

1 William Paterson University – FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – October 13, 2020
2 FACULTY SENATE WEB PAGE <http://www.wpunj.edu/senate>

3
4 **PRESENT:** Abraham, Aktan, Alford, Andreopoulos, Brillante, Christensen Crick, Diamond,
5 Duffy, Ellis, Fuentes, Gazzillo Diaz, Hack, Helldobler, Hill, Janos,
6 Jurado, Kaur, Kearney, Keckojevic, Kollia, Liu, MacDonald, Marshall, Martus, McMahon (for
7 O'Donnell), Monroe, Mwaura, Natrajan, Powers, Rebe, Rosar, Sabogal, R. Schwartz, Shekari,
8 Silva, Simon, Snyder, Steinhart, Swanson, Tardi, Tosh, Vega, Verdicchio, Wallace, Watad,
9 Williams

10
11 **ABSENT:** Owusu, Weisberg

12
13 **GUESTS:** Boucher, Broome, Cannon, Choi, Davis, DeLoatch, Galetz, Gelfer,
14 Ginsberg, Goldstein, Griffin, Hertzog, Jackson, Jones, Marks, Martin, McLaughlin-Vignier,
15 Miles, Mongillo, Rabbitt, Refsland, Richardson, Ricupero, Rosenberg, Ross, M. Schwartz,
16 Sharma, Shekari, Vasquez, Weiland, Zeman

17
18 **PRELIMINARIES:** Chairperson Natrajan called the online meeting to order at
19 12:31pm. Martus and Crick moved acceptance of the Agenda which
20 was approved unanimously. Martus and Hill moved acceptance of the Draft Minutes of
21 the September 22nd meeting, which were also approved unanimously.

22
23 Chairperson Natrajan noted:

24 Before I turn it over to the Vice chair, I wish to take a minute to signal the celebration of
25 Indigenous People's Day yesterday. It was a day of remembrance and acknowledgment of the
26 lives lost and the costs borne by the Ramapo-Lunape, the Hackensacks, the Munsee, the Tappan,
27 the Raritan, the Pomptons, the Haverstraw, the Esopus, and several other native American
28 groups. Their histories today and the lands we occupy are only remembered hazily or lazily, at
29 times memorialized but in what anthropologist Renato Rosaldo called, a mode of 'imperialist
30 nostalgia'. Our commitment to diversity and justice at William Paterson University demands that
31 we strive to do better and face historical truths with the dignity they deserve.

32 **PROCEDURAL NOTE:** All senator's microphones should be muted. When one wishes to
33 speak s/he should type SPEAK in the Chat box. Duffy and Ricupero will keep track of those
34 desiring to speak and the Secretary will recognize each in order. When recognized, the
35 speaker will then unmute the microphone. Only the Chair's screen will be visible. The session
36 will be recorded but only the Secretary will have access to the recording.

37
38 **VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT:** Wallace and Hill's nomination of Kelly McNeal to the
39 Admissions and Enrollment Management Council as the representative of the College of
40 Education was also approved unanimously. Wallace and Hill nominated Anita Kumar to be the
41 College of Education/s representative to the Elections Council; the nomination was approved
42 unanimously. There is still one council opening available for the College of Arts and
43 Communication. If anyone is interested, please contact Wallace.

44

45 **GRADUATE PROGRAMS COUNCIL: PROGRAM CHANGE: MASTERS IN**
46 **EDUCATION: CURRICULUM AND LEARNING CONCENTRATIONS:** Choi and Silva
47 moved acceptance of the Council's resolution. Choi noted that the various programs are being
48 separated out. Martus expressed concern that one need not have an undergraduate science or
49 mathematics degree to get these masters. Mongillo stated that these programs have existed for
50 15-20 years and that science and mathematics faculty have taught courses in them, Snyder asked
51 if these programs were just a reorganization of what's been taught before or have there been
52 changes to the requirements, and is this what other institutions are doing. Mongillo replied that
53 there has been no change to the curriculum and content. They are being separated from the
54 M.Ed. in Curriculum and Learning and will be stand-alone programs. This will allow student
55 transcripts to emphasize the area of the student's concentration. She noted that most other
56 schools do this, and the changes will help us to market our programs more competitively. Jurado
57 stated that the Nursing Department is proposing an MSN to replace the MEd in School Nursing.
58 Graduates with an education degree cannot teach in nursing programs. The Masters in Education
59 Program Changes was approved with five negative votes and two abstentions.

