregate form, the survey’s findings in a manner which protects the anonymity of those evaluated and those asked to complete the survey. In the event that the two presidents cannot reach consensus on a joint report, the president of the Senate may issue a brief (i.e., 2-3 pages) report to supplement the University president’s report.
3. The policy conforms with the provisions of the Report of the University Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluation (see below) approved by the University Senate.

**II. Report**

 A. Proposal

1. Purpose and Principles

a. To establish a system that enhances the University’s effectiveness by providing constructive, formative feedback from faculty/professional staff/librarians about the effectiveness of the University’s administrative leadership.

b. To implement a system that is on-going and not sporadic;

c. To implement a policy and procedures that the faculty/professional staff/librarians and the University administration regard as valid and reliable;

d. To ensure the confidentiality and privacy of individual faculty/professional staff/librarian feedback as well as findings about individual administrators;

e. To implement a system which recognizes that faculty/professional staff/librarian input is an essential part of administrative evaluation, while also acknowledging that the overall evaluation of administrators is the legal responsibility of the University president and the Board of Trustees;

f. To provide feedback from the faculty/professional staff/librarians concerning individual administrators’ effectiveness that will be used along with any other assessment/evaluation that the University’s president selects. This proposal is intended as a supplement to the administration’s current process for administrative evaluation (e.g., PMP); it does not seek to replace or change the process currently in place but instead to add to it; and

g.To provide feedback about individual administrators’ effectiveness using an instrument based on best practices.

2. Procedures and Participants

a. NJCU will utilize the “Feedback System for Administrators” survey instrument available from IDEA. If an alternative instrument is selected in the future, both the University president and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will approve the alternative. To control for budgetary costs and time considerations, the IDEA administrative survey instrument will be distributed bi-annually. The initial distribution will take place during the Fall 2018 semester. Initial findings will be reported during the Spring 2019 semester. For subsequent years the calendar of survey distribution dates, response deadlines, and feedback dissemination will be determined jointly by the University president and the SEC.

b. Prior to each survey distribution, the University president shall send a memorandum announcing the feedback system, encouraging all to participate, and emphasizing the confidentiality both of the input from faculty/professional staff/librarians and of the findings about individuals.

c. All full-time faculty/professional staff/librarians shall have the opportunity to submit a survey for their own administrative supervisor and for other administrators within that administrative chain-of-command. No administrator shall complete the survey, including administrators with faculty rank. Full-time faculty and librarians will evaluate their assistant/associate dean(s), assistant/associate directors, their dean or director, and assistant/associate vice presidents, vice president(s) assistant/associate provost(s), and provost including those persons with “interim” in their title. Professional staff members will evaluate their immediate administrative supervisor and those higher in their chain of command. Respondents shall not be asked for feedback about any person within their bargaining unit.

d. The validity and reliability of the feedback instrument and results are of utmost importance; consequently, all parties, including but not limited to the Senate Executive Committee, the University administration, and the leaders of the bargaining unit(s), must refrain from any actions, campaigns, or other endeavors that may undermine the reliability, validity, and/or integrity of this plan and/or its implementation.

3. Oversight

a. Only administrators who are not being evaluated, (e.g., presidential assistant(s), directors without faculty reporting to them) shall implement and oversee the survey with the assistance and concurrence of the SEC.

b. Clarifications and other issues related to the implementation of this policy shall be determined together by the University president and the SEC.

4. Findings

a. Each time the survey is conducted, the University president (or her/his

designee) in collaboration with the president of the Senate shall provide orally and in writing (i.e., 2-3 pages) a summary of the findings to the full Senate. The summary will be presented in a manner which protects the anonymity of those evaluated and those asked to complete the survey. In the event that the two presidents cannot reach consensus on a joint report, the president of the Senate may issue a brief (i.e., 2-3 pages) report to supplement the University president’s report.

b. Feedback (i.e., survey findings) about an individual administrator shall

be provided to: a) the University president (or designee); b) the president of the Senate; c) the individual reviewed; and d) the individual’s supervisor(s).

