

#### **Public Login:**

https://kean-edu.zoom.us/j/96347110669?pwd=b3Z5VGV0WTZ6ODRDNXR2K1FjcFJpdz09

Meeting ID: 963 4711 0669 Passcode: 682396

Ch-SA called the Meeting to order at 3:16PM.

### I. Approval of the 04/02/24 Full Senate Meeting Minutes.

Ch-SA requested a motion to approve the previous Full Senate Minutes.

Motion to Approve - KC

2<sup>nd</sup> Motion to Approve – MH

Vote: 20 in Favor/0 Against/1 Abstaining – Minutes approved by a vote of 20/0/1 of those Senators present.

### II. Curriculum Items for Notification and/or Vote.

Ch-SA noted the following items for notification and asked if there were any comments. None were offered. Program Revisions:

A. BS: Public Health

### III. Academic Standards & Policy Committee:

A. Undergraduate Course Repeat and Grade Recalculation Policy.

Ch-SA relayed that Chair of the Academic Standards & Policy Committee, Don Marks, was not able to attend today's Meeting due to pressing academic commitments but did wish to have an explanation to the Full Senate of the proposed new Undergraduate Course Repeat and Grade Recalculation Policy. Robyn Roebuck from the VPAA Office began a detailed explanation of the rationales and proposed changes of the policy.

The current policy allows unlimited repeating of courses, regardless of grade earned. RR explained that this has had certain unintended consequences, such as taking available seats in courses away from other students in need of these courses. It also can exhaust a student's available financial aid if these courses are taken outside the normal semester loads.

The new proposed policy would cap repeats at twice total for each course, with each course eligible for single repeats. Only course with a grade of F, D, C, C+, AF or WD are eligible for a repeat/recalculation. Courses with a grade of B- or higher an ineligible for repeat. Exceptions to this can be approved at the Dean's discretion. Both grades will remain on the student's transcript, but only the higher grade will be factored in for GPA. Graduate courses are ineligible for repeat/recalculation. RR stated that the committee reviewed best practices at peer institutions, and it was composed of members of the Division of Student Success and Retention, Office of the Registrar and Office of the President, as well as a well-respected consultant, Karin Fiorza of EAB. She then turned the discussion over to Dr. Mensah Peterson, who elaborated further on details of the proposal. MP noted that currently students need to petition to be admitted to a repeat course. This hampered continuing and readmitted students form changing their major due to varying GPA requirements. This also affects students in need of a certain GPA to graduate. The new policy addresses this persistence through to graduation impediments inherent in the current policy.



NR asked what the rationale was for the original policy. Both RR & MP said they sought a rationale, but they could not discover a record of why these policies were adopted initially. NR asked if the full semester Withdrawal was to be affected? RR stated that this proposed policy only revised Repeat/Recalculation policy. She also offered that a "W" grade did not impact GPA.

AG offered that there would be a need for communicating this policy to both student and advisers, as his experience is that student are not usually aware of these polices and how they impact academic planning decisions. RR agreed that students "do not know what they do not know" and should be encouraged to seek advisement on these issues. She offered that Gillian Scott could provide for CRM notifications via Navigate for students who would be impacted by this policy to seek advisement, for example. Ch-SA questioned what to do if a student needed grades higher than a B- on their transcripts to qualify for say certain Law Programs? RR responded that that situation would fall under the province of the Dean's discretion. Ch-SA questioned if a student would know they needed to go to the Dean. Dr. Birdsell replied that 4.0 GPA students know enough to go to the Dean and that this policy is not geared towards that particular type of student. This policy is to free up limited STEM seats due to the large number of STEM course repeats currently. The population of students who would benefit from this proposed policy far outweighs those who have a unique issue. DG inquired who this would impact Incomplete policy. RR answered that similar to Withdrawal this proposed policy does not affect existing Incomplete policy, as an Incomplete grade is not a Final Grade. Glynnis Tan [student rep] offered that the recalculation for a course for her was very beneficial and appreciated that there would no longer be the need to petition for the repeat, as that was a difficulty for her.

