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**University Senate**

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

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**February 8, 2016**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**DEPARTMENTS PRESENT**: A. Harry Moore, Harriet Phillip; Accounting, Jeanette Ramos-Alexander; 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, John Melendez; Educational Technology, Chris Carnahan; 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, Gail Gordon; History, Jason Martinek; Library, Min Chou; Literacy Education, Fran Levin; Management, Wanda Rutledge; Marketing, Melissa M. Martirano; Mathematics, Freda Robbins; Media Arts, Kathryn D'Alessandro; Modern Languages, Grisel Lopez-Diaz; Dept. of Multicultural Ed., Donna Farina; Music, Dance & Theatre, Amparo Fabra Crespo; Nursing, Gloria Boseman; Philosophy/Religion, Scott O’Connor; Political Science, Joseph Moskowitz; Psychology, Frank Nascimento; Sociology/Anthropology, Max Herman; Special Education, Patricia Yacobacci; Women’s & Gender Studies, Jacqueline Ellis.

**DEPARTMENTS ABSENT:** African/Afro American Studies; Alumni, Jane McClellan; Economics, Ivan Steinberg; ESL; 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,

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

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

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

**University Senate Meeting Minutes**

**University Senate Meeting #5 for AY 2015-2016**

**Monday, 8 February 2016, Gothic Lounge (H202)**

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

**I. Moment of Silence**

President Riotto requested a moment of silence to honor:

Dr. Phillip J. Congilose, Assistant Professor in the Health Sciences Department, and coordinator of the driver’s education programs here at NJCU

Dr. Shirley Williams, a longtime faculty member in the Criminal Justice Department. Dr. Williams made history in 1983 when she became the first female and the first African American in the University’s Department of Criminal Justice.

**II. Clicker System Test:** Passed

# III. Approval of Agenda

Motion made and seconded to approve agenda.

Agenda approved

# IV. Approval of Minutes

Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes.

Minutes approved

**V.** **Announcements**

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

1. February we celebrate Black History Month – Please visit the Lee Hagan Lee Hagan Africana Studies Center website for a list of events.
2. We have the National Society of Leadership and Success (NSLS) Lecture Series.

JuJu Chang, The Power of Your Story on 9 February 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at theMargaret Williams Theatre. Admission is FREE.

To reserve a free ticket, visit the web site indicated in the announcements: <http://jujuchangliveatnjcu.eventbrite.com>

1. Chinese New Year Celebration in the Atrium at the Harborside beginning at 5pm on February 9th will feature the Nai Ni Chen Dance Company & Chinese Music Ensemble of New York and others. Please RSVP to Wendy Paul at wpaul@njcu.edu

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

1. The Senate Executive Committee has received the College of Arts and Sciences Leadership Profile covering the Search for Dean requesting the Senate Executive Committee’s comments and we will provide same shortly. Also, the School of Business and Continuing Education Leadership Profiles for Deans should be forthcoming for the Senate Executive Committee to review.
2. The Senate Executive Committee is working with the Provost Office on several items, including but not limited to: the Faculty Handbook, the infamous # 19, and other items that are under the purview of the Senate with an emphasis on academic issues but to be clear, not just academic.
3. The Senate Executive Committee will be meeting with the Union to ascertain items that belong in the Union, those that 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.
4. The Senate Executive Committee did meet with the Ad Hoc Committee on Monday, January 11, 2016, during the Semester Break, and officially charged, in person, the committee with developing a plan for submission to the Senate for evaluation of the University's administration. The committee was strongly encouraged to solicit input from all parties and entities including but not limited from the administration; Again, the committee’s service and participation is very much appreciated.

## VII. Economics Department move to the School of Business – Dr. Wanda Rutledge

The purpose of this item was to seek clarification of the Senate’s scope of authority in matters that are not explicitly spelled out in the Senate Constitution.

The recent move of the Economics Department to the School of Business was used as an example of need for this clarification. There has been considerable previous discussion on whether or not the move should have been taken to the Senate as part of the process. According to Senator Rutledge, a strict reading of the Senate Constitution reveals nothing that says it should have been or had to come before the Senate. It is important for the Senate to have this conversation because other issues are coming up where there is some disagreement about the Senate’s scope of authority. Rather than fighting over something that is holding up progress, a mechanism or procedure should be figured out that allows these disagreements of opinion or interpretation of documents to be brought up in a way that we can move forward.

