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**University Senate**

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

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**March 21, 2016**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**DEPARTMENTS PRESENT**: A. Harry Moore, Harriet Phillip; Art, Brian Gustafson; Biology, Ethan Prosen; Chemistry, Robert Aslanian; Computer Science, Mort Aabdollah; Criminal Justice, Bill Calathes; Early Childhood Ed., Regina Adesanya; Educational Leadership & Counseling, Vaibhavee Agaskar; Elementary/Secondary, Vanashri Nargund; English, Joshua Fausty; Finance, Rosalyn Overton; Fire Science, Anthony Avillo; Fitness, Exercise and Sports, Amy Rady; Geography/Geoscience, Nurdan Aydin; Health Sciences, Lilliam Rosado; History, Jason Martinek; Library, Min Chou; Literacy Education; Management, Wanda Rutledge; Marketing, Melissa M. Martirano; Mathematics, Freda Robbins; Media Arts, Kathryn D'Alessandro; Modern Languages, Grisel Lopez-Diaz; Dept. of Multicultural Ed., Donna Farina; Music, Dance & Theatre; Nursing, Gloria Boseman; Philosophy/Religion, Sabine Roehr; Political Science, Joseph Moskowitz; Psychology, Frank Nascimento; Sociology/Anthropology, Max Herman; Special Education, Patricia Yacobacci; Women’s & Gender Studies, Jacqueline Ellis.

**DEPARTMENTS ABSENT:** Accounting, Jeanette Ramos-Alexander; African/Afro American Studies; Alumni, Jane McClellan; Economics, Ivan Steinberg; ESL; Educational Technology, Chris Carnahan; Latin American Studies; Professional Security Studies, Richard Cosgrove;

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

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** Audrey Fisch, Tim White

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

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT**:

Betty Gerena.

**STUDENT SENATORS PRESENT:** Arijean Feliciano, Leman Kaifa.

**STUDENT SENATORS ABSENT:** Daniel Outar, Jeniyah Wilkins.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Alvert Hernandez, Corinne Reilly-Ferretto, Ana Pena.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** Harold Daniels III

**Draft 3 April 2016**

**University Senate Meeting Minutes**

**University Senate Meeting #6 for AY 2015-2016**

**Monday, 21 March 2016, Gothic Lounge (H202)**

Senate President, Dr. Joseph Riotto, called the meeting to order at 2:09 PM

**I. Clicker System Test:** Passed

# II. Approval of Agenda

Motion made and Seconded to approve agenda.

Motion to amend agenda to place Criteria for Search Committee for Faculty to after University Senate Standing Committee Reports.

Motion Passed

Agenda approved

# III. Approval of Minutes

Motion made and Seconded to approve the University Senate Meeting Minutes of 8 Feb 2016.

Minutes approved

**IV.** **Announcements**

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

1. In an effort to streamline the Senate distribution process the agenda and the attachments were positioned on GothicNet so as to not inundate senators’ e-mail boxes.

Sense of the Senate was that this was a good approach.

1. Congratulations are in order to the Gothic Knights Men’s Basketball team for capturing an unprecedented seventh Eastern College Athletic Conference (ECAC) Division III Metro/Upstate championship.
2. President Henderson invites the University Community to sign up for one of several focus groups being held in H217 on:

Wednesday, March 23rd (2-3:30 PM)

Monday, March 28th (3-4:30 PM)

Tuesday, April 5th (3-4:30 PM)

No more than 20 people will be chosen for each session. Please RSVP to Virginia at extension 3111 no later than Monday, March 21st.

1. A Town Hall meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13th (2-4 PM) in Ingalls Recital Hall, R101. President Henderson will provide an overview of new programs, student success initiatives, fundraising, international efforts and construction.
2. NJCU’s Open House is scheduled for April 16th. Please save the date.

