

# **Faculty Senate Retreat Agenda**

## **Committee Chair Reports**

### **Academic program and planning report**

Reviewed 4 proposals.

Having problems with 2 week deadline- want to review this deadline, and use an online system for submitting proposals.

Reviewing proposals and have discussion with other programs.

Difference between major and minors and concentrations — because confusion regarding what they were proposing and if needed a full review.

A revised proposal on increasing the number of G-courses within a given category was submitted to the Senate and voted down.

A conversation was held about whether or not the scope of the 'I' attribute meets the needs of ensuring our students are exposed to global issues. It was decided not to revisit the attribute definitions at this time.

A conversation was had about academic programs using G-courses to fulfill requirements for the major. The committee is concerned about the tendency but does not see that there is anything that can be done at the committee level to combat this trend.

Discussion of the review process continues. The conveners are piloting a review process in which faculty with courses up for review submit only a syllabus for the course and no additional paperwork unless the convener has concerns about the appropriateness of the course for that category. This minimalist process is likely to increase faculty compliance with the procedure but removes one of the valuable aspects of the course review – the self-reflection on the part of the faculty member with respect to what they are doing in the course and why.

### **Administration and Finance: Susan Fahey**

Funding by school on discretionary money (2 meetings)-

- Some Deans fund beyond the \$900 allotted money but some Deans do not.

Schools vary in degree seek external funding.

Variations in where conferences are being held among the disciplines.

Deans should be transparent regarding securing extra funding.

No adjuncts were not eligible for funding – though are required to do research; it varies among programs. Endorsed those faculty be funded for travel.

Talked but did not vote on professional development money.

#### *How to share the Road with Cyclists*

Transportation related concern for cyclist and pedestrians.

Access related concerns to the physical space available.

Putting gravel against path to assist or have shared “sharrows”.

Recommended a bike awareness messaging campaign.

### *Pedestrian Safety*

In the parking lots, especially in Lots 6 & 7— voted to unanimously send both issues to the Parking committee and have Susan Fahey and Michael Busler report back.

### *Campus Accessibility*

#### **Parking**

We do not meet demand for ADA compliant spaces.

Front side drop off area for Students, employees and PAC visitors.

Looking between WQ and PAC.

Looking at Campus Center facility which has a design but they don't have funding yet.

Signage is needed.

Various signs on campus need redesigning or replacement to be ADA compliant.

Many inaccessible restroom/services need signs directing to an accessible one.

#### *Restrooms*

Accomplishing renovation of F-wing 100 level restroom to be complaint opened.

Evacuation Plan.

Booklets in classroom — they do not tell you what to do if you cannot negotiate stairs or otherwise need assistance evacuating.

*Question asked* — need more awareness regarding parking spaces regarding vans — particularly in Lot 4.

*Answer* — we do not meet the requirement of accessible van spaces.

## **R&PD: Justin Ostrofsky**

9 rounds of funding — 196 applications, endorsed 125 applications=64%

Major changes effective this year- all sabbatical recipients are required to sign an acknowledgment of the terms of the award before the award can be considered official.

New online system — effective May 2017, R&PD awards are now collected and reviewed electronically through online secure system.

## **Committee on General Studies**

It was a quiet year for General Studies with the committee meeting only twice as no agenda items were brought to the committee by either committee

# **Committee on Student Affairs: Manish Madan**

Commencement speaker.

Adding newer forms for Academic Honesty.

BOT- Senate- President never signed the policy so senate needs to follow up on this  
Answer- if suspended goes on transcript.

BOT — Union discussion on MOA- 3 faculty members that looked at this matter showed that 70% happy with IDEA- so no compelling reason to change, only concern is that IDEA moving to online administration.

This is not to be a link sent to students, but should be administered in a synchronized manner.

placement of students for fieldwork. A revised proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 9-0 in favor at the 12/8/16 meeting, and forwarded to the Senate.

*Doctor of Nursing Practice*

Reviewed by the Committee twice at the 12/8/16 and 1/26/17 meetings. Feedback provided regarding use of adjunct faculty, field placements, and reliance of overload teaching by the Committee. A revised proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 9-0 in favor at the 1/26/17 meeting, and forwarded to the Senate.

*Bachelor of Science in Computer Science/Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems*

Proposal to convert the Computer Science and Information Systems major into two separate majors was reviewed by the Committee twice at the 2/23/17 and 3/26/17 meetings. Feedback provided regarding administrative support, program coordinators, and enrollments. A revised proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 6-1 in favor at the 3/26/17 meeting, and forwarded to the Senate.

II. Proposals – Concentrations

*Pre-Nursing Concentration*

Proposal for a new concentration in Health Sciences was reviewed at the 9/28/16 meeting. The Committee had questions regarding the impact of the concentration for the Chemistry and Biology courses that would be required. The proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 11-0 in favor, and forwarded to the Senate.

