



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

## **MINUTES OF MEETING**

### **December 1, 2014**

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

**Presiding:** Dr. Karen Morgan, President University Senate

**DEPARTMENTS PRESENT:** A. Harry Moore, Harriet Phillip; Accounting Jeanette Ramos-Alexander; Biology, Ethan Prosen; Chemistry, Robert Aslanian; Computer Science, Mort Aabdollah; Criminal Justice, Bill Calathes; Early Childhood Ed., Regina Adesanya; Economics, Ivan Steinberg; Educational Leadership & Counseling, Vaibhavee Agaskar; Educational Technology, Chris Carnahan; Elementary/Secondary, John Bragg; English, Joshua Fausty; ESL, Anne Mabry; Fire Science, Kevin Malley; Fitness, Exercise and Sports, Quoc Tu; Geography/Geoscience, Anna Cieslik; Health Sciences, Lilliam Rosado; History, Rosamond Hooper-Hamersley; Library, Min Chou; Literacy Ed., Fran Levin; Management, Wanda Rutledge; Dept. of Multicultural Ed., Vesna Radanovic-Kocic; Nursing, Gloria Boseman; Philosophy/Religion, Sabine Roehr; Physics, Chris Herbert; Political Science, Joseph Moskowitz; Professional Security Studies, Richard Cosgrove; Psychology, Patrice Dow-Nelson; Sociology/Anthropology, Max Herman; Special Education, Carol Fleres; Women's & Gender Studies, Jacqueline Ellis.

**DEPARTMENTS ABSENT:** African/Afro American Studies; Alumni, Jane McClellan; Art, Dennis Dittrich; Finance, Rosalyn Overton; Latin American Studies, Liza Fiol-Matta; Marketing; Mathematics, Freda Robbins; Media Arts, Kathryn D'Alessandro; Modern Languages, Grisel Lopez-Diaz; Music, Dance & Theatre, Amparo Fabra Crespo;

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Cindy Arrigo, Deborah Bennett, Michael Cole, Marilyn Ettinger, Audrey Fisch, Karen Morgan Ivy, Joseph Riotto, Rosemary Thurston, Rubina Vohra, Tim White.

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** Christopher Cunningham, Jack Egan.

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

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** Angela Arriaza-Jarquín, Asheenia Johnson.

#### **STUDENT SENATORS PRESENT:**

**STUDENT SENATORS ABSENT:** Brianna Gipe, Miraclea Adams, Claudio Josuel Alejo, Thomas Caban.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Jasmine Bass, Ana Pena

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:**



**University Senate Meeting Minutes  
University Senate Meeting #3, For AY 2014-2015  
Monday, December 1, 2014, Gothic Lounge**

Senate President, Dr. Karen Morgan, called the meeting to order at 2:12 PM.

**I. Certificate of Appreciation**

In appreciation of 20 years of service as office assistant to the University Senate, a certificate of appreciation and recognition is presented to Donna Piscopo for all her excellent service and dedication.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

Motion made and seconded to approve minutes as presented.

Motion made and seconded to amend the agenda by adding “student concerns” as an additional item under New Business.

Motion approved.

Motion made and seconded to amend the agenda so that item #9 on the agenda, Committee Reports be reordered so that the General Education Ad Hoc Committee and General Education Executive Committee reports are the first committee reports.

Motion approved.

Motion made and seconded to table agenda item #10: Constitutional Amendments and to create, within a week, an ad hoc committee of three-five members to review the proposed constitutional amendments and to report back with recommendations to the Senate at or before the March 2, 2015 Senate meeting.

The report should be presented to the Senate Executive Committee for review in a timely manner so that the entire Senate receives it by the March meeting.

Motion approved.

Motion made and seconded to approve agenda as amended.

Motion approved.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Motion made and seconded to accept the minutes of the November 10, 2014 Senate Meeting as presented.

Motion approved.

**IV. Announcements**

President Morgan referred the Senate to the back of the agenda for all announcements.

