

KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING
MINUTES

March 14, 2023
3:15 p.m.-4:15 p.m.
Zoom Webinar

Senators in attendance:

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

Student Representative:

Glynis Tan

Guests: Bellitto, Moskovitz, Salvatore

[•=present ex=Excused absent=ab]

Meeting called to order by Chairperson Ahlawat at 3:15pm

I. Minutes – February 21, 2023
A. Motion: Mack
B. Second:
II. Curriculum Items for Notification-Notification and Vote or None
III. New Business-
<p>Chair: Next on the agenda are several Curriculum items approved by the UCC. The BSN medical lab science approved but needs to be revised due to a title change. Chair: The following curriculums were revised, approved by the UCC, and forwarded to the Provost’s office:</p> <p><i>A. B.A. Biology: Education/TSD (Teacher of Students with Disabilities) (Revision), B. B.A. Biology: Education (Revision), C. B.A. Biology: General Option (Revision), D. B.S. Biology: Cell and Molecular Biology Option (Revision), E. B.S. in Medical Laboratory Science, F. Biology Minor, G. B.A. English: English in Global Settings Option (Revision), H. B.A. History: Pre-Law Option (Revision), I. B.F.A. Interior Design, J. M.Arch. Architecture (Revision), K. Occupational Therapy Doctorate (Revision)</i></p>

Old Business The document outlining the course revision cycle was edited by Don Marks referring to resolution 2023-03 – 2017. Several options were included:

1. Request that the Provost alter this policy to reflect a five-year cycle, tied to the program review process.
2. Allow individual faculty and departments to decide if they want to review the course outlines before or after the program review.
3. Don said sometimes it is better to finish the program review and use information from the assessment cycle to guide your course revisions.
4. Faculty can certify or indicate which course outlines don't need revision.
5. The rationale here is that we don't bog down the CMS system by just constantly revising course,

Open it up for discussion.

Senator: I know that for those of us who have accredited programs, alignment of the program review and the accreditation may be out of sync. Maybe we need one clause that deals with the case of accreditation.

Chair: Don mentioned that some programs have an eight-year cycle. Therefore, programs may revise course outlines more frequently if the discipline or the curriculum needs revisions. What language do you feel we should add here?

Senator: Realign your program review to coordinate with the accreditation visit.

Chair: This resolution would require faculty and departments to certify that faculty has reviewed each of the course outlines to determine which ones needed revision.

Senator: I think the notation that a five-year program review is what we mean by program review period.

Chair: Motion to approve was called by Walter Mack and seconded by Jack Sargent? All senators voted in favor. There were not votes opposing. The resolution passed and will be put on the website.

Chair: Now under new business.

1. The chair had a meeting with Dr. Salvatore, Dr. Birdsell, regarding multiple academic issues surrounding courses. She did not agree to certain course caps.
2. Dr. Birdsell will call a meeting of all the curriculum chairs from different departments and identify what his concerns are and what he would like to do. He will propose that the curriculum chairs go back to their departments to look at all the different issues that Dr. Birdsell brings up. The Senate does not determine course caps.

Michael Salvatore: Sure, you did, I just want to make sure that David's sentiment around the revision is specific to pedagogical intensity, physical boundaries and limitations. We can find a common ground in terms of what those caps should be for different level courses.

Chair: We should also discuss other issues that are important to the Senate. For example, hopefully getting rid of I-Sections the way they have been run in the last few years.

Joy Moskovitz: I'm happy to follow-up on that.

Chair: The next items on our agenda are the ad hoc Senate committees. There will be two ad hoc committees, the research committee and the teaching and service committee. Dr. Bellitto will serve as the chair of the research committee, and work with chairs of individual college research committees. I will pass it on to him to explain more.