NR wondered when a student consistently fails a course, is this an issue of the student or is it an issue of the course? RR replied that the university does track courses with high DFW rates, and so that is one way to divine the distinction. Most repeats occur in the 1000 level courses, as well.

Ch-SA inquired why there was no faculty representation o the administrative committee that developed this proposed policy? RR responded that the committee did meet with the Senate AS&P committee. Ch-SA offered that the Senate AS&P Committee only received this proposal the prior Friday and met with them on Monday. RR acknowledged this, and apologized for the compressed timeframe, noting that BofT approval date did drive the timeline.

MH made a motion to vote on the acceptance of the proposed policy. KC seconded this motion. Ch-SA asked for a vote. AG made an objection to the vote, which paused the proceedings. NR questioned whether an objection can be made once voting has commenced. AG asked if there was a need for more time to review the proposed policy, given the just recent delivery of it to the Senate AS&P committee. After a brief discussion on parliamentary procedure, Ch-SA agreed that the vote needed to proceed. The results of that vote tally are as follows:

Motion to accept the proposed revisions to Kean University's Undergraduate Course Repeat and Grade Recalculation Policy [enclosed as an addendum]:

YES: 14 NO: 2 ABSTAIN: 3

**Motion is APPROVED.** 



Dr. Birdsell asked how much time would realistically be needed in the future, as if it was a 3-month review, academically we all were bound by a semester schedule and a BofT meeting deadline for all academic matters. GV and BL agreed that having served on the UCC there are tight deadlines for curricular approval at the committee level if revisions are to be implemented within the next academic cycle. DC reiterated that there is a continuing concern about shared governance, and in the interest of that, there could be clarity on review timeframes from the Senate to assist in the approval process. He suggested perhaps the creation of an Ad Hoc committee on review and approval processes for the Senate.

#### **IV. Old Business**

Ch-SA asked to skip to item B., as Dr. Birdsell had comments and update for the Senate on this topic.

- B. Senate Committees on Research, Teaching & Service Update.
- Dr. Birdsell first and foremost thanked Christopher Belitto, Consuelo Bonillas and Dina Rosen for their efforts in leading these Senate subcommittees on Research, Teaching and Service. Dr. Birdsell was genuinely pleased with the results, which he felt represented a healthy process of engagement with one's colleagues to discuss these important topics. He made these overall observations:
- 1/ Guidelines are important for our tenure-track colleagues and that these are certain to continue to evolve.
- 2/ The documents represent a mix of products, which reflect the mix of disciplines and distinctions within the University community.
- 3/ There is an importance for guidance for those beginning a tenure track career path vs. those who are seeking to attain a Full Professorship promotion. These are two different conditions of achievement: different stages of scholarship.
- 4/ There are numerous modalities of evaluation: books vs. journal articles, performance vs. creative output, etc.
- Dr. Birdsell felt there is more work needed for clarification in the following areas regarding Research & Scholarship: 1/ The need for differentiation between Scholarship/Teaching/Research. Too often there was double or even triple counting of accomplishments. For example, a methodology used for Teaching was also counted as Research, etc. Dr. Birdsell felt there needed to be for distinction between defining these three areas in some of the reports. Is supervising student performance a Teaching endeavor or a Scholarship practice?
- 2/There were sometimes broad lists of what constitutes scholarship. For example, and Op-ed is not in Dr. Birdsell's opinion Scholarship.
- 3/ The need for "volumetric" expectations which will vary from discipline to discipline. The need for 4 to 5 journal articles vs. a book publication varies from discipline to discipline. Dr. Birdsell would like to seek a way to "harmonize" volumetrics across the various disciplines.

Regarding Teaching and Service Dr. Birdsell had these observations:

- 1/ There is differentiation in Teaching (Clinical vs. Classroom, etc.) and need to establish quality standards; to use "well established high impact practices" as a basis can be a vague term with metrics.
- 2/ There is a need to strengthen the peer evaluation process.



