

KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING
MINUTES

April 11, 2023
3:15 pm-4:15 pm.
Zoom Webinar

Senators in attendance:

•Ahlawat, •Anderson, •Boateng, •Bonillas, •Boyd-Jackson, **ab**-Brandwein, •DiVirgilio, •Donovan, **ab**-Dowdell, • Evans, •Farrokh, •Gover, • Gubi, **ab**-Halper, • Konyk, •Mack, •Marks, •Martinez, •Mayhall, •Pena, **ab**-Pintado-Casas, •Roebuck, •Rodriguez, •Rosa, •Rosen, •Sanchez, •Sargent, •Verdi, •Webber, •Yucetepe

Student Representative:

Glynis Tan

Guests: Bellitto, Hayes, Moskovitz

[•=present ex=Excused absent=ab]

The meeting called to order by Chairperson Ahlawat at 3:20 pm

I. Minutes – April 11, 2023
A. Motion: Jack Sargent
B. Second: Walter Mack
II. Curriculum Items for Notification-Notification and Vote or None
III. New Business-
<p>Chair: The minutes are approved. I welcome Craig Konyk as the new senator; he will replace Anna Wetzel, who is on indefinite leave. Welcome, Craig.</p> <p>Chair: Let's start with the main issue about the revision to the constitution. The draft was shared with the administration last March after a discussion in this body. The constitution was not put to a formal vote awaiting feedback from the administration. Dr. Salvatore provided comments this February/March and changes made. Dr. Salvatore was informed of the plan to present the constitution to the full Senate discussion and vote.</p> <p>Senator: Curious about an example of how families and citizens participate in shared governance.</p> <p>Chair: At Kean University, many stakeholders, including families and citizens, with the children coming to school, many working here, etc. Effective, shared governance involves stakeholders participating in various ways to impact university policies. For example, alums through Kean Foundation, current students through student government, other groups, etc. In addition, University Senate is a body with faculty and staff stakeholders.</p> <p>Senator: Does the Staff have a Union?</p> <p>Chair: Until a few years ago, Professional Staff were members of KFT but were promoted to managers with the requirement they give up union affiliation. Some elected to remain with KFT and not take managerial titles. Professional Staff are KFT-eligible members. The non-professional Staff are CWA members.</p>

Senator: KFT-eligible members can participate in the Senate, but CWA members cannot

Senator: Walter, can you clarify what you mean? I'm learning all this right now. What is your concern? I just want to know how many people can run for the election every year.

Chair: Let's look at Section 3.1.2. We have 30 members in the Senate is a manageable number. It is not too small and not too large. Each year ten members are elected. The proposal is for 8 faculty, 1 Professional Staff member, and 1 member from the non-unit manager group each year. Currently, we have 7 or 8 professional and non-unit managers in the Senate. The proposal is for 6.

Senator: That would ultimately be 24 faculty, 3 professional staff, and 3 non-unit managers. Is this proportionate to the actual makeup of the employee body? That's where my issue comes in. I know Marguerite pointed out that most universities don't have university senates. However, we do have the University Senate. So, if the goal is to eliminate the university senate and move back to a Faculty Senate, we should call it that. I understand the goal is to be an open body that reflects everyone who works here and deals with academic and student issues.

Senator: It comes from the traditional model of the faculty senate. The models of University Senates are adaptations from the faculty senates with proportional representation, but faculty is still in the majority. So, it is traditionally a body for the faculty with a voice to deal with academic matters because that is our purview. That's the philosophy behind this revision.

Senator: It's dismissive of the experience and voice others bring. We would be regressing. It is hypocritical to say we are inclusive and a shared governance body. We're doing the exact opposite.

Senator: Many universities have staff councils with a voice, but it would be a complete outlier if we had equal representation in a university senate.

Senator: I have a question about Senate history. I don't know how far people go back but correct me if I'm wrong; this body was a Faculty Senate, but it was changed to a University Senate under the directive of the previous President to control the Senate's functioning. I believe the current proposal is a good compromise. This is my sense of history about the Senate.

Senator: That's pretty much correct. Dawood tried to get more administrators so that he would have his point of view. Do I like the Professional Staff would be limited? I'm okay with it, provided administrators and managers are limited too. We've got almost the same number of Professional Staff and Administrators that we have now under the proposal. We'll live with it.

