

# KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING  
MINUTES

**February 7, 2023**  
**3:15 pm - 4:15 pm.**  
**Zoom Webinar**

**Senators in attendance:**

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

**Student Representative:** Tan

**Guests:** Moskowitz, Salvatore

[•=present ex=Excused absent=ab]

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

A.	<b>Minutes</b> – January 24
	A. <b>Motion:</b> Webber
	B. <b>Second:</b> Donovan
	C. Motion Approved
B.	<b>Curriculum Items for Notification-None</b>
C.	<b>Old Business- None</b>
D.	<b>New Business-</b>
	A. Chair: Marguerite Mayhall served us admirably as Secretary for the Senate. Unfortunately, she is unable to continue. I am hoping for a volunteer to serve as the secretary and if you can just email me indicating your interest, I would appreciate your help.
	B. Chair: The first item we will take up is item B on the agenda, a proposed resolution on returning to traditional academic departments and shared governance based on conversations last week. Any questions for Dr. Hayes or Joy Moskowitz?
	Senator: Is there a final document somewhere outlining the entire reorganization?
	Joy Moskowitz: Thank you, Dr. Donovan. No, there is not. As we discussed in the last full Senate meeting, our next step is to receive, hopefully, today, the Senate's support for the movement from schools and EDs to departments and chairs. Then, the Task Force will recommend to Provost to seek BOT approval for reorganization in their March board meeting. Then, we will reconnect with the Deans to discuss their recommendations as informed by the recommendations from the faculty.
	Senator: Is there a timeline of when you see these things happening and you see the outputs for these?
	Joy Moskowitz: Yes, So what we've been discussing in the task force is included on our website with our agenda; the timeline is the language from the master contract: elections typically take place by April 30 for departments and chairs. There are a lot of different layers involved, and so we'd like to be able to move forward quickly with the Senate

support today.

Senator: Thank you. I strongly feel that when we have elections for the new chairs, the Lecturers can vote too. There are close to 100 Lecturers on the faculty. Many in my department have been with us for several years. And it's the difference in my department between about 15 people voting versus only five. I think because of the history of the last 15 years, Lecturers have replaced retirees, and they are part and parcel of our faculty. So it is only fitting that they can vote for the new chairs.

Chair: I'm not sure, Joy. Is voting in department elections a union issue?

Joy Moskovitz: Yes, it is.

Chair: We can invite the Union to the Senate exec and speak to them about their position.

Chair: The last paragraph of the proposed resolution incorporates the issue Senator Donovan raised. The Senate hopes that the detailed reorganization information is not released at the last minute and that the Senate has the opportunity for input.

Senator: The administration has not entirely agreed with the Union on the nature of the Chair's job, how much release time, and the specific duties. The Union has been negotiating this for a while, but the deal on the Chair's position is not settled.

Joy Moskovitz: Thank you, Dr. Gover. We know the importance of the job description for the Chair and it is underway. So any work that we can do in advance before the board formally acts, we will do so. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Joy, for the clarification. May I now call for a motion to approve the resolution? Dr. Matt Halper is making the motion to approve. Second?

Chair: The resolution is approved unanimously.

- E. Chair: The second item is the resolution on course cap increases. The last paragraph of the resolution asks for dialogue, either with a smaller group of Senators or with the faculty in departments, to look at this issue.

Senator: At the last union meeting, Dr. Salvatore explained it was a semi-emergency where Kean had 400 new students come for the spring semester, and they needed to deal with that. So instead of adding sections, they spread them to those existing sections.

Senator: I fully endorse the resolution. Would you consider putting a specific timeline for response at the bottom of the resolution page? It is a reasonable resolution, but we would hope for a timely response, perhaps in the next three or four weeks.

Michael Salvatore: I understand there's a request to get more information to be more transparent in the process, and we can certainly do that if we want to arrange how we communicate that. I could sit down with the chairperson of the Senate and have a conversation. But, listen, we know this is an administrative prerogative. And if Sucheta, you're that liaison, or you have a designee, we can work to ensure we do that for the Fall semester.

Chair: Thank you. I especially feel for accounting as course caps were raised a few years ago from 30 to 40, even though the department did not want to increase them. And now more students have been added beyond 40. So it also becomes a question of equity.

Michael Salvatore: Thank you for that. I looked at the question regarding the course from 30 to 40. And that was not haphazard. It was pretty intentional. It was around the caps that existed previously. Courses identified for increases were those with caps adjusted through the curriculum process over the past 18 months, some during COVID.

Chair: I share some institutional history on course caps. Several years ago, the

administration either unilaterally changed some caps or EDs twisted faculty arms, and they kind of went along with it, especially untenured faculty. In accounting, for example, they have been at 40. Adding even more students now is not fair. It also impacts student experience in courses like accounting that require additional support

Chair: Dr. Webber, do you want me to add a last paragraph saying we request a timely written response to this resolution?

Senator: It would be my hope, and I'm a diplomat at heart, but in a timely way before the next semester or term.