3/ Candidates need to write meaningful Teaching Statements that are goal oriented and not platitudinal. These need to discuss professional development pathways. Use CT&L to create a ladder for professional advancement.

- 4/ Have graduate expectations by the hire year, not tenure year. Create differential standards that are clear.
- 5/ Explore differential pathways to tenure, such as emphasis in Teaching as a clear distinction for hire (such as at Temple and Georgia State do).
- 6/ Concern for paid consultancy to be considered as satisfying a tenure requirement of Service. Dr. Birdsell noted ethical concerns and difficulty in assessing such work for tenure.

In summary, Dr. Birdsell felt that on the balance this has been very productive, and it has contributed to a process that will create progress on this for all involved. Dr. Laura Baecher has copies of this and will distribute Dr. Birdsell's summary comments. Dr. Birdsell felt there was "a lot to like" in the documents and commended the faculty on their accomplishment of this.

MH asked about the expectations for Kean to move to R1 and if there was even more support for RTR given those expectations, as other peer institutions. Dr. Birdsell replied that Kean is not yet there for any R1 effort, and that a 3/3 load is common for R2 institutions. He offered that a t 4/4 load is unusual for a R2 University, but that there is financial coordination and alignments that need to happen in tandem.

Dr. Birdsell felt that Kean University in many other respects is in a stronger position than when he arrived. For example, in November of 2023, there were 130 Tenure track faculty and 135 tenured faculty. That is an increase of 119 tenure track positions since his arrival in 2021. Kean has a higher yield rate than all but two universities in the state of NJ 9with one of them being Princeton University). Dr. Birdsell was also complementary of the amount of external Research funding that faculty has been able to garner. These grants can help support RTR funding. In many ways overall grant funding is a way that supports such things as, say, Elizabethan scholars, where grant support is not as easy to come by.

AG asked if there was any discussion of moving to multiyear contracts for tenure track and lecturer appointment, as the year-to-year appointment cycle is counter to most multi-year grant funding cycles. Dr. Birdsell said that this was desirable yes, but at the moment he does not have the wiggle room financially from the University to be able to move to that model. However, recent lecturer contracts were written for 2 years terms. But he is optimistic in that significant hiring progress has been made with 44 new faculty hired since 2021 have RTR, versus in 2020 only 14 RTR awards were made. AG asked if Dr. Birdsell could comment on the process for the selection of RTR awards Dr. Birdsell volunteered that, in the interest of transparency, due to limitation of time, he made the first selections when he arrived to the Provost position in 2020, but the most recent cycle relied solely on the recommendations of the College Research Committees' recommendations and Dean approvals and then filtered through the financial constraints that limited awards. Dr. Birdsell said that there are still concerns about overall equity in each College for awards, and discussion of if RTR should be mostly for junior tenure-track faculty, verses tenured faculty, but those are discussions to be had by each College going forward.



A. Enhancing 'Value' for our students through Student & Career Services, Academic Currency & Rigor and Resources.

Ch-SA returned to item IV-A on the agenda for the balance of the time for the meeting. Ch\_SA moved to the topic of how the University creates value for our students. Can Career Services be more pro-active for our students, perhaps performing more "outreach" to ensure all students have access to their services? Ch-SA also mentioned grading standards to improve academic rigor, as this seems to vary across colleges in the university. She requested that this topic could be discussed in much more detail at the Senate Retreat which is scheduled for Tuesday June 11<sup>th</sup>.

Lastly, MH asked if Dr. Birdsell had an update on the Travel Portal that has been promised to help streamline travel documentation. Dr. Birdsell relayed that he has been promised it would be up and running by July 1<sup>st</sup>. MH offered to compose a "fanfare" for the event, and Dr. Birdsell welcomed that initiative.

Before moving to adjourn the meeting, Ch-SA relayed to the gathered Senators that President Repollet has graciously agreed to come to address and thank the Senators for their service at the next Full Senate Meeting and she very much welcomed his visit.