## **V. Clicker Test Preformed**

## **VI. University Senate President's Report**

1) A senator-at-large position is available due to a resignation. The position is available until May 2015. John Collins was the candidate for the position with the next highest vote count.

Motion made and seconded to support the Executive Committee's appointment of John Collins to serve as senator-at-large for the remainder of term.

Motion approved.

2) The Senate has not received additional nominations from the Student Government Organization for positions on standing committees. We expect Alvert Hernandez, the Student Government Organization president, to forward, to the Senate Office, additional nominations as students are identified for the positions.

3) The Dean of Students is seeking four faculty members to serve on the Judicial Board and additional faculty and staff representatives to serve on the Smoke-Free and Tobacco Use Policy Implementation Team. Those interested should contact Donna Piscopo.

4) Dr. Morgan revised her previously distributed Senate Administration Coordinating Committee Report (SACC) report about the May 2014 SACC meeting. The revised report will be e-mailed to all Senators so that it can be shared with their constituents.

5) The Senate Office received inquiries about the disillusionment of the College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee as related to the curriculum approval process. Following informal conversations, Provost Julius asked Interim Dean Moran for a formal response. Copies of Dr. Moran's memo are included in today's hand-outs.

5) Provost Julius has announced that Dr. Morgan will be the Assistant Provost commencing January 1, 2015. Consequently this is likely to be her last meeting as Senate President. Dr. Morgan expressed her pleasure serving as Senate President and is thankful for the opportunity. "These are exciting times... with many possibilities" for the University. She looks forward to working with all the constituencies of the University. "This is not a formal resignation since my position is not effective until 2015."

Discussion of Senate President's Report:

The revised SACC report was shared with the Executive Committee of the Senate. It describes additional changes to the General Education Program which

were approved by the Senate though not included in the report's previous version. Some revisions concern class size and specifically: a) the insertion of "recommended" prior to the listing of maximum enrollments and b) the exclusion of the possibility of lower enrollment caps if approved through the curriculum process. A third item about enrollment, c) the omission of item #19: Enrollment and Scheduling on the course approval form, was in the previous SACC report. Rationales for all these changes were sought but not forthcoming.

Motion made and seconded to direct the Senate Executive Committee to place on the agenda of next SACC meeting reconsideration of the course caps language approved by Senate and furthermore the reinstatement of item #19 on the Course Proposal form.

Discussion: Because copies of all the relevant documents are not available at today's meeting, consideration of the resolution should be postponed. The previous SACC report was distributed. The omission of item #19 on the course proposal was discussed previously by the Senate. The absence of the revised SACC report from today's handouts is surprising. The resolution seeks rationales for changes and/or advocacy for items the Senate previously approved. Is the motion needed since the Senate previously approved these items? The Senate should be able to respond to SACC reports and to SACC decisions (especially concerning items which were forwarded to the Board of Trustees) with follow-up motions. The Executive Committee can pursue this topic without a resolution. Nothing is lost by passing the resolution especially since it concerns previous decisions and since some new administrators and Senate officers have been selected since the May 2014 SACC meeting.

Motion made and seconded to call the question: approved

Motion approved.

## **VII. University President's Remarks**

Dr. Sue Henderson, using the attached PowerPoint slides, updated the Senate on a range of accomplishments and projects and challenges facing the University. NJCU is the safest college campus in New Jersey. NJCU has lowest tuition in state and students leave with lowest amount of debt in the state. We must focus more on enrollment and we must grow. Enrollment has been flat over the last few years and has increased at some other public colleges. NJCU needs to improve retention and recruitment. Students appreciate the faculty's personal interest in their well-being. New trustees are adding more financial experience to our institution. Implementation of the New General Studies program and the approval of the Urban Studies minor are commendable. Numerous facilities projects are underway. Remediation of West Campus land, primarily paid for by Honeywell Corporation, is completed. Ground will probably be broken in March 2015 for expansion of the Science building. Air conditioning will be added to the Athletic

