

3
4 **PRESENT:** Andreopoulos, Becker, Bhat, Cho, Davis, Diamond, Donaghy, Duffy, Ekmekjian, Ellis, Finnegan, Gardner,
5 Godar, Healy, Kim, Knaus, Ku, Lawrence, Levitan, Martinez, Martus, McCallum, Mongillo, Owusu (for Thiuri), Parras,
6 Pavese, Pinkston, Pollak, Potacco, Refsland, Rehberg, Falk-Romaine, Rosar, Scala, Robin Schwartz, Speert, Steinhart,
7 Stroppel, Suess, Tardi, Tesfaye, Verdicchio, Wagner, Walsh, Weil

8
9 **ABSENT:** Chung, Mbogoni, Mulrine

10
11 **GUESTS:** Barnes, Basu, Bolyai, Brown, Ciliberti, Daniel-Robinson, De Young, Dean, Goldstein, Gonzalez, Hahn,
12 Hayden, Hill, Kashyap, B. Mason, Malanga, Miller, Olaye, Overdorf, Panayides, Pardi, Peterman, Rabbitt, Robb, Sargis,
13 Schaeffer, Schuhmann, Seal, Snyder, Torres-Santos, Verdicchio, Villar, Watad, Weiner, Williams, Zeman

14
15 **PRELIMINARIES:** The Senate was called to order by Chairperson Godar at 12:36 PM. The proposed agenda was
16 moved and seconded by Martus and Duffy and unanimously approved. The minutes of the October 13, 2009 meeting were
17 moved and seconded by Duffy and Martus and, likewise, unanimously approved.

18
19 **CHAIR’S REPORT:** Godar reported that elections for the Sabbatical, Promotions, ART and Range Adjustment
20 Committees were in progress and that once concluded the Executive Committee would propose a committee to receive
21 Administrator Evaluations and draft a report. She said that the Administrator Evaluation is conducted every two years and
22 makes use of the confidential Campus Vote system. She said that volunteers familiar with quantitative analysis are sought
23 to serve on the committee and to notify her if interested. Tardi asked for a clarification of the ART submission process.
24 She said that recently completed ART project reports should be included in ART applications. Tardi added that if the
25 report is not yet completed, a summary should still be included. In response to a question from Martus, Tardi said that the
26 Research Council is welcome to submit any recommendations on the ART process to the Union for consideration.

27
28 **VICE-CHAIR’S REPORT:** Martinez announced five nominations to fill Council vacancies, as follows: Bettina Mason
29 as adjunct representative to Advisement & Registration, Susan Sgro and professional staff representative to Research, Iris
30 DiMaio as professional staff representative to Admissions & Enrollment Management, Tom McCloskey as adjunct
31 representative to Budget & Planning and Djanna Hill as Education representative to Graduate. The nominations were
32 approved unanimously.

33
34 **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL – BSBA CONCENTRATION IN CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNING:** On
35 behalf of the Undergraduate Council Tricia Snyder presented the proposal to add a concentration in Financial Planning.
36 She said that the new concentration will not require additional facilities, equipment or personnel and that additional
37 marketing costs will be borne by the College of Business. She said that the concentration is a response to changing student
38 needs and helps keep the program relevant and attractive to students. The proposal passed unanimously.