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

1. On February 24th, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) acknowledged and responded to the Search committees for Deans for the College of Arts and Science and School of Business. That is, the SEC reviewed both committees’ documents and is pleased to report that the documents were very well written and that they can proceed as submitted. The SEC congratulates everyone on a very nice job and knows that the committees’ next steps in the search process will be handled in similar excellent fashion! The SEC appreciates everyone’s time and service on these two committees and fully supports the committees in their work and offers the SEC’s assistance if needed.
2. The Senate Executive Committee is working with the Provost Office on several items, including but not limited to: the Faculty Handbook, AUR, the infamous # 19, and various ad hoc committees.
3. The Senate Executive Committee will be meeting with the Union to ascertain items that belong in the Union, belong in the Senate, and those items that are multidimensional elements for both to pursue. It was acknowledged that there is an overlap and appropriately so. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for 28th March.
4. On the RiverKeeper item: The SEC had positioned it on today’s agenda; however, University Counsel indicated it best if Mr. Al Ramey and Dr. Aaron Aska meet with the Planning Development & Budget Committee and have the committee report out to the Senate. The SEC has charged the PDB who has already sent an e-mail to them requesting a meeting date.
5. As to jurisdictional items that the SEC was charged with, the SEC will be re-charging the Ad Hoc committee to revisit amending the Senate Constitution which should address these issues. In addition, the SEC offers the following:

Resolution to Clarify the Senate Procedure for Review of Proposals for Revision of Existing Programs:

**WHEREAS**: From time to time, curricular changes are made to previously approved existing graduate and undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, certificate programs, developmental programs, honors programs, and other similar programs ("programs");

**WHEREAS**: Proposals for substantive curricular changes to programs require review by the University Senate;

**WHEREAS**: In the past, curricular changes to programs have been reviewed by the Senate;

**WHEREAS**: The majority but not all of these changes to programs have been substantive;

**RESOLVED**: That the Senate calls upon the Curriculum and Instruction Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee to draft and jointly propose to the Senate:

1. A formal written procedure and corresponding forms), for submission of proposals for substantive curricular revision of existing (previously approved) programs; the procedure/forms) shall include the following (among other possible items):
   1. the individuals, departments, committees, academic administrators, and others who need to approve the proposed program changes;
   2. the effective date of approved program changes;
   3. all sections of the previously approved (existing) program document that would remain unchanged;
   4. all proposed revisions with appropriate rationales.
2. a list of the types of changes that are required to be processed and reviewed by the Senate (e.g., changes to total credits, new/substitute courses, changes to program titles, etc.);
3. a list of the types of changes that are not required to be processed and reviewed by the Senate (e.g. changes to course descriptions or course titles, etc.);

Proposals for substantive program changes without budget implications require review by the Senate Curriculum and Instruction committee or the Graduate Studies Committee though not by the Planning, Development, and Budget committee (PD&B); however, program revisions with budget implications require review by PD&B.

Discussion began with a request to define “substantive”. Examples of substantive changes were pointed out in the resolution (see #2 above) and defining what constitutes a substantive change is part of the charge to the committees. It was also noted that there are non-substantive changes that one may still want to present to the Senate as the Senate is the voice of the NJCU community and by doing so you are actually notifying the community that you are making changes. Otherwise the community doesn’t know.

The comment was made that until these guidelines are drafted the Senate would hopefully continue to review program changes without guidelines so the work of the faculty will not slow down. Also it was asked what the procedure right now is as these guidelines are being developed. For example, how would changes to major requirements be approached? There is be documentation on the Senate website as far as program changes and it is suggested to adhere to those types of criteria. It was further clarified that in the past, even when there wasn’t a clear procedure, these issues usually would go to the Senate C+I and PDB committees So it is still basically the same process.

Resolution Passed

## VI. University Senate Standing Committee Reports

1. **Curriculum and Instruction Committee** – Dr. Erin O’Neill and Dr. Michele Rosen, Co-Chairs

The committee approved 15 courses, 1 department name change, 2 course changes, and 6 program proposals (see Attachment #1).

Discussion:

It was noted that the Economics Department should be under the School of Business (not the College of Arts and Sciences).

Discussion occurred about inconsistency among the program proposals with regards to signatures for the chair of the college/school curriculum committee even within the same college/school. Some of the proposals have the signature and others do not. It was noted that some colleges/schools have a college curriculum committee and others do not. There was additional debate about whether it was even constitutional for C+I to review the proposals without such signatures, as according to the Senate Constitution, C+I makes its recommendations “based on their review of individual College Curriculum Committee recommendations.” Concern was expressed that when we deviate from our processes we put into question the integrity of those processes and integrity of our processes is a listing as an item in our Middle States Accreditation requirements.