60
61 **GRADUATE PROGRAMS COUNCIL: 4+1 COMBINED PROGRAM: BACHELORS IN**
62 **COMMUNICATION AND MASTERS IN PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION:** Choi
63 and Hill moved acceptance of the Council's resolution. Crick voiced support and noted that it
64 should appeal of new audiences. The Program was approved unanimously.

65
66 **GRADUATE PROGRAMS COUNCIL: PROGRAM CHANGE TO THE EARLY**
67 **CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONAL ALTERNATE ROUTE**
68 **CLINICAL EXPERIENCES CERTIFICATE PROGRAM:** Choi and Alford moved
69 acceptance of the Council's resolution. The program changes were approved unanimously.

70
71 **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL: BACHELORS IN COMMUNICATION DISORDERS**
72 **AND SCIENCES: PROGRAM CHANGE:** Wallace and Martus move acceptance of the
73 Council's resolution. The program change was approved unanimously.

74
75 **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL: CHANGE TO THE BACHELORS IN EARLY**
76 **CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:** Wallace and Fuentes moved acceptance of the Council's
77 resolution, which was approved unanimously.

78
79 **CHAIR'S REPORT:**

80
81 The SEC met with the President and Provost. We asked and received data on trends in
82 Promotion, ART, travel and career funds. We also expressed concern over the low number of
83 promotions this upcoming year. We also asked and received update on how the 100-level
84 attendance, early assessment, and student support data was being used. Due to the need to
85 attend to the RTP document today, I will send my report via an email to Senators and chairs.

86 **CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF THE RETENTION, TENURE AND**
87 **PROMOTION DOCUMENT:**

88
89

90 This is an opportunity for the Senate **to show that we care**. The document has been in the
91 works for five years and is now in the hands of the Senate. As it stands, the document clearly
92 addresses long-standing issues raised by faculty at all ranks but especially pre-tenure faculty.
93 Issues such as a) that the path to tenure and promotion was not clear, b) that the diversity of
94 scholarships are not valued since they do not 'fit' conventional molds, and c) that the enormous
95 service engagements of faculty, especially faculty of color and women were invisibilized or not
96 valued. The new RTP addresses each of these issues, and does so in very strong and bold ways.
97 We can be proud of it as a collective product of our vision of who we are. It would be a **missed**
98 **opportunity for the Senate** were the document to get mired in the Senate without reaching it
99 in a timely manner to the departments. A final point. It was claimed at the last Senate that the
100 chair had only wanted 'grammatical' changes in the document. Here is what I said for the
101 record. I hope it is clear for everyone that discussion was not just allowed, it was encouraged in
102 the spirit of dialogue and co-ownership of this document. Indeed, the number of changes that
103 the RTP Committee members and then the Senate Executive incorporated over the last few
104 weeks speaks for how open this process has been. I now open discussion on the RTP by pointing
105 to the Motion on the Floor – introduced by the Senator from Communications, Matt Crick.

106 *That the RTP Document be forwarded to the administration with the expectation that it will then*
107 *be sent to the colleges and departments for further development and guidelines.*

108

109 Tardi thanked the Senate Chair and the RTP Committee for making a number of changes based
110 on comments at the last Senate meeting. She pointed out that she doesn't think the motion on the
111 floor is legal since it was based on a previous version of the RTP Document. She said there are
112 some inaccuracies that she will address with the administration. The issue of tracking faculty
113 was not raised at the last meeting, but she has discussed this with the President. Why is it being
114 allowed for those going from associate professor to full professor, but not for new hires. She
115 would like the Document to say that newly hired faculty would be able to track themselves.
116 They would have to be excellent in teaching and could select the second area in which they
117 would demonstrate excellence, while meeting the basic requirements of the third area.