Senator: Yeah, Dan. It was called the faculty senate until fairly recently. And even when it was called the Faculty Senate, it included non-unit managers and Professional Staff.

Chair: However, administrators were non-voting members until the prior administration changed it. The draft proposal reverts to administrators as ex-officio members. As a compromise in the proposed revision, 6 members out of 30 are professional and non-unit managers. And talking about inclusiveness, then what about the CWA? What about the students? What about adjunct faculty? But then you also need to consider the effectiveness of this body.

Ultimately faculty have significant insight into lots of things academic on which we are consistently losing our voice. The faculty voice needs to be brought back through the Senate. We don't have the advantage of the master contract that we don't have the benefit of the power of the purse. We have an advisory role, and even that seems to be eroding. It wouldn't be wise for that to happen, given other good things happening to restore the faculty's rightful position.

Senator: This draft guarantees professional staff representation. In the past, there was no guarantee that professional Staff or managers would be on the University Senate.

Senator: People still have to get voted in. So why are we limiting? But what if we don't have enough faculty who are interested? I don't understand the mechanics of this will work.

Chair: Robin, you just assume insufficient faculty are interested in serving on the Senate. Faculty interest declined as the Senate became a tool of the past administration with a minimal independent

voice. However, the culture is changing, and faculty are increasingly engaging. Changes such as the traditional department structure, changing the constitution, and making the Senate more of a reflection of the faculty will bring us back to the standard form of shared governance. Even things like the conventional pathway for faculty growth - moving from assistant to associate to full professor and then to the Dean and higher up to Vice Presidents and other administrative positions needs to happen, which stalled at Kean University years ago. That has to happen for the faculty to become fully engaged eventually.

Senator: Are lecturers a part of the voting constituency?

Chair: Yes, full-time faculty, including lecturers, are voting constituency.

Senator: I am new to the Senate. It was very educational to read the constitution. I ask if there is union-specific Professional Staff and where lectures stand concerning voting for a chairperson. I also wanted to know the benefits of a University Senate over the Faculty Senate and Staff Council. I don't like this separate but equal stuff. If there was going to be a Faculty Senate and a Staff Council, that Staff Council needs to be just as valuable as a Faculty Senate.

Senator: We will have many more faculty voting as we just hired over 100 faculty, and more will be hired in the coming years. There will be more faculty involvement in voting and serving as senators, with an improved environment and increased numbers.

Chair: Charles, being from political science and working on the revision, what are your thoughts?

Senator: I am trying to weigh in about proportional representation based on the number of faculty compared to managers, other administrators, and all these entities. I signed in late and didn't get most of the conversation.

Chair: It is about the constituents of the University Senate and the proportional representation.

Senator: I'm just wondering if some other committees and groups invite folks from all different backgrounds to think about things related to these kinds of concerns. Robin said we have ideas we want to bring to the table. So maybe we should go back to this sort of place where the faculty have a place at the table. Can someone tell us whether we're invited to other places or not?

Senator: From a professional standpoint, the Senate is probably the most likely place for a Pro-staff person to be on a committee or to be involved in discussions. Usually, when the President or Provost has a committee Assistant Deans, Managers are selected, and rarely any Pro-staff.

Senator: Exactly. I think there's a perception of the power that Professional Staff and other non-unit managers might have. The Senate is their opportunity to speak out. I would dare say those individuals have the credentials we are discussing. They understand what academic purview means. They know a lot of policies and procedures and things like that. Yeah, I don't understand your curriculum issues. But I'm your girl if you want to test me on academic policy and practice. Andrea, Judy, all of these people here, I don't want to leave anybody out, but I think they are valuable senators.

Senator: Speaking for Professional Staff, I can say that managers have many more opportunities to be on college-wide committees than Professional Staff have ever had.

Chair: The link in the draft constitution for the Council of New Jersey State Colleges lists Managing Administrative Directors as Managers. The draft constitution was modified to reflect three Professional Staff and three non-unit managers. If you feel managers have enough opportunities, we can change it back to 6 professional staff and not have any non-unit managers. This issue arose on how MAD positions were created.