Center. The Business School is being relocated in the downtown area. As the population in Jersey City increases, NJCU needs to build on our competitive advantages and meet the challenges of other institutions seeking to expand their offerings. The West Campus development is proceeding and a transportation link to the light-rail station is being explored. Ground breaking for the new residence hall is scheduled for June 2015. Three demand studies have been conducted showing a need for dormitory facilities. A variety of funding methods are being utilized including state funds, private-public partnerships, leasing land rather than selling it, and market rate housing projects. The West Campus will include an academic building. Dr. Henderson reiterated the importance of recruitment, retention and increased enrollment.

In response to questions, Dr. Henderson said: a) the report on demand for increasing housing is available on request; b) the housing study includes recommendations for efficiencies that can offset the additional cost of administering student housing and we recognize that economies of scale may not initially be in effect when providing a range of student services both on- and off-campus; c) transportation between the School of Business and the main campus, which is both efficient and not expensive for students and the University, is being worked on; d) fees for student and faculty parking at the Business School campus will probably be the same as currently in effect; e) the cost of light-rail transportation between campuses, and the possibility of free transportation between campus are subjects still being worked upon; f) we do need to look at tutoring for upper level courses; g) buildings owned by the University will use our own staff while in private-public partnership facilities there will be fair wage labor contracts.

### **VIII. Course Duplication**

Discussion (continued from previous month):

When a signature is not included on the line (on the proposal cover sheet) which indicates consultation with another department(s), is the course automatically vetoed?

Motion made and seconded to amend the main motion (made at previous meeting) to change the last line to read: "His/her department was consulted on the proposed course." The entire resolution would thus read:

That the General Education Committee and the Senate Curriculum and Instruction Committee be aware that the course approval process includes a process to review and confirm that there are no duplicate courses to be certain that chair/coordinator of the other department/program signs the proposal cover page to indicate that he/she was consulted on the proposed course.

Discussion on amendment: Adding the amendment changes the original intent of the entire motion. How would one know whether another department even saw the course proposal? All course proposals, in their entirety, should be posted on-

line for everyone to see. This amendment would change the current meaning of the signature line. Will the Provost determine and potentially not approve duplicate courses? Some departments are ignoring the offerings of other departments.

Motion made and seconded to call question on the amendment: approved.

Discussion continued on amended motion: In some instances duplication may be desirable. How is duplication defined? In its current form the proposal duplicates our current process. Cross-listing a specific course is possible. Course duplication is an important issue but this motion does not resolve it. In the future a new clearer motion should be proposed.

Amendment and amended motion: not approved.

#### **IX. National Student Exchange (NSE)**

Mr. Mathew Lahm explained that in fall 2014, 11 students are attending NJCU as part of the National Student Exchange program. Their home colleges include: Arizona University, University of Louisville, Moorhead State, Kent State University and others. All eleven are attending NJCU because of our location. In spring 2015, 9 other NSE students will attend NJCU. We currently have NJCU students attending California State University at Northridge and University of Puerto Rico.

#### **X. Committee Reports**

##### **a) Ad Hoc General Education Curriculum Committee – Josh Fausty**

##### **General Education Curriculum Committee Report to the University Senate November 24, 2014**

14 of 16 General Education (GE) course proposals thus far received by the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECC) from the Deans have been reviewed by the GECC. In most cases, minor revisions were requested by the committee and subsequently received from the proposers.

The following 6 course proposals were received, revised, recommended for approval, and forwarded to the Senate Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I) for its review on November 18, 2014:

- Contemporary Economic Issues
- Contemporary Mathematics
- Ethics in Everyday Life
- Food, Philosophy & Global Health

- Mathematics Makes a Case
- Personal Finance

The GECC expects to receive many more course proposals for the first time, and to receive revised versions of several course proposals that it has not yet recommended, soon after the December 1, 2014 deadline for department curriculum committees to forward GE course proposals to the Deans.