Senator: Regarding the dialogue, Mike, I think it's worth considering; maybe you and Sucheta could talk to people aware of prior Registrar's practices because it seems like a good one. It leaves some breathing room and the whole mechanism has a little headroom.

Chair: Thank you for the suggestion, and we will explore this. I would like to add to the draft resolution a last line that a group of senators will meet with the administration before the next semester to address that this situation doesn't repeat. Or do we need to add a specific date, say by April 10? Is that acceptable?

Senator: I support it.

Senator: I think it was Craig who spoke a little bit about tuition payment schedules. We used to have a different practice about allowing students to pay a certain amount that could hold their space in the class. And this is one of the reasons why we have a last-minute registration surge. So can we discuss whether we could return to a different payment schedule?

Michael Salvatore: Thanks for the question. Several conversations are occurring right now on campus solely aimed at improving the student experience. So obviously, that is one of them in terms of how we address student accounting, the rollout of the award packaging for aid, and the scholarship process. So these are all converging now. It is certainly something that is being evaluated currently.

Senator: I'm just curious what we expect to get out of this resolution other than what Dr. Salvatore has already given us, saying I'm open to discussion. It would be a good show of faith for us not to put a resolution forward today. I fear this would be the same type of action we've had in the past. It sounds like he's saying, yes, we can maybe put an ad hoc committee together to try to come up with a solution because everyone's offered some great ideas today already. I wonder what everyone is expecting in return by such and such a date other than what we've heard.

Chair: There should be documentation about our conversations on a critical issue of course caps that many in the Senate and beyond have strong feelings about. It is a good-faith effort to address this issue. We are having a candid conversation, but creating some documentation isn't bad faith. So if there are no other comments, can we move to vote on the resolution? Will someone make a motion to vote on the resolution with the change that Dr. Webber suggested? I would add the recommended change to the final copy of the resolution.

Senator: I accepted it as a friendly amendment already. There's a motion on the floor. Seconded.

Chair: **The resolution 2023-01 on course caps passes.**

Senator: Nicole Rodriguez says she doesn't believe there were more 'yes' votes for the previous resolution than 'no.' Could everyone in the chat type yes or no on how you are voting? So we have a record of it.

Chair: Yes, resolution on course caps. Please type in the chat if you are in favor, not in favor, or abstaining. Thanks, Matt, for assisting with the vote count. **The vote is 17 'Yes' and 3 'Abstain.' The resolution passes.**

- F. Chair: Next discussion is about the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. An Academic Standards and Policy Committee existed in the past but has been inactive for some time.

Our constitution says that the Senate is one of the central bodies to provide input and recommendations on important academic matters and establish instructional and educational standards. Currently, no one seems to know how many of the academic policies came about. Course cap is one of those things.

This semester there are 265 sections. There is an issue in terms of student learning. Are these courses providing the same learning experience? And should we have the i-courses? In this context, reconstituting the Academic Standards and Policy Committee came about. There are many other issues because of technological evolution in higher education. We also have online courses and hybrid courses in addition to face-to-face. But I don't think we have given much thought if they are cannibalizing each other. Another is the intellectual property or ownership of class materials that we post on the learning management systems. These are issues for a committee like the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

So we don't need to vote on reactivating the Academic Standards and Policies Committee today. But I wanted to start the conversation and for you to think about it. We will have more discussion again and vote on it then.

Chair: Thank you. The next item on the agenda is to consider the elimination of specific committees. We briefly discussed this last fall. Craig Anderson, Robin, and I have been meeting in preparation for our elections, and we have some proposals. Committees to eliminate are student retention, Nathan Weiss Committee since it doesn't exist anymore, Kean at Ocean, the WKU committee, and the Campus Culture. So these are the committees we may not need at this point. There is the Writing Emphasis Committee, and I think to pause that committee. Much work is going on with the GE Task Force and the GE committee, and they might address writing. Maybe we can revisit it next year if we need a writing emphasis committee and its charge. I am also proposing combining the Academic Technology committee with the Learning Commons. There is a lot of overlap now as the way technology has developed.

Senator: I just want to say that I don't necessarily agree with pausing the writing emphasis committee because they have been working very hard to get them together.

Chair: We are not just finalizing this today. There is a distance Learning committee. Can anyone who has served on a distance learning committee talk about their experience?

Senator: I'm on that committee. Is there anyone else that's on that committee here? The committee is working to evolve. Initially, years ago, it looked at ways to keep the pedagogy strong and make sure we achieve our accreditations and everything works. And then, for a bit, it turned into just sort of checking that courses that were submitted for online had all of the pieces needed. So there was a time when it was not aligning with the goals, and now it's trying to change. So we have to balance, make sure that faculty stay in the lead and that we have people on there with solid technology knowledge. It can be an influential group, but it hasn't been in my experience.

Chair: Can some of the tasks of the distance learning committee be shifted to academic technology and learning commons and some to the academic standard committee?