Discussion:

The relevance of several Standing Committees to the move was discussed. The Curriculum and Instruction committee responsibilities include recommendations on the establishment or dissolution of departments, programs and majors. However, Dr. Rutledge noted that this was neither, it was a **move**. The Planning, Development and Budget committee responsibilities include use of physical resources and advising the administration regarding master plans. The movement of departments and creation of new school and/or campus could be interpreted as part of the master plan of the University. The Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs committee is concerned with “the general welfare and interests of the faculty and professional staff.” However, since there is nothing explicitly stated about the movement of departments in the constitution, there was disagreement about how applicable the interpretation of these responsibilities was.

There was general agreement among those that spoke that a mechanism/procedure to resolve these types of “interpretation” conflicts in the future was desired. Suggestions included:

1. Any senator can propose revisions or amendments to the Senate Constitution. However, no constitution could or should include everything that could come up, so a having a mechanism in the constitution rather than adding specific responsibilities is probably the best way to go.
2. There are Senate documents that address may these things already. In particular, a 1979 document and later comments in the Senate meeting minutes by then Senate President Dr. Bennett were mentioned. These two sources could help clarify the issue.
3. Robert’s Rule of Order indicates that matters such as jurisdiction should be presented to the body (via an agenda item) and the body can collectively make the decision about its jurisdiction.
4. The Senate has already established an ad hoc Constitution committee. This types of discussions that were taking place in that committee would have included situations such as when there is uncertainty about X, this would be the mechanism to resolve that uncertainty. It might be appropriate to reconvene the committee and charge it with this issue.
5. Ongoing conversations between the Senate Executive Committee, the office of the Provost and the Union include the topic of what specifically falls under Senate purview. These conversations may be a first step. Once, there is a shared understanding, then there is the opportunity to do something more official and structured

Motion and Seconded for the Senate Executive Committee to report back a recommendation on how to resolve issues of jurisdictional clarification when issues arise that are not specifically addressed in the Senate Constitution.

Discussion: The question was asked “What wording would cover the moving of a department?” Answers ranged from adding the words “moving a department” to the constitution within the C+I responsibilities to the verbiage in the 1979 document may cover that.

Motion passed

## VIII. University Senate Standing Committee Reports

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

A brief report to present the results of the Dec 2nd and Jan 27th meetings of the committee.

1. The committee reviewed and endorsed for approval following applications:
   1. Program entitled: Math Major with a concentration in Actuarial Science

Submitted by Dr. Chakraborty

* 1. Graduate Program entitled: M.A.T. in Special Ed. With Teacher of Students with Disabilities/Certification eligibility & Specialization in Autism Spectrum Disorders
  2. Minor in Public Relations hosted by Marketing, School of Business

Submitted by Professor Melissa Martirano

* 1. Submission for Early Childhood Education

Submitted by Dr. Regina Adesanya

1. Upon discussion and in the absence of direction from “corporate counsel” the PD&B committee is returning the requested impact of the “river-keepers lawsuit” to the SEC as currently in-actionable due to a lack of information and no outcomes for the committee to review as the matter is currently in litigation. In the committee’s view, there is nothing for them to do at this time, but they would be happy to look at it again when something happens.
2. The PD&B committee is requesting via the Senate and/or the SEC a specific line item breakdown of the review previously conducted by the administration of the proposal to run a shuttle from the Main Campus to the new School of Business, especially in light of the actions taken in regard to the Military Science Proposal submitted and previously approved at an earlier meeting. The tangential issue is the “reliability” of the shuttle.

Question: The Vice President of Finance is ex-officio on PD&B. can’t you just be able to get the line item breakdown from him?

Answer: I hope so. The Senate President has requested from President Henderson that Dr. Aaron Aska send a representative to PD&B meetings if he is unable to attend so that these types of questions could be answered immediately.

Question: What should we expect, if anything, in regards to the topic that the chair of the PD&B committee says has been returned to the Senate Executive Committee in terms of the safety matters that seem to be related to the River-Keepers’ lawsuit? Will there be a briefing, will we hear more about this, or will it just get lost?

The Senate President met with University legal counsel and the courts are supposed to meet during the last week of February to take up this topic. There was discussion about whether there was a gag order on the discussion of the topic as it is currently in litigation. There appears to be no gag order so we are free to discuss if we wish. The Union has already submitted a letter expressing concerns for the wellbeing of faculty. Dr. Gordon has previously sent out information of the issue.

Answer: Submit a request to have it added as an agenda item for the next meeting and we can discuss it then. Dr. Gordon also agreed to resend her original River-keepers summary.

1. **Elections Committee** – Dr. Chris Carnahan, Chairperson

The following individual was elected to serve on the Search Committee for the Vice President Student Affairs & Enrollment Management.