The GECC will meet on December 4, 2014 to continue its review of submitted proposals. It will request revisions, if necessary, and forward recommended course proposals to the C&I for its review as quickly as possible in light of the December 19, 2014 goal to forward a list of approved GE courses to the Registrar.

**Submitted on behalf of the General Education Curriculum Committee:**

Joshua Fausty, Chair  
 Max Herman  
 Anne Mabry  
 Erin O'Neill  
 Freda Robbins  
 Michelle Rosen  
 Rubina Vohra

**[Suggested] Motion:** The Course Proposal Guidelines will be revised to include section 12d (on Programmatic Assessment and Signature Assignments) as follows:

- d) General Education courses are required to participate in **programmatic assessment of the University-wide student learning goals**. Toward that end, General Education courses must include instruction in, and require students to complete **Signature Assignments** that facilitate assessment of; the outcomes associated with the two University-wide student learning goals covered in the course (see Item 9). For example, if a General Education course addresses Written Communication and Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving, then the Signature Assignment(s) must cover the outcomes associated with both Written Communication and Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving. The course may include one Signature Assignment that covers both learning goals or two Signature Assignments, each of which covers one of the two learning goals. The General Education Assessment Plan provides for signature Assignments to be collected and scored by a committee of outside readers. Instructors should also use Signature Assignments in the context of the course and instructor-determined Signature Assignment grades should count toward the final course grade. **The Signature Assignment(s) must be described in detail in Item 12d**

**and identified in Items 10, 11, and 16.**

The General Education section of the Course Proposal Guidelines would then read as follows:

**12. Undergraduate General Education Courses** (Indicate whether approval is sought as a General Education course. These proposals are subject to review by the General Education Curriculum Committee. Proposals for General Education courses must indicate how the following requirements are met:

- a) Indicate whether approval is sought in Tier 1 (Tier 1 Seminars), Tier 2 (Tier 2 Seminars), or Tier 3 (Tier 3 Capstones). **Tier 1 Seminars** comprise the first encounter with college-level work in concert with the composition and math courses. Each of these seminars provides introductory experience in at least one of the modes of inquiry that students will focus on more deeply in Tier 2. Each seminar addresses a topic that serves as a context in which students develop at least two of the University-wide student learning goals. The topical nature of the seminars provides an opportunity for a meaningful introduction to work in the disciplines. **Tier 2 Seminars** build on the introductory work of Tier 1. While continuing to develop and reinforce skills in at least two of the University-wide student learning goals, each of these seminars focuses on a topic or theme and gives students more in-depth work in at least one of the disciplinary modes of inquiry. **Tier 3 Capstones** are the culmination of General Education at NJCU. In the Capstones, students work individually or with peers to design, develop, complete, and present research or creative projects. Each Capstone provides a hands-on experience in which students showcase their command of the skills they have been honing and the knowledge they have acquired in Tiers 1 and 2. The Capstones also provide an opportunity for students to integrate their work in General Education with early work in the major.
- b) Indicate in which **Mode(s) of Inquiry** approval is sought. Courses seeking approval in Tier 1 and Tier 2 must meet the criteria for inclusion in at least one (and up to two) of the Modes of Inquiry: 1) Creative Process and Production; 2) Language, Literary, and Cultural Studies; 3) Scientific and Quantitative Inquiries; and 4) Social and Historical Perspectives. Courses may be designated as intermodal if they meet the criteria for two Modes of Inquiry. Intermodal courses will meet the distribution requirements in two Modes of Inquiry.
- c) Indicate which **department(s) or academic unit(s) the course will be listed under**. For interdisciplinary courses to be cross-listed (offered by more than one department or academic unit), indicate each department or academic unit in which the course will be listed (i.e.: PHYS and PHIL). The signatures of the department and curriculum committee chairs of each department in which the course



will be listed must be included on the Request for Permanent Course Approval or Course Change (“cover page/routing slip”) form.)