5. Assessment, Revisions, and Other Matters

a. At the conclusion of the first implementation of the IDEA survey “Feedback System for Administrators,” the University president and the entire SEC shall review the University’s experience with this system and suggest improvements. In the absence of any adjustments, this procedure will remain part of the University’s established policy.

b. The University’s Faculty Handbook, Employee Handbook, website and similar publications shall reference this faculty/professional staff/librarian feedback system about administrative effectiveness and note the responsibility of all those involved to participate.

6. History of Ad Hoc Committee’s Work

This proposal was developed after reviewing comparable policies in effect at colleges and universities throughout the United States. In New Jersey, for example, Rutgers University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, William Paterson University, and Stockton University have on-going systems that include faculty/staff input as part of an administrative evaluation process. Members of NJCU’s Ad Hoc Committee spoke with faculty members at each of these New Jersey institutions for input in formulating the plan presented in this report. The Ad Hoc Committee also investigated the literature on best practices concerning faculty/professional staff/librarian input in administrative evaluation practices. The publications which were particularly useful were IDEA’s “Feedback System for Administrators: Best Practices” and the report on “Faculty Evaluation of Administrators” from the American Association of University Professors.

Administrative input was sought in the development of this proposal:

* The November 2, 2015 Senate resolution was presented by the Senate’s Executive Committee (SEC) at a Senate-Administrative Coordinating Committee (SACC) meeting. At that meeting, the administration acknowledged there was no prohibition against the Senate pursuing this undertaking. The administration did, however, raise various concerns.
* The SEC subsequently conveyed to the Ad Hoc Committee the administration’s reaction, including concerns about the Ad Hoc Committee’s membership, conflicts of interest, and the need for administrative input. The Ad Hoc Committee attempted to meet with the administration to respond to the concerns but the administration would not meet with the Ad Hoc Committee.
* The Ad Hoc Committee then asked that the administration to devise, by itself, a process for administrative evaluation of individuals that would include faculty/professional staff/librarian input through a survey on a regular basis. To that suggestion, the administration repeated its previous concerns.
* The Ad Hoc Committee, at the suggestion of the SEC, then agreed to have the SEC serve as an intermediary to work indirectly with the administration to devise a mutually acceptable process for developing a feedback system. To this approach the administration, after initially agreeing, again repeated its previous concerns.
* Due to retirements, resignations, and other changes in the committee makeup, in March/April 2018 the SEC reconstituted the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee. This report, drafted prior to the reconstitution, has been thoroughly reviewed, discussed, amended, and approved unanimously by the full current committee.
* Throughout this entire process the Ad Hoc Committee was provided with various memoranda from the administration that repeated its concerns. As a consequence of these interactions, the Ad Hoc Committee is now presenting this proposal to the Senate for its consideration and approval. We have attempted to address each of the administration’s concerns even though our multiple attempts to meet with the administration were unsuccessful.

 Motion (made and seconded): to amend the agenda to make the Ad Hoc Committee’s report an action item for today’s meeting.

Discussion: Does the proposal indicate who would be evaluating whom? Yes, faculty/staff would evaluate those people above them in their change of command. An individual’s results are provided to the person being evaluated, the individual’s supervisor(s) and to the University president. An overall summary would be distributed to the University Senate, and would not indicate individuals by name or position(s) and which would be written together by the University president and the senate president. If they cannot agree on a single summary, each could write his/her own summary for distribution to the Senate but their reports must protect the confidentiality of all those involved. Confidentiality is crucial. Do the summaries go to the BOT? The University president would decide what is shared with the BOT on the belief that administrators’ evaluations are the president’s responsibility and at her/his discretion as an internal governance matter.

 Motion: passed.

 Motion (made and second): to approve the motion about administrative evaluation as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee [as stated above in the report]

 Motion: passed (yes – 29; no – 2).

**VII. Adjournment**

Motion (made and seconded): to adjourn.

Motion: passed.

Meeting adjourned 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Joseph H. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Secretary of the University Senate