*Pre-Physician Assistant Concentration*

Proposal for a new concentration in Health Sciences was reviewed at the 9/28/16 meeting. The Committee had questions regarding the impact of the concentration for the Chemistry and Biology courses that would be required. The proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 11-0 in favor, and forwarded to the Senate.

*Visual Arts K-12 Certification Concentration*

Proposal for a new concentration in Education leading to a teaching certification in visual arts was reviewed at the 1/26/17 meeting. The Committee discussed the At Some Distance course requirements and the potential for limiting student course choices. The proposal was approved and passed by a vote of 10-0 in favor, and forwarded to the Senate.

*Early Childhood Education Concentration*

Proposal for a new concentration in Education leading to a teaching certification in early

childhood education for teaching in pre-school to grade three was reviewed at the 2/23/17 meeting. The Committee voiced concerns regarding the courses required and the impact on supporting programs, and discussed concerns about the short time frame for turnaround being asked for in the proposal. The proposal was approved for forwarding to the Senate on the condition that the proposers work with Chair to address the changes discussed. The proposal was passed by a vote of 6-0 in favor, and forwarded to the Senate.

III. Closure of Program Notific #

Nasn b

MI eevi

required to identify and reach out to other impacted programs prior to submission. The Committee felt that a combination of methods might be considered. The Chair will discuss with the Senate leadership for next academic year.

#### *Page Limit for Written Portion*

The Committee suggests that proposers be cognizant of the length of proposals. It was suggested that 10 - 12 pages of narrative and rationale, with appendices for data, be the standard followed for proposals.

#### *Definitions for Proposal Formats*

The Committee urges that the Senate leadership seek clarify with the administration as to the differences between terminologies — what is a major, minor, concentration, etc. – and codify this for proposers. Example proposals should be provided to the faculty for each type.

#### *Close the loop*

The Committee would like communication from further down the chain as to what happens to proposals after they leave the committee. A mechanism for such communication should be established such that the Committee is regularly updated as to the status of proposals it sends forward.

#### *Research data*

As long as it is possible, the program proposal writing process should be strengthened by using Hanover Research to gather data for labor market and enrollment projections. While not strictly necessary for the committee's review, having such data makes it easier to review the proposal. It is the understanding of the Committee that one month notice is required to get on the queue for Hanover Research to conduct such studies.

### VII. Academic Year 2017-2018

#### *A. Chair*

Douglas Harvey will remain as Chair for the next academic year.

Judy Copeland was re-elected to serve for 2017-2019 as the GENS representative by vote of the School of General Studies faculty.

Jiajin Chen was elected to serve for 2017-2019 as the BUSN representative by vote of the School of Business faculty.

Mary Padden was elected to serve for 2017-2019 as the HLTH representative by vote of the School of Health Sciences faculty.

All other representatives will be elected or appointed before the first meeting of the 2017-2018 academic year in September.

## **Committee on Library:**

Two librarians received tenure.

Fall faculty conference- issue was raised about the restoration of the McNaughton collection of popular reading materials, which had been in steady decline during the last 3 years.

Student senate did a survey “do you read for leisure” and how many books read in last 6 months? campus- typically have access to e-books

Students residing on Stockton Campus can acquire a library card and borrow materials there upon presentation of a Stockton ID and a “regular” ID card.

Funding issue- if want to increase leisure reading for students, we do outreach.

Library Budget –

- Discussion and possibility of the Senate taking up the matter with a request of improved funding of the library by Stockton University in order to meet such a growth and adequately support faculty research and other scholarship.

In particular, the committee asked the library director for additional information regarding the current budgetary “crunch”.

Due to inflation, all library can do is maintain access to what we already have, since all go up 5% annually, so increase in budget goes to the 5% increase. If we do not renew subscription, we lose access to back file.

Conclusion no budgetary access to obtain new request.

Q: Is online subscription cheaper?

A: Before it was, but not it is the same price. Many online journals, if do not continue subscription, then do, and go by size of college for their charges.

If you want paper and online, then must pay extra cost.

Save money by eliminating duplicate subscriptions that may have similar or same materials.

Library budget has remained the same although students and programs have increase. Perhaps library budget should increase as a new program emerges.



Library use to be able accommodate annual standing orders for resources but no longer could afford

- Is there a report of denied requests?
- Perhaps in the library's annual report

Could we hook into the county library's online stock of popular novels?