39
40 **GENERAL EDUCATION - COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:** Duffy moved and Martinez seconded moving to the
41 Committee of the Whole for discussion of the General Education proposals. This was unanimously approved. Kathy
42 Malanga distributed a diagram that illustrated the similarities and differences of the two proposed models. Tardi asked for
43 a discussion of the feasibility of the models. Godar said that both models have a common implementation plan which is
44 posted on the GE Documents page (<http://www.wpunj.edu/senate/gedocs.htm>). Godar said that subcommittees will be
45 formed that will make recommendations as to which courses fit the GE requirements. She said that faculty and advisor
46 training will be required and that the administration knows this. Levitan said that both models provide more choices for
47 the students and that scheduling and choice must be carefully balanced and will require coordination with the Registrar.
48 Verdicchio said that the GE Council agreed on the implementation plan but that there are details yet to be completely
49 figured out. Bhat thanked the Council for the diagram. Finnegan asked why the two proposals differ in their treatment of
50 transfer students. Malanga said that in both plans a student transferring to WPUNJ with an A.A. degree is exempt from the
51 GE program unless a course is part of a major. Malanga said that there are two junior-level courses in the USP model and
52 none in the Alternative model. Finnegan said that the two models also differ in their treatment of technology-intensive
53 courses. Kelly and Peterman provided discussion of how the Alternative and USP models incorporated this element.
54 Steinhart said that he was concerned that “technology” might simply mean “ability to use Microsoft applications” and that
55 this is not an appropriate technology learning outcome. Godar said that faculty will be working in committee to make sure
56 that the technology requirements are sufficiently inclusive of a range of skills and not biased towards Microsoft. Kelly

57 said that the technology-related outcomes were derived from the Learning Literacies Team work and are not based on any
58 particular software. Scala asked if the USP core competencies will each have a technology component. Peterman said that
59 they will, and that all the core courses will have both technology and literacy components. Godar said that nearly all
60 course outlines will require revision and reapproval. Pavese asked for a clarification of the Alternative model “expression
61 in the arts or communication” and the USP model “comparative values in the arts.” He wondered if either of these would
62 require a student to take a music performance course. Godar said that performance courses would not be required in GE.
63 Kelly said that either performance or appreciation would satisfy the requirement. Davis said that it is a significant
64 undertaking to revise all courses to include the required technology components and that it is important to make sure we
65 have tangible outcomes. She said that the technology outcomes need to be clearly stated in the GE program. Peterman
66 said that these will be made clearer during the implementation process. Diamond asked for clarification of the course
67 vetting process. Malanga said that, depending on the model that is approved, there will be 6-10 groups composed of
68 faculty from all the Colleges. Kelly said that they will be selected by fair and democratic means similar to the way Senate
69 Councils are composed. Parras noted major differences between the two models, particularly the explicit requirement of a
70 literature course in the Alternative model and the lack of this in the USP model. He said that we should adopt the program
71 that requires both literature and philosophy courses, which he said should be at the core of a liberal arts education.
72 Stoppel said that music and art are equally important. Potacco spoke in favor of the USP model’s multidisciplinary
73 inclusiveness and choice of humanities focus. Martus said that in the Alternative model technology seems
74 compartmentalized while in the USP model it is diffused across five courses. Martinez called for the Order of the Day at
75 1:15 PM. Levitan asked that the USP be removed from the floor and that the USP and Alternative models be considered.
76 Duffy seconded. With one nay, this passed. Steinhart asked how far amendments can go in changing the structure of a
77 model. Davis cautioned against a rush to vote if there are unvoiced questions from the floor. Martus said that the area of
78 technology is being sold short and that the question of who will teach these courses and how they will be trained is not
79 addressed. He added that all courses should be writing intensive and that the USP model addresses this better. Levitan said
80 that the intent is to engage the entire faculty in teaching GE and that technology is not more explicit because we do not
81 want to train everyone on particular software, knowing that these particulars change rapidly. Donaghy expressed concern
82 that classroom infrastructure cannot adequately support technology intensive courses. Steinhart called the question, Knaus
83 seconded and it failed to pass. Kim asked if all full time faculty would be required to teach GE. Godar said that there
84 would be no such requirement. Tardi commented that the majority of the current GE courses are taught by adjuncts. Scala
85 praised the Alternative model for its focus on civic awareness. Godar said that a civics component is in both models.
86 Pavese asked if either model has the potential to hurt enrollment in smaller departments. Owusu said that the current GE
87 program feeds students to the Geography program and that it might take a few