However, it was also noted that we do ourselves a disservice by holding back the fine work in the departments because a college disbanded their College Curriculum Committee. Faculty are writing courses because they need them to benefit the students and C+I is reviewing them for that reason. It was agreed that the issue was not the proposals themselves, but the integrity of the University and University procedures.

Resolution: Henceforth, the Senate directs the C+I committee and Graduate Studies committee to adhere to constitutional processes and only review curriculum documents (that is, documents received by C+I and Grad Studies after 21 March 2016) that have been approved by the respective college/school curriculum committees.

Discussion occurred about whether it was within the power of the Senate to determine if College Curriculum Committees are convened. It was asked if we want to pass this particular motion if, in the end, it would require the Senate to stop acting on proposals if the Dean’s Office does not convene that committee. It was noted that this is a constitutional matter and if the University staff, faculty, and administration are bound by the constitution approved by the Senate, SACC, and Board of Trustees, then not convening the committee would be a violation of University policy.

The question was asked if we are simply creating another hurdle in the approval process. Perhaps a simpler answer would be to agree to amend the constitution to remove the requirement for college curriculum committees. It was noted that might be what happens eventually, but that is not where we are now.

The point that we currently have an inequitable process now was made. Some departments have to send proposals through a College/School Curriculum Committee and others do not. That inequity needs to be corrected eventually, but we need to document how we will resolve the current situation. It was suggested that perhaps the constitution could be suspended in regards to the College Curriculum Committee requirement for proposals that are already in the pipeline. It was noted that if this resolution is passed, we are asking that part of the constitution be remembered and enforced though we haven’t necessarily enforced it previously. This would make the record clear and would not require suspending the constitution.

The Provost made three points. First, he has no problem with College Curriculum Committees and will meet with the Dean to discuss re-convening such committee, but he wants to know why the committee was disbanded last time. Second, after constitutions are written they need to be studied and amended. He finds this one very confusing from his perspective. Although he doesn’t suggest that we suspend the constitution; whatever we do, we should make sure that we don’t act in such a way that holds up the approval of programs. Finally, we need to make sure that the process does not act to our detriment. We need to have good review and ensure the integrity of the programs. The Provost is more concerned about the integrity of the programs than the processes.

It was recommended that, when a proposal reaches the Senate committee, if there is not a signature by the college curriculum committee rather than just bounce it back, the committee go ahead and start looking at the proposal and let the chair of the department know that they have to get the signature of the college curriculum committee. It was argued that this would result in too much back and forth between committees and proposals should either be sent back or be reviewed and done.

Motion to call the question.

Motion passed: Question called

Resolution Passed

Motion and Seconded to approve the Geoscience/Geography Department name change to the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Discussion:

It was argued that this is an inappropriate name change for several reasons. Background: In academic year 2013-2014, a group of faculty from Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience, and Physics got together to propose an interdisciplinary Environmental Science major. The proposal was brought to and approved by the Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs. A search committee was assembled for a faculty member in environmental science who would head up the new major. When the names were sent to the Dean, two faculty were asked for because one person can’t put together an entire major. This was agreed to, so two faculty were hired; one each in Biology and Geoscience. A committee was then convened with members from Biology, Chemistry, and Geoscience which started meeting last year and working through putting together a proposal for the interdisciplinary Environmental Science major. They heard through the grapevine about a proposal to change the name of the Geoscience department, but none of the departments knew that the proposal had been submitted to the Senate process; all while the committee was meeting to continue work on the new major.

The name change will undermine the interdisciplinary Environmental Science major (which was in the works and everyone in all the departments knew it was in the works) because there will be an Environmental Science major and a different program/department called Earth and Environmental Sciences. This will be incredibly confusing for our students who are not going to know where to register or what courses they should be taking. Finally, the Geoscience department does not have an environmental science program. It’s an environmental geology program that has no environmental courses outside of the Geoscience department.