- d) General Education courses are required to participate in **programmatic assessment of the University-wide student learning goals**. Toward that end, General Education courses must include instruction in, and require students to complete **Signature Assignments** that facilitate assessment of, the outcomes associated with the two University-wide student learning goals covered in the course (see Item 9). For example, if a General Education course addresses Written Communication and Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving, then the Signature Assignment(s) must cover the outcomes associated with both Written Communication and Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving. The course may include one Signature Assignment that covers both learning goals or two Signature Assignments, each of which covers one of the two learning goals. The General Education Assessment Plan provides for signature Assignments to be collected and scored by a committee of outside readers. Instructors should also use Signature Assignments in the context of the course and instructor-determined Signature Assignment grades should count toward the final course grade. **The Signature Assignment(s) must be described in detail in Item 12d and identified in Items 10, 11, and 16.**

Motion made and seconded to approve the motion included in the GECC report which reads in part (and which is stated in full above): The Course Proposal Guidelines will be revised to include section 12d (on Programmatic Assessment and Signature Assignments)  
Motion approved.

- b) Ad Hoc General Education Executive Committee – Barbara Hildner

**Ad Hoc General Education Executive Committee (GEEC) Report  
to the  
University Senate  
November 2014**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL  
REPORT TO THE SENATE  
SUBMITTED ON NOVEMBER 24, 2014**

The General Education (GE) Proposal contains provisions for implementation which current circumstances ask us to reconsider. This report identifies those provisions, aims to produce a shared understanding of their meaning and implications, and offers two motions for Senate

consideration concerning the relationship of current students to the GE Program in fall 2015.

This report concerns sections of the GE Proposal entitled “Transition from Old to New Program,” “Timetable,” “Transfer Students.” The pages containing these sections are attached.

**[Suggested] MOTION I.**

According to the GE Proposal “Students who enrolled at the University prior to the adoption of this new program will have the option of fulfilling their General Education requirements in either the old or the new program” (Transition from Old to New Program). The GE Executive Committee discussed two possible interpretations of this sentence: (1) Students can begin the GE Program from the start, using their GS credits as electives, or (2) students can transfer their GS courses into the appropriate GE program and finish out the new GE Program. The GE Proposal expects these options to be particularly appealing to students with relatively few GS credits: “Students who have completed their early course work will be well positioned to move into the new program. From a student’s perspective, doing so affords greater flexibility (more electives come into play) and an earlier opportunity to begin work in their major course of study” (Timetable).

**[Suggested] Motion I: Because of the complexity of launching the GE Program, current students will register for GS and not GE courses in fall 2015.**

**Rationale:** New students will require about 66 sections of GE courses (calculations attached), 60 of which are Tier 1 courses. Increasing the number of sections to over 100 sections to accommodate an uncertain number of current students, most of whom will have under 30 GS credits and will need Tier I courses is not possible, given the current pace of Tier I course development and the December 19 deadline for scheduling courses.

In fall 2015, current students benefit from accessing the stable set of prerequisite courses available in the GS program that they understand. Over 70 percent of current GS courses are prerequisites for various major programs and these programs have often wanted their prerequisite courses satisfied within GS. Working out the relationship of prerequisite courses to the GE program is in its initial stages. It is uncertain how many of the Tier 1 courses offered in fall 2015 will satisfy prerequisite requirements or whether prerequisite courses as they come forward will be Tier II courses. Except under special circumstances, having GS prerequisite courses satisfy GE requirements in the Modes undermines the integrity of the GE Program. This is particularly true because so many GS courses serve as prerequisites.

There are similar issues for transfer students. According to the GE Proposal, “The Comprehensive State-Wide Transfer Agreement and any subsequent revisions to that agreement will govern General Education policies for students transferring into the University with [the] one exception” of students who have an Associate’s degree. The transfer protocols are clear for the GS Program and unclear for the GE Program. Until the relationship between transfer courses and the GE Program is established, transfer students benefit from taking courses in the GS Program.