118

119 Parliamentarian Simon said there were two ways to hand the problem Tardi noted. The easiest
120 way is to introduce a new motion, rather than amending the old one.

121

122 Crick, the original mover, removed the first motion and introduced the same wording as a new
123 motion (seconded by Verdicchio): *That the RTP Document be forwarded to the administration*
124 *with the expectation that it will then be sent to the colleges and departments for further*
125 *development and guidelines.*

126

127 In response to Tardi's suggestion, Natrajan stated that many universities adopt the idea that
128 specialization should be allowed at the professor level. Tardi said that with our teaching load, it
129 is rare that anyone could be excellent in all three areas. Let's be realistic. We must be excellent
130 in teaching and in one other area and meet the criteria in the third. This works elsewhere and
131 would be good model for our new hires.

132

133 Kaur thinks the current procedures work well and fears that tracking could create an unspoken
134 caste system. She realizes that the standard of excellence can become magnified and become
135 impossible.

136
137 Christensen echoed Kaur's comments and is concerned that if we track faculty too early,
138 hierarchies will be created (e.g., between research and service). She also pointed out that the
139 world "excellence" isn't used until the professor level. Expectations for full professor are
140 gradually stepped up, but associate professors are expected to be well-rounded.

141
142 Gazzillo Diaz said that not everyone is excellent in all three areas. She thinks it will be difficult
143 for someone to move from associate to full if they haven't been tracking themselves from the
144 very start. With less ART and fewer sabbaticals as well as all the other work we must do for
145 accreditation etc., it will be very difficult for new hires.

146
147 Andreopoulos, reporting for her departmental colleagues, asked the administration if the current
148 practice of being promoted to associate upon receiving tenure is under review. They also
149 recommended dropping the word "international" at both the associate and full professor levels.
150 Chairing important committees shouldn't be essential; service on them demonstrates leadership.
151 Finally, speaking of herself, Andreopoulos said that new faculty are so focused on scholarship
152 that they can't devote much time to service.

153
154 Natrajan said that many view teaching and research as an integrated whole. To be a good teacher
155 one must have some kind of research agenda. Expectations need to be commensurate with our
156 kind of institution. He noted that the RTP Document only mentions international as one of
157 several choices, not a requirement.

158
159 Marshall sees the Document as a block of marble that will be sculpted in the colleges and
160 departments. To be too specific will make it difficult for the very different departments to work
161 with it. She believes that the departments should be helping their junior faculty to identify and
162 nurture their specific strengths.

163
164 Martin stated that most faculty are not retained due to inadequate scholarship. She attributes that
165 to the large service responsibilities that they are required to perform. Large departments can
166 protect their faculty, but smaller departments can't. If one has done extraordinary service,
167 shouldn't they be given some slack on research?

168
169 Kollia emphasized that WPU has a heavy teaching load (24 credits/year vs. 18 in some
170 comparable institutions), support for research is diminishing, class sizes are increasing – hers
171 have doubled – which takes time away from scholarship. She would prefer to see people meeting
172 criteria at a certain level and showing a higher degree of performance in another one.

173
174 Aktan supports tracking for reappointment as well as promotion.

175
176 Christensen reiterated that "excellence" is only mentioned in the full professor paragraph.
177 Departments should have the opportunity to define the expectations that best suit their
178 disciplines. The Document gives new faculty more ways to get tenured and allows for new forms

179 of service within and outside the academy. This document calls for effectiveness and sustained
180 growth at all three levels. Wallace echoed those remarks.

181
182 Provost Powers stated that the Document is general so the departments can define for themselves
183 what “effectiveness” and service mean in each department. There is flexibility built into the
184 Document and departmental by-laws must reflect these things. Kaur found this comment helpful.