The Geoscience/Geography Department presented why it needs to change its name to the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences. The department has expertise and experiences in the field of earth and environmental science; has academic and professional recognition and leadership (both nationally and internationally) in the field; and has technical and analytical capacity very close to one million dollars (all added through service courses and service grants). This would be an excellent opportunity for recruitment, retention, and graduation. There will be no impact on existing programs including Geography. They will be working on the interdisciplinary program that they initiated together with Biology and Chemistry, so there would be no impact there. Additionally, At least 40 departments throughout the United States have changed their names and incorporated “Earth and Environmental” into their names. The name change was described as a brilliant opportunity and a progressive activity.

It was noted that this might be a good reason for why we need a college curriculum committee. It was also noted that it is important to students that they understand the content of a department and NJCU is usually very slow in using national terminology in whatever arena. Therefore, it is important to move to what these departments are called nationally.

There was discussion about where this new interdisciplinary major would be housed. It was agreed that that major (wherever it is housed) and this department could be confusing. Therefore, the group working on the major should be sure to include the now named Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences in the discussion and make sure that the major we have is in one place and that it is approved in the appropriate manner. However, it was stressed that an Environmental Science Major is not on the floor of the Senate today because the major has not moved forward. What is being voted on now is a name change for an existing department, the change is from Geoscience/Geography Department to Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences.

It was asked if it was still possible for the departments to work this out between themselves or are we here because they couldn’t and now someone has to decide aside from the two of them.

There was discussion about whether the body should even vote on this issue as the Senate does not vote on C+I reports. It was suggested that any vote on the name change would be an action item and a separate agenda item that we haven’t gotten to yet (and might not this meeting). However, it was noted that the constitution stats that C+I shall “make recommendations to the Senate for the establishment or dissolution of departments programs and majors.” The only thing that goes directly from the C+I to the Vice President for Academic Affairs is course recommendations. This situation is beyond one individual course so would go through the process that is inclusive of this body taking a vote. Additionally, this body recently received a committee report and it was subsequently interpreted by the SEC that simply receiving the report was sufficient as an explanation for approval of the content of the report. Now we are hearing the opposite. This should be clarified with our vote.

Motion Passed

Motion and Seconded to approve the 6 Programs in the C+I report

Motion to vote on the Programs all at once.

Motion Passed

Discussion revolved around what NJCU gets from the minor in Military Science. It draws students who are interested in ROTC. All of the credits are be taken at Seton Hall University (so they get the tuition). A student interested in ROTC would still do a major and General Education courses at NJCU. NJCU is already accepting those credits in transfer now. This program acknowledges that students have so many courses in the same area that we should help them with getting credentials.

Motion Passed – all 6 programs approved

1. **Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs Committee** – Dr. Natalia Coleman, Chairperson

The following items were presented (See attachment #2)

1. The committee reviewed materials for an honorary degree nomination and has passed the committee’s recommendation on to President Henderson and the SEC.
2. The committee reviewed 17 sabbatical applications for the 2016-2017 academic year. 8 were recommended to the Provost’s office for approval.

Discussion revolved around why only 8 of the 17 applications were recommended. It was asked if the committee was given a certain number that could be recommended. The answer was that the committee was not given a number of “slots”. All of the applications were reviewed and many did not meet the criteria set for sabbaticals.

It was requested that the committee (in collaboration with the Provost’s Office) publicize clear deadlines and notifications. It was suggested that they be put on the website.

1. The committee reported its response to the ad hoc committee’s report on the Faculty Department Personnel Committee (see attachment #2 for details). The report was received in a FAQ format with 51 questions. The format was unchanged. The FPSA added clarifications and their recommendations to the document.

Discussion: The purpose of this document was to try to clarify existing procedure in regard to DPCs and committees for promotion. They have very different functions and roles. The charge was not to suggest changes.

Resolution: The University Senate recommends to the University Administration that only tenured faculty members be permitted to participate in the reappointment/tenure process including the Departmental Advisory Committee. The department chair, if untenured, should have no role in the process.