Senator: The point has been made indirectly, and I want to say this respectfully. I think we need to put it on the table kind of and talk about it. Dan was alluding to this earlier; the Senate became a University Senate in the context of the previous administration. The sense was to add more Staff to the Senate so there would be a little bit less of a voice for the faculty and a bit more opportunity for

the administration to control the proceedings of the Senate. That is the legacy that we're responding to here. That is the historical context that shaped the drafting of this document that we're looking at this week. Faculty and Professional Staff are unionized, which is good, and the administrators are employees at will. That means more pressure can be brought on them to vote in particular ways. I'm not saying that it happens, but it's possible that it can happen. And because it's possible that it can happen, it changes the character of the Senate.

Now, I think we need to talk about how we want that to be; I believe Marguerite was alluding to this earlier. Many institutions have classically considered a faculty senate because the faculty is in a different position than the administrators. So this body, the Senate, becomes the place for the faculty to exercise shared governance. It's because they're in a different position relative to the conditions of their employment. It's thorny; I don't necessarily want to make this a debate about conditions of employment. Yet that influences the decision about who should be in the Senate; the way participants in the Senate can be influenced according to the conditions of their employment in the University.

Senator: Don makes a good point. We must realize that we complain about share governance, but if you change it to Faculty Senate, you remove the share. I mean, share governance is Staff, administration, and faculty. We no longer have the former administration. We must move from the past; we're done with a divorce.

Senator: We would be a complete outlier if we did that. Faculty Senates are composed primarily of faculty in terms of employment and academic standards. Some staff has equivalent credentials. But their job title and purview enable them to be on a faculty or University Senate. Trying to make it inclusive of every constituent on campus, we are entirely diluting the faculty voice. I put it in the chat to maybe completely reimagine this and form a staff council. Then we can have interactions among different bodies with equal representation.

Senator: I think we can't have it both ways, right? Either we're a university senate, or we're faculty staff. As a University Senate, you have to be inclusive. That's all there is to it. If we're going to be outliers amongst our peers, then we shouldn't have University Senate. That's not a good enough reason for me. Maybe it is for others, but perhaps I'm misunderstanding because you're shaking your head forcefully.

Senator: That's not what I'm saying. Majority representation by faculty is appropriate in this case as it is in universities with University Senates. That is how it is handled because they recognize that the faculty has expertise in academic affairs. We're not saying that we don't want anybody else, but faculty majority is key here.

Senator: So, 24 out of 30 members. Just a general election without quotas for many reasons other people mentioned. I'm mindful that the previous administration was difficult on every employee. Fortunately, we don't have that same environment here. I'm glad we have a University Senate that includes many different perspectives and should continue and be strengthened. Whether it is done with allocations by employment type or if it is just an open election, I do think having a University Senate is reflective of Kean's mission.

Chair: This draft was a compromise between keeping some traditions of the current Senate. If you count the number of constituents currently in the Senate, we are continuing that. The only difference is that faculty should vote for faculty, professional staff vote for professional Staff, and non-unit managers vote for non-unit managers. The rest of the constitution is an improvement on the existing document to provide better direction on the operations of the Senate, as evidenced by the fact that people don't have many questions on other items.

Senator: It's a challenge to have all views reflected. I think all six slots be given to professional Staff because managers can be a part of committees and engage in university work considerably. We already see them and work with them nearly as much. It makes sense. It's a compromise to make. Think about just 6 professional staff.

Chair: I'm open to that, but many people here have manager designation and may not be thrilled.

Senator: I would not be happy with that.

Senator: As a pro-staff, I'd be pleased about that.

Senator: I just wanted to say that Rowan and Montclair have evolved into University Senate, whereas Stockton has remained as Faculty Senate. So, we're not outliers.

Chair: I sent a copy of what the Senates look like at different NJ institutions. Montclair has proportional representation of one Professional Staff, and the rest are faculty from each college.

Senator: proportionate to what I guess is my question, proportionate to the number of faculty?

Chair: I requested how many student majors, FTE, and full-time faculty exist in each college. CBPM is 56 faculty, 66 in HS&HP, 109 in CLA, 45 in CEDU, Hennings is 76, and Michael Graves 20.

Senator: I'm wondering what proportion are non-unit managers, Professional Staff, and faculty to give each a proportionate role.

Chair: We don't have a breakdown for non-unit managers, but there are 296 administrators that, include non-unit managers, 196 professional staff, and 372 faculty.

Senator: I would love for CWA and adjuncts to be on Senate, but we're regressing with this. You're not saying that X amount of members from this college, X amount of members from that college; you're just saying faculty at large, then you might have everybody from CLA here.