* Mince John, Mathematics

1. **Curriculum and Instruction Committee** – Dr. Erin O’Neill and Dr. Michele Rosen, Co-Chairs
2. The committee approved 36 courses from the College of Arts and Sciences and 8 courses from the School of Business (see Attachment #2).

Comments: The pre-requisite for Statistics I on page 6 of the report is incorrectly listed as Algebra for College, it should be Developmental Math. Decision Intelligence in Supply Chain on page 8 of the report is incorrectly listed as a General Education course.

Motion to amend the Curriculum and Instruction Committee report to be consistent with Senate approved recommended course caps for Tier 1 (20) and Tier 2 (25) except for English Composition 2 (20).

Discussion: There appears to be courses that are not consistent with the Senate approved recommended course caps. This is an opportunity to ensure that policy is followed. The intent of the resolution was to decrease caps that exceed the recommended course caps. Caps that are lower will not be raised if there is a rationale for the lower cap (and there had to be a rationale in order for the class to be approved with the lower cap).

Motion to call the question.

Motion passed: Question called.

Motion Passed.

Note: Once these courses are signed off by the Provost and go to the registrar’s office, they will be permanently approved. Once these courses receive permanent approval, all temporary approvals will be extended so scheduling for Fall 2016 can occur.

Addendum: Deb Woo will send an email to the registrar’s office after the meeting to extend temporary approval for all courses and then the permanent approvals will be changed.

1. The following language has been revised and added back to the course proposal form as #19 (see attachment #3).

Discussion: These are some of the criteria that would be included in a rationale to have a course cap different from the recommended ones. These criteria were provided by both the Provost’s office (based on conversation with the Chairs) and the May 2012 FPSA report. Item #19 is not currently in the Guidelines, so this will be adding them back.

Motion passed. This will go to SACC for approval and inclusion in the Guidelines for Requesting New Course Approval and Changes document.

**IX. DRAFT: AUR’s Approval Process**

The Senate Executive Committee presented a proposal for guidelines to add new curricular AURs. These guidelines are based on the process for proposing new minors and incorporate comments from the 30 November Senate meeting.

Motion and Seconded to omit lines 11, 13, and 19 from the form and to change the ordering so that the college curriculum committees sign off before the Deans.

Discussion began with the number signature lines for the Provost. The Provost wants only one. It was noted that the reason there were two signatures originally was simply to document the coming and going of the proposal. There are currently two on this form because it may be important for the Provost to review any changes made by consultants before it goes forward in the process. The Provost trusts the process. A review of the AIC manual indicated that it is not necessary for AURs to the Counsel of Presidents. It was suggested that the Senate decide what it wants in the document and SACC can comment later.

The role of the General Education committees and director in the form were discussed. General Education was included because, historically, AURs have always been part of General Education. The committees have very different roles: GECC is exclusively curricular and GECAP looks at policy. It was stated that three signature were too many: GECAP should be enough because the director of General Education is a non-voting member of that committee and, if it is wise, the GECAP should consult the GECC before they move a proposal forward. Also stated that not having the director of Gen Ed be a signatory could be a missed opportunity.

It was asked why the College of Arts and Sciences curriculum committee has a signature line if there is not currently such a committee. The Senate Constitution includes a CAS curriculum committee. Although the committee was disbanded by the then Dean, it is not incumbent of the Senate to leave that line off of future forms. There is also talk of re-instituting the committee. If there is such a committee, they get a signature and if there is not, they won’t sign off.

The following were requested by the body:

1. Please specify somewhere on the form that this process applies to courses that are not General Education courses.

The whole point of the form is that it is about All Undergraduate Graduation Requirements outside of the already approved programs. It was suggested to add the wording “other than General Education requirements” after the third line of the page “All-University Undergraduate Requirement Addition/Revision”.

1. Is it possible to suggest some parameter for how long each signatory has this in the process so that it doesn’t hold up a whole program for a year or two?

The parameter already exists: 10 days as listed on Senate website.

1. Would it be possible to provide a flow chart that shows where parallel processes would be possible such as in the curriculum committees?

Motion to call the question.

Motion passed: Question called

Motion passed; Changes to form approved.

Motion to approve the form with the amended changes and send to SACC.

Motion to call the question.

Motion passed: Question called

Motion passed The amended form will go to SACC.

Motion to Adjourn made and Seconded.

Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned by President Riotto at 4:01 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Ethan Prosen, Ph.D.

Secretary of the University Senate

Attachments

#1 PD&B Report to the University Senate

#2 Curriculum and Instruction committee report to the University Senate

#3 Revised language for Item #19 for the Guidelines for Requesting New Course Approval and Changes document.