Discussion: This references Items #10 and #28 in the report. Faculty handbook currently allows for untenured faculty/chair participation in the reappointment/tenure process. The reasoning of the resolution is that tenured faculty have the protection to voice their opinions (no matter what those opinions are) and are not in a position that may involve multiple loyalties. The role of the Union in this was discussed. The Union reserved the right to negotiate later. It was pointed out that this is intended as a clarification of what people should be doing already. It was asked what happens to small or new departments that don’t have tenured faculty. It was also stated that when someone is elected chair of their department they should be expected/allowed to fulfill all the duties of that position. Concern was expressed about looking at the resolution without the context of the entire document. For example, there is a contingency for not having enough tenured faculty in the document.

Motion to Call the Question

Question called

Resolution Passed

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

A brief report to present the results of the February 24th meeting of the committee. The committee reviewed and endorsed the following applications for approval (see attachment #3):

1. Proposal for name change of Department of Geoscience/Geography to the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences.
2. Doctoral program in Community College Leadership submitted by the Department of Educational Leadership

## VII. Criteria for Search Committee for Faculty – Dr. Joseph Riotto

This item was requested by a seasoned senator wherein the composition and criteria, if any, of the search committee for faculty was called into question. Apparently, qualified search committee members were being removed (and the understanding is that they were removed late) and replaced by the hiring manager in several departments after the search committee was already approved by the department.

Discussion: It was emphasized that DPCs and Faculty Search Committees are different things. The rules for DPCs are not applicable to search committees. Search committees have different criteria. The hiring manager determines the composition of the search committee.

Motion and Seconded for the Senate Executive Committee to create an ad hoc committee to work with the administration to jointly develop a document that explains the procedures for the selection and criteria for search committee members.

Discussion: We already have a University hiring document. We do need criteria for all committee participation. There are currently multiple practices for determining committee composition. It was noted that this situation might be a misconception. There are legal issues that need to be addressed.

Motion and Seconded to Table until next Senate meeting

Tabled until next Senate meeting

**Meeting Extended** 15 minutes by President Riotto

**VIII. Motions to Revise General Education Tier 1 and Tier 2 Requirements** – Dr. Joshua Fausty, Director

The following motions to revise general education Tier 1 and Tier 2 requirements were presented (See attachment #4 for details).

Motion 1: Be it resolved that the following language replace the current requirements for the number of Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses in the New General Education program:

* Students complete four Tier 1 seminars (12 credits) and six Tier 2 seminars (18 credits) with at least two seminars in each of the four Modes of Inquiry; they take a total of ten seminars (30 credits) across Tiers 1 and 2.
* Intermodal seminars count toward two Modes of Inquiry; however, they do not reduce the total number of seminars required in Tiers 1 and 2.
* Students also complete one Tier 3 Capstone (3 credits) in the final semester of Gen Ed.

Motion 2: Be it resolved that the following exception take effect for students who place into non-developmental English composition:

* Students who place into ENGL 101 without ENGL 095 are permitted to take as few as one Tier 1 seminar and as many as nine Tier 2 seminars to reach a total of ten Tier 1 and 2 seminars (30 credits); they are urged to consult with an advisor before deciding on this course of action.

Motion 3: Be it resolved that the following exception take effect for transfer students with 30 or more transfer credits:

* Transfer students who enter NJCU with 30 or more credits may receive Gen Ed credit for up to six Tier 1 seminars transferred in and may take as few as four Tier 2 seminars to reach the required total of ten Tier 1 and 2 seminars (30 credits).

Discussion revolved around clarification that these motions refer to Tier 1 and Tier 2 seminar courses. These motions will have no effect on the English and Math requirements of the General Education Program. The total number of seminar classes will remain unchanged at 10. The third motion is intended to provide more flexibility for transfer students as most transfer classes are being credited as Tier 1 classes.

Motion and seconded to vote on as a package

Motion passed – The 3 motions will be voted on as a single package

Motion to Call the Question

Question called

Motions Passed

Quorum Called

Quorum not present

Motion to Adjourn and Seconded.

Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned by President Riotto at 4:11 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Ethan Prosen, Ph.D.

Secretary of the University Senate

Attachments

#1 Curriculum and Instruction committee report to the University Senate

#2 Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs Committee report to the University Senate

#3 PD&B Report to the University Senate

#4 Motions to Revise General Education Tier 1 and Tier 2 Requirements