Chair: The main reason is academic reorganization is not complete. Also, faculty in many departments are just hollowed out over the years. It will take some time before we reach the faculty numbers that existed before the prior administration. Therefore, it did not make sense to work on proportional allocation for faculty until the picture was clear of how the colleges will look, perhaps before the next election. We didn't even have a representative from Michael Graves College and that's not right.

Senator: But I don't think that's something we can dictate as people still have to be elected unless you dictate the number for each college. I think having an election means you got to take what you can, what the votes are.

Chair: I believe people are more likely to run if the election for Senators is within the colleges. In many ways, the Senate will be more vibrant. In any case, we need to vote up or down on the draft constitution. The current constitution on our website is full of inconsistencies and doesn't reflect the kind of University we are.

Senator: We could have some time to discuss fresh ideas before the vote. You should have a time limit, and then we should vote. That's my suggestion.

Senator: Perhaps we can bring this back to our respective areas and get an idea of what others think.

Senator: How will the new proposed structure change what we currently have? You're saying 24 faculty, 3 professional staff, and 3 non-unit managers? What is the structure now?

Chair: Well, voting is at large, with self-nominations, and the ten highest vote recipients are elected for a three-year term.

Senator: I'm looking at the Senate and right now, we 8 professional staff or managerial individuals. That's with an open call for elections. Right.

Chair: The new proposal limits who can vote. Upper-level administrators will not be able to vote in Senate elections as it existed in the past. The previous administration unilaterally changed that to include all administrators. Each constituency will elect members from their constituency only.

Senator: Okay, that is in the future under the draft constitution.

Chair: Well, this year, the elections are still under the old system as the proposed constitution is not

approved. I plan to invite the President, if his schedule permits, to address the Senate before the semester ends. Joy Moskovitz always comes to the Senate meetings and represents Academic Affairs. Dr. Mike Salvatore represents the President, so we are involved in healthy conversations.

Senator: I was just going to add that under the current system, it is possible for no staff to get elected or no managers to get elected. It could also go the other way around, and it could also be all Staff elected and no faculty. This proposal is actually ensuring that the voices for each of the groups are represented. As Don made a faculty point of view, we have always discouraged untenured faculty from serving in the Senate. Because part of what we do as a group is to speak truth to power and we wanted to ensure that people whose jobs were on the line, i.e., not tenured, be not in an uncomfortable position.

And this would also certainly apply to any one on a contract basis that they could feel free to speak to take a position to be recorded. It's taking a vote which a given administration may not agree with. Having a representative Senate where other groups have a voice provides the opportunity to get that input, but also ensures that we as a body of majority faculty can be that voice to power even when it's unpopular. Yes, we all think it's a much better situation now. But we don't know who is coming after President Repollett. So we can't just operate as if everything is fine. In the future, there will be times when we may have to say we don't think that's a good idea. That's why that's one of the things that tenure gives you is the ability to have that voice. Through this proposed constitution, we want to make sure that those other voices are represented, they are guaranteed representation, and that we have the opportunity to be the shield and be that voice.

Chair: Going forward, we should register anonymous votes on important and challenging issues. We usually raise our hands for ordinary issues. Still, for important issues where people feel a little bit uncomfortable or are not always willing to take a stand in public, we should register the anonymous vote.

Senator: Is that in the Constitution?

Chair: Yeah, we do that during the reorganization meeting as well. I will send a Qualtrics link from the Senate account to cast your vote, as we have been doing with the university promotion committee.

Senator: I was just going to ask what our next step was for voting. Do we need a motion to bring this to a vote? Or we'll just do that next time?

Chair: We can spend about 30 minutes on discussion with each member limited to about 2 minutes max. I will send out the link to your email and cast a vote. We don't want to be rushed into it now. I hope someone will make a motion to end the discussion, and then the Senators will vote. The ad hoc committee on adjunct faculty also wants to present the results of their findings soon.

Senator: Does this have to go through exec to come out of draft form first?

Chair: No, the Exec discussed it, but the Exec does not need to approve it before the Full Senate votes. It stays as a draft until the Senate votes and passes it as per the 2010 constitution on the Senate website.

Motion to adjourn. All in favor. Meeting adjourned

Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

IV. Next Meetings

- A. Executive Committee Meeting – April 18, 2023 – Zoom at 3:15 pm.
- B. Full Senate Meeting – April 25, 2023 – Zoom Webinar at 3:15 pm.