185
186 Tardi brought up a question raised by Martus at the last meeting: If departments are going to
187 create their own standards with great specificity, how are campus-wide committees going to be
188 able to judge who is meritorious? There must be a general foundation. How will committees
189 beyond the department be able to compare candidates?

190
191 Crick thinks tracking doesn’t belong in the Document but should be done in the departments.
192 The Document give pre-tenure faculty lots of choice and gives them a voice in describing what
193 they want to do.

194
195 Martus said that the Document needs to be reviewed in three to five years. One point that will
196 need to be looked at again is: What counts as “professional experience?”

197
198 Helldobler agreed with Martus that the Document needs to be reviewed periodically. It is the
199 foundational documents upon which departments will build their criteria. He thinks the RTP
200 Committee was sensitive to WPU’s institutional culture and he supports the Documents as
201 written.

202
203 Hill appreciates “nurturing,” “choice” and “living document.” “Backward design” sees where
204 one wants to go and then creates the necessary document. She thinks it can be helpful for new
205 faculty. She then called the question. Crick seconded.

206
207 More than a third of the senators voted against calling the question, so the motion failed the
208 discussion returned to the motion on the floor.

209
210 Verdicchio said that bottling up the Document will have negative consequences for pre-tenure
211 candidates and would be a missed opportunity to bring clarity to the RTP process. We need to
212 have the conversations at the college and department levels.

213
214 Diamond said that this is a foundational document and that departments will establish their own
215 documents. What will college-wide committees use?

216
217 Ellis thinks the Document should be tied into the Strategic Plan. If we’re moving the institution
218 in a certain direction, that should be spelled out in a more deliberative way.

219
220 Andreopoulos agreed that “international” broadens the perspective, but it also raises
221 expectations. To broaden things on the theoretical level is fine, but on the practical level we must
222 acknowledge limited resources and a four-course load, all of which are of great concern to the
223 faculty.

224
225 Gazzillo Diaz asked when the faculty member states that she or he wishes to display excellence
226 (besides teaching) in one specific area?

227
228 Christensen repeated that international work is not a requirement at any level. Many faculty do

229 work and publish internationally, but the Document does not raise the bar for anyone. Junior
230 faculty deserve the specificity of knowing exactly what is required for tenure and promotion at
231 every level. This is a general document, but the departments need to create clear written
232 expectations that make sense for their disciplines.

233
234 Helldobler affirmed his belief in shared governance. He said that getting to the definitive
235 document is impossible. This is a good document and at some point the University is going to
236 have to move with or without the Senate. Something has to happen by the end of October for it to
237 move to the colleges and departments for discussion. He hopes he doesn't have to do it without
238 Senate consent.

239
240 Davis noted that in Range Adjustment one states where one's strengths are and chooses to be
241 evaluated on that basis. Perhaps the RTP Document could address the issue that way.

242
243 Powers said that when he interviewed a year and a half ago RTP was a major theme he heard
244 about and the need for a clear vision to move forward. This is a good document that needs to be
245 discussed in the departments and the colleges. Take a leap of faith that you can trust the
246 administration and the Senate. We'll work together to make sure this works well. Once the
247 pandemic is over this will give us good tools to move forward.

248
249 Marshall raised a point of order about the earlier calling of the question. After inconclusive
250 discussion, Natrajan declared that we would adjourn now and take the issue up next time and
251 vote on it.

252
253 **ADJOURNMENT:** Upon Martus and Wallace's motion, the Senate adjourned at 1:51PM.

254
255 The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 27th at 12:30pm.

256
257 **It will be an ONLINE meeting.**

258 **Please "check in" as early as possible (ideally, before 12:30 so the secretaries can confirm**
259 **attendance). An accurate attendance is necessary since there was some question about the**
260 **correctness of a vote during today's meeting and we can't afford to have that happen next**
261 **time.**

262
263
264 Respectfully Submitted: Bill Duffy, Secretary
265