Beginning the GE Program with a large number of sections that enroll students who have very different relationships to the Program may well place an undue burden on the assessment process in the first semester of the GE Program.

#### **[Suggested] MOTION II.**

**[Suggested] Motion II. Students admitted to NJCU before September 2015 will complete a modified version of the GS Program, although once GE courses are available to them, they may apply the GE credits to the appropriate GS Area requirements.**

- a. **The revised Planning Sheet #2, now called Planning Sheet 3-GS (attached) outlines a modified GS Program with the following requirements:**
  1. **Students will take six credits in each of Areas A-F.**
  2. **The FYE courses will not fulfill an AUR but will satisfy a requirement in the appropriate Area.**
  3. **ECI and ECII will become 4 credits (absorbing the one credit Writing Lab) to bring them into line with ECI and ECII courses offered in other phases of the Composition Program.**
  4. **The modified GS Program will be 53 credits. It will have 13 fewer credits than the current GS Program and 8 more credits than the GE Program.**
- b. **A schedule will be provided in a timely manner to students and advisors that indicates the Areas requirements satisfied by GE courses.**

**Rationale:** The General Education Proposal anticipates students in the GS program migrating to the GE Program with its many fewer credit requirements. Again, it describes the benefits of reduced credits from the students’ perspective as “affording greater flexibility (more electives come into play) and an earlier opportunity to begin work in their major course of study” (Timetable).

The existing Planning Sheet 2 describes a reduced credit version of the GS program operational for the last 15 years and lays the foundation for Planning Sheet 3-GS, which provides continuing students with some of the benefits of reduced credits while still maintaining the integrity of the GS Program.

The GE statements that “completion guidelines for the current program will continue to be observed” can be accomplished in the modified version of the GS Program by adhering to Planning Sheet 3-GS.

**The GE Executive Committee will bring forward a proposal concerning granting exceptions to GS/GE requirements because of the needs of various major programs.**

Motion made and seconded to approve Motion I included in the GEEC report which reads: Because of the complexity of launching the GE Program, current students will register for GS and not GE courses in fall 2015.

Discussion: When a current GS courses is being revised for inclusion in the new GE program a department can a) offer both courses and keep the students in separate sections or b) only offer the revised course and have it count toward both the GS and GE program. This is a departmental decision. Current students will not be entering the new program.

Motion approved.

Motion made and seconded to extend the Senate meeting until 4:30PM

Discussion: This time extension disadvantages senators with other responsibilities starting at 4:00PM.

Motion approved.

Motion made and seconded to approve Motion II included in the GEEC report which reads in part (and which is stated in full above): Students admitted to NJCU before September 2015 will complete a modified version of the GS Program, although once GE courses are available to them, they may apply the GE credits to the appropriate GS Area requirements.

Discussion: Students in programs with certification requirements that do not match the proposed modifications will need additional credits in certain areas and will consequently need more general education credits than other students.

Motion made and seconded to amend the main motion (i.e., Motion II) by adding item C which would read: c) Students who have certification requirements that require 9 credits in certain Areas (A-F) will be allowed to take only 3 credits in up to two Areas.

Discussion on amendment: Some programs already have similar flexible requirements. The amendment is contrary to the depth goal of the area requirements in the GE program. The proposal does not change retroactively the credits students earned in EC 1 & EC2. So students who earned 3 credits in each course would continue to have only 3 credits from having taken those courses and that will fulfill their requirement. Students who take the revised EC1 & EC2, will earn 4 credits for the courses when the revised format is implemented. Does this proposal apply to all programs with accreditation requirements?

Motion on amendment to add item C to the main motion II: approved.

Motion on amended main Motion II: approved.

Advisers and students need to be informed about the above changes as soon as possible. Whatever approvals are needed at SACC and possibly from the Board of Trustees should be sought immediately.

#### **XI. Quorum Call & Adjournment**

Quorum not present.

Meeting adjourned by President Morgan–Ivy at 4:16PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph H. Moskowitz, Ph.D.