Senator: I want to address the Learning Commons. The Learning Commons seems to be about tutoring, writing support, research support, and like many things; that's my

impression. And it looks like the distance learning committee is conceptually thinking about technology and how faculty do things. I don't believe the distance learning committee should be approving courses. It already goes through a course approval, so you shouldn't add another layer.

Chair: I proposed moving forward with the academic standards and policies committee and combining academic technology with the learning commons committee. Does that make sense?

Senator: It doesn't because the learning commons is about supporting students, and it's not necessarily the same thing. It waters down what the learning commons and I wouldn't want to water that down.

Senator: Pedagogy should be the most significant piece of what distance learning does, how to teach, which tools can be helpful, and trying to take a leadership role.

Senator: Could we either get the charges or have a representative from the different committees come to the Senate and state their case? Right. Set aside a little time in our next meeting or the following one to review this because it has come up a few times. We have to consider it.

Chair: Luis comments about possibly adding a DEI committee that communicates with the DEI office. Or maybe include it in academic standards/policies or college curriculum committees.

Senator: I just got off a phone call with Tamika and she is creating a DEI committee. Should this be a senate committee? We chatted about the need for this quite a while ago and she sent out an email to all the Deans and said, can you give us the names of some people who are active in this area and could have good conversations about it? There is a seven-point agenda which I can certainly share with you. I will tell you a lot has been happening, and it is ready to launch. We certainly are open to having those conversations if you want.

Chair: We should have this conversation continue at the next meeting. I want to work with the Provost's office and Dr. Salvatore on the committees they create versus the Senate standing committees and arrive at some agreement.

We did have a Senate Research Committee then. Earlier in the summer, each college formed its research committee, and then each college also created its teaching and Service committee. Consider that when thinking about distance learning. Are the college Teaching and Service committees addressing pedagogy issues, or do we need a body over individual college committees? Perhaps a Senate committee consisting of one or two members from the Senate and chairs of the College Research Committees come together to develop university-wide guidelines for evaluating research.

One of the challenges in the promotion committee was that there were no guidelines on expectations on faculty performance. This could be a faculty-driven process where Chairs from individual colleges come together, have a conversation and perhaps create a universal document that addresses differences in disciplines. Similarly put something on paper regarding expectations on research, teaching and service; any thoughts?

Senator: The Research Committee did kind of seem to come and go. It would be potentially helpful to have one. We also have the IRB and the ORSP office. And what is the purview of the Research Committee? I think we need a body to define that, right?

Chair: Dr. Salvatore has provided with certain sections highlighted of the constitution for us to review. I also pointed to him the proposal in the draft constitution that faculty vote for faculty in the Senate elections, professional staff vote for professional staff and administrators vote for administrators.

The last topic concerns holding in-person meetings, at least every alternate meeting. The next in person would be February 21. Again, we are losing by not being able to interact with each other and the administration.

Senator: I agree with you. You're very astute about what happens to us when we're remote. The problem is that it's logistically challenging for many people and part of the reason we have this inertia toward in-person meetings.

Senator: I think in-person is great. I feel bad saying this, but I rescheduled what I could because I thought these would all be in person. So, again, I know logistics, scheduling, and all that. But again, I get the logistics. I know people also teach at 4:30 pm; I don't.

Senator: I agree with you. Sucheta, I think we should try in person. So I think we should try because you socialize, talk informally, and it's just a good policy. COVID has subsided to a degree, and I think we should be in person, but I appreciate that not everybody can do that.

Senator: Rachel, yes. I also just wanted to be sensitive to our colleagues who aren't assigned to the main campus. Not just Robin, but I also don't want to discourage folks from running for Senate just because they may be unable to come to the Union main campus.

Senator: Rachel, one of the things we can consider is that it's a good transition and maybe just not hold our policy or absence policy. It would be nice to see humans in the flesh again and speak to one another.

Chair: Thank you. I do recognize the challenges. The question is, does it help to have some meetings in person? I think that's the question, and I feel we are not interacting enough among ourselves and the administration. Perhaps with the in-person meeting, we should consider inviting the Deans to join us as they recommend and implement policies. If more than two-thirds agree to in person, we will schedule the next meeting in person.

Senator: Attendance at the senate meetings with the Zoom approach has been higher than ever. By multiples, I mean we have 40 attendees, for example, beyond the panelists, and we've had as many as 70 or 80 attendees with the Zoom option. So I think it's really important that we maintain the ability for external observers to attend via Zoom or other electronic means.

Chair: The plan was to have the webinar for the attendees, but the senators meet in person, so we will still be broadcasting the meeting live.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:20p.m.

#### Next Meetings

- A. Executive Committee Meeting – 14 February, 2023 – Zoom at 3:15 p.m.
- B. Full Senate Meeting – 21 February, 2023 – Zoom Webinar at 3:15 p.m.

---

For assistance in logging in, etc.:

Co-Host:

Robyn Roebuck &lt;rroebuck@kean.edu>; 908-337-0877