Chris Bellitto: The ARTP letter of agreement must be prepared for external reviews and include criteria for tenure and promotion? I'm part of the ad hoc Union Committee. Provost agrees that criteria for ARTP should be grounded in the programs, so faculty should be developing the criteria. There are three tasks. The first task would be to come up with some general (flexible) template (rubric) by June. We're reviewing two examples. TCNJ is specific in the number of articles and presentations. The NSF surveyed 51 departments at 20 public universities. You will find charts on pages 36 to 37. My plan is to convene the six representatives to look at these two examples in the fall 24. There's another committee that's doing this for teaching, and service. We will gather all of this by January 15, of 2024. We must make sure that creative works are included. New first-time tenure track professors need to know how to make decisions about publishing. Comments, questions, suggestions for other examples of rubrics?

Senator: Chris, has there been a distinction in terms of the creative arts side versus the people who may be published in journals? Has there been discussion in terms of how to evaluate the differences in those areas?

Chris Bellitto: Yeah, that's one of the reasons why I picked that NSF because they get into these different types of fields. The answer is absolutely.

Chair: Chris is really serving as the hub and the college chairs are going serve in a similar capacity.

Senator: There was a lot of talk about the Boyer model. You know, I guess when the new administration started, I haven't heard as much about that. How's that?

Chris Bellitto: Yeah. Well, we can put that into our discussion as well. Yeah, absolutely.

Senator: Good afternoon, everyone. Chris, I know that Visual and Performing Arts is no longer its own college. But I would suggest that maybe there'll be a call for a representative from the creative arts faculty to serve in addition to the six representatives from the colleges.

Chris Bellitto: Okay. I have the list here. We are in liberal arts. You and I are in the same school, right? The committee chair is Mia Zamora. Jen Crupi, Shalander Samuels, Brian Oakes, Julia Nevarez, Zandra Gratz, C. Nicholson, and Lewis Kachur.

Chris Bellitto: I'm reaching out to the six chairs of the colleges, and then they're going to reach out to faculty.

Chair: Any other questions about the research committee. In the same light, we are going to create another ad hoc committee on teaching and service. This committee will review issues such as criteria for conducting peer observation and criteria for evaluating instruction as well as criteria for determining appropriate service activities.

Senator: Yeah, I was just wondering why we have one committee for two separate things. Why can't we have a separate one for teaching and a separate one for service?

Chair: We could have but when the letter of agreement was signed and there are already college committees on teaching and service as one. And Joy was kind enough to share with me the list. Our idea was to get this conversation started, put something on the paper, then people comment on it. There will be substantial variations between disciplines, whether it is departments, or disciplines, etc. It's not

going to be one size fits all.

Chris Bellitto: Then the next challenge will be at the senate level.

Chair: We will formalize the process next week, I'll have the resolution saying we have formed these committees, and this is how they are going to work. I am assuming every college had elections last year.

Chair: There is another resolution coming from the UCC to include the College Curriculum Committee in the process. Currently, when the programs or departments are revising or developing new programs, they approve within the department, go to the Dean and then straight to the UCC, bypassing the CCCs. Documents that come to the university curriculum committee are not complete or have things missing or have courses that have not been approved. Discussion followed:

Senator: I don't know what the original reason for not including program review at the college level was, and it's possible that it had something to do with workload. I'm curious about whether the college curriculum committees would find it just a lot more work to review programs, in addition to reviewing the courses, and maybe what we could do is just have them check off that, in fact, the courses that are part of a program.

Senator: In terms of the courses, were the college curriculum committees created with a review of courses in mind?

Chair: Yes, And the other thing is, the workload of the current college curriculum committees should go down substantially, given you just approved the extended timeframe for course revisions. As I'm reviewing and approving in the CMS system. Most of the times, seeing proposals being sent back because they didn't conform to the format.

Senator: That's good point. One thing that I think might be an issue is that the workflows in the CMS would need to be modified to support whatever new routing we have.

Chair: Andrea, and Joy are the ones who really handle much of the work, including on the CMS, maybe they have something to share.

Senator: In order to revise the system, we can't interrupt the current workflow, because we have documents already going through the system. If this was to be approved, that it should be something dealing with perhaps the new academic year, perhaps July 1.

Joy Moskovitz: Indicated that courses are not being revised prior to program submission. The CCCs would be able to identify any issues in program revisions. There are also technical issues we need to consider. We may need to consider a rebuild of the CMS. Andrea, that's something that we'll talk about.