- Worth exploring
- There has been a decrease in access to print journals in the past 10 years.
- With all the fees students are charged- is there some money that can go to the library budget?
- Proposals for new programs- there use to be a more serious look at the demand for the program, and in the resources section, no new requests were made. People are not really thinking about this on a program level; particularly new programs need to show any information on student demand and take seriously the idea of resources.
- Demand analysis in programs submissions — provost hired Hanover research, but did not start because programs already handed in proposals.
- Therefore, Hanover should look at the demand before new program proposals.
- Hanover is a great idea-but it may take time before they address a particular school's concerns.
- Can senate address the schools goal of 10,000 students by 2021— and how it will affect each programs 5-year plans?
- This will be a 2.8 % so our supply will increase by 7 %.
- Definitely need more faculty lines to address this goal
- Need 10,000 to balance out the budget.
- As we bring on new students, what is happening to high school population in NJ? If we are trying to get 10,000 – is this a sustainable strategy?
- Is there a strategic financial plan? What faculty has a say on this plan? No response was provided by the administration.
- Need the committee to be transparent about their strategic plan.
- Fastest growing school is Health Sciences- concerned about the faculty-student ratio and how it is compared to other schools.
- Student growth and faculty growth is not being met. Health sciences have used adjuncts for 4 courses a year, which is not allowed.
- Education leadership, not enough faculty to handle dissertations of students along with their teaching loads.
- Recommend that senate look at new program proposals.
- Lack of communication among the schools about adjuncts being utilized across the programs.
- Now adjuncts are precepting preceptees at a distance.

5 – Breakout into Committees for Discussion of Challenges Facing Committees

Full Senate Discussion of Challenges Facing Committees

Will be done online in September due to lack of time.

## **Atlantic City Update:**

Pictures were shown regarding the process of the buildings

Have officially broken ground on the academic building

Academic building

- 5,600 square feet
- 14 classrooms, 3-4 can double as classrooms or computer rooms
- Offices are on 3<sup>rd</sup>

II. Proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and a Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems (Second Reading)

- o Will remain in the School of Business.
- o Vote on approving program or against.
- o 30 people voting- results indicate that 29 votes were in favor of approving the program; 1 abstention.

I. Approval of April Faculty Senate Minutes-minutes were approved

II. Endorsement of a Meeting Module Change (2:30 Start) (Second Reading)

4:00PM-5:00PM Class module

Will be a trial basis academic year 2018-2019 needed for 2 semesters.

Taskforce will be created and report back to Senate by 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in order to impact the future scheduling.

Science program have to run labs, so if you want to run for senate, then avoid to teach during this meeting module.

Try to accommodate faculty in ARHU.

Q: Concern for Arts-different times for labs and visual art, modules are at 2.5 hours, so able to get classes in before 4:30, so if cannot teach on 2:30 module, then faculty is impacted.

Q: To provost- can classes in Arts be scheduled during the meeting module?

A formal request should be made by Dean; cannot be answered today.

Paucity of resources in order to reschedule classes.

Visual or performing arts need to address this.

This is a pilot so after we implement it, then we can truly address concerns.

Concern about only having 4 weeks to evaluate this, pilot has to be longer than 4 weeks, for at least a full semester.

Answer: initial report can quickly address the concerns, so get a full academic year. The initial report would affect the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester.

Trial 2 semesters, get feedback after 4 weeks

Q: Why not do a theoretical pilot instead of a real pilot

Q: What are we voting on?

A: Senate to vote on where to endorse a meeting module tie of 2:30 to 3:50 on Tues/Thurs at the 4-5:50Pm class module.

Is there motion to revise the module?

Suggestion to amend the motion with caveat of schools can make a request to override the meeting module to schedule classes at this time.

Clause: some exceptions for studios and labs and other courses that do not fit into regular class modules.

Added impact of satellite campuses — will they also be impacted by meeting module?

Can we vote no on the amendment?

Can we do a mock schedule for every school?

5<sup>th</sup> debate on this issue.

Reason for it coming up for 40 years — let's try someth

he Ý eas ka fo cing d h e c las at th h class m

odules

ho ç any ro å r b m å oul ´ be o Bse

lto this s“an é È and å

meet at t: 0 ath a r tha9 at 4: 4

No, the students would not get the link.

Can new faculty be encouraged to do synchronous evaluation?

À Yes, IFD should communicate it.

Being mandated would not be allowed likely.

Concern about response rates.

What is the plan for synchronous?

- Having a computer room, kiosk, using smart phones, iPads.
- Is there a real possibility for students to take the IDEA seriously if doing it on a mobile device?
- It will be mobile friendly
- Pilot showed great response rate, and did synchronous and a- synchronous

Q: a student can be suspended and return to same program and transcript will not show the suspension.

Expulsion means no chance of returning.

Q: 3<sup>rd</sup> offense grounds for suspension or expulsion — so not automatically mean get suspended or expelled?

À Yes, that is correct.

If a student is suspended, it will be notated on their transcript.

Page #1, “those 2 sanctions will be recorded” old version.

Motion on page 4 paragraph 2, “sanction imposed” revised to “the suspension or expulsion will be recorded”.

More training search chairs- more beyond having standard appropriate questions, but having a streamline process.

We should still be looking into diversity and hiring.

Interested in having a survey about having a search advocate on the search committee.

Interested from knowing what others want senate to look into and addressing

Open to the audience- no suggestions made.

Minutes prepared by elected secretary for the Faculty Senate 2017-2019 term: Allison Sinanan.

Minutes revised by secretary of Faculty Senate on 9/21/17.