#### V. New Business:

C. <u>Distance Learning Committee</u>
[Not discussed due to time limit constraints]

#### **Motion to Adjourn**

Ch-SA requests a motion to adjourn the meeting. KC made a motion to adjourn. CA seconded the motion. **All in Favor - Meeting adjourned at 4:24pm** 

#### V. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Executive Committee Meeting Tuesday, April 23, 2024 **Zoom**, 3:15 p.m.
- B. Full Senate Meeting Tuesday, April 30, 2024, 3:15 p.m. **In-person** with live Zoom feed for attendees.
- C. Senate Reorganization Wednesday, May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024, 11AM
- D. Senate Retreat Tuesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024
- E. Complete meeting schedule for Spring semester:

https://www.kean.edu/offices/university-senate/meeting-schedules-executive-committee-and-full-senate



### Senators in attendance:

Senators in attendance:				
Mukul Acharya [MA]	P			
Sucheta Ahlawat [Ch-SA]	P			
Craig Anderson [CA]	P			
Stephanie Baker [SB]	P			
Charles Boateng [CBoat]	P			
Consuelo Bonillas [CBoni]	P			
Sharon Boyd-Jackson [SBJ]	A			
Dean Casale [DC]	P			
Kathleen Curran [KC]	P			
Gilda DelRisco [GDR]	P			
Ronald Dowdell [RD] [retired]				
Rachel Evans [RE]	P			
Daniel Gover [DG]	P			
Aaron Gubi [AG]	P			
Matthew Halper [MH]	P			
Maria Ingelmo [MI]	A			
George Kolodiy [GK]	A			
Craig Konyk [CK]	P			
Barbara Lee [BL]	P			
Holly Logue [HL] – [David Barber as proxy]	P			
Mahshid Namazi [MN]	A			
Don Marks [DM]	E			
Marguerite Mayhall [MM] [on Sabbatical]	P			
Brid Nicholson attending				
Judy Pena [JP]	P (via zoom)			
Nicole Rodriguez [NR]	P			
Andrea Rosa [AR]	P			
Dina Rosen [DR]	P (via zoom)			
Benito Sanchez [BS]	P			
Gail Verdi [GV]	P			
Jane Webber [JW]	Е			
	Mukul Acharya [MA] Sucheta Ahlawat [Ch-SA] Craig Anderson [CA] Stephanie Baker [SB] Charles Boateng [CBoat] Consuelo Bonillas [CBoni] Sharon Boyd-Jackson [SBJ] Dean Casale [DC] Kathleen Curran [KC] Gilda DelRisco [GDR] Ronald Dowdell [RD] [retired] Rachel Evans [RE] Daniel Gover [DG] Aaron Gubi [AG] Matthew Halper [MH] Maria Ingelmo [MI] George Kolodiy [GK] Craig Konyk [CK] Barbara Lee [BL] Holly Logue [HL] – [David Barber as proxy] Mahshid Namazi [MN] Don Marks [DM] Marguerite Mayhall [MM] [on Sabbatical] Brid Nicholson attending Judy Pena [JP] Nicole Rodriguez [NR] Andrea Rosa [AR] Dina Rosen [DR] Benito Sanchez [BS] Gail Verdi [GV]			

P = Present A = Absent E = Excused



### **Student Representatives:**

1	Glynnis Tan
2	

### **Guests:**

ducsts.		
1	Dr. David Birdsell – VPAA, Provost	
2	Dr. Salvatore – VP Admin	
3	Robyn Roebuck - VPAA Off.	
4	Dr. Jonathan Mercantini - A.VPAA	
5	Megan Engels	
6	Dr. Julia Neverez	
7	James A. Castiglione – KFT	
8	Dr. Mensah Peterson – SS&R	
9	Dr. Marvin Adames - SS&R	
10	Dr. Vivian Zambrano – SS&R	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		