Senator: What about the suggestion of a checklist as opposed to a full review by the college level?

Joy Moskovitz: That's something that we could look at, I'm meeting with Denise Anderson. I can update her on this conversation. CMS has been in place for over a year now. We're able to reevaluate how that's going.

Chair: We'll wait to hear from Denise again.

Joy Moskovitz: The courses must exist and be approved before they can create a program. Program documents are making their way to UCC without course revisions. Therefore, the program or the Option cannot move forward until and unless those courses are completely reviewed and approved and exist in the catalog.

Chair: I guess we will come back to it at least everyone has more information. I will pass it on to Rachel, she would like to share the information on the GE taskforce presentation that is coming up.

Senator: Thursday, March 16, 3:20, to 4:20 in the Little Theater of the Student Center, and on Zoom. We're having the presentation of the general education curriculum task force. We will also be holding college specific meetings, starting next week and through mid-April.

Chair: The last item is the Senate election update, we were waiting to try to run the elections based on the new college and department configurations, but this hasn't been moved forward. For this year, we are going to run the elections with current schools/departments. The call for nominations will go out. We have to revise our schedule a little bit will go out on March 17. Craig Anderson, do you want to fill everyone in?

Senator: I've just gotten some information from James Castiglione, about the letters of agreement, I have to talk to him a little bit later today.

Chair: Then give faculty two weeks for nominations. Yeah, the goal is to conclude the election by May 2. The finalized calendar will be sent out via email.

Chair: The chair raised a question regarding a discussion going on in public spheres focusing on Universities, Civic Engagement, and the Value of College Degrees: What impact can faculty have on public opinion regarding the value of a college education? When we talk about service obligations, required expectations, this would be something that the university should consider rewarding, how faculty get involved within their communities, what are they doing?

Joy Moskowitz: I want to welcome Robin to the office of the Provost as an Assistant VP for Academic Affairs. She will continue to be an asset to the university. In this role, Robin is going to be working directly as our liaison to enrollment management, and student success and retention, working very closely with career services and international student services, as well as our academic support programs, and of course, those other developing projects as they present themselves.

Chair: In addition to being involved in the community, etc. We need to also think about why so many people are thinking that the college education is not valuable. What is causing that? I don't know, either Joy or Mike has any thoughts on this?

Senator: I know a couple of the governors have signed legislation to stop requiring college degrees for several government state positions. It's not exclusively that they don't value the college education. It's also sort of the return on investment, that what they're really saying is that individuals don't have to go into deep debt, to get a college degree to then get a job that often doesn't pay all that much, because it's an entry level government job.

Chair: The chair indicated that may believe that just a vocational training program makes more sense for some high school graduates. Should we also look at ourselves and look at our programs and say, what are we delivering?

Senator: Mike, as the administration talked about the value proposition, I mean, obviously, state universities like Kean University or a bargain, I mean, for \$50,000, you can get a significant education, and aspects of vocational training if you go into a particular major. I feel like part of this is our branding. We are valuable, and we have value.

Michael Salvatore: I think it certainly deserves a broader conversation and a bit

more strategy. But I'm glad it's coming up. Several factors are contributing to this making the education profession not as appealing as it once was. You know, many of our parents probably said, Hey, become a teacher. It's a great job, a great salary, and you get health benefits. I don't think parents are saying that now. In fact, I don't even hear teachers saying that. I think it's a bigger conversation, we should have certainly connecting with the feeders like the Future Teachers Academy, and programs that are in high schools. And if we're strategic, maybe we can grab the bulk of those who are going to be educating our children in the future.

The chair closed this discussion and ended the meeting by referencing an email thread regarding issues with promotion and range adjustments. The author of these messages outlined, “bylaw violations” made over the past two years. The Chair read the email to ensure that the author was heard through the senate. A motion to end the meeting was made, seconded, and members voted to adjourn at 4:20 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20pm

IV. Next Meetings

- A. Executive Committee Meeting – March 21, 2023 – Zoom at 3:15 p.m.
- B. Full Senate Meeting – March 18, 2023 – Zoom Webinar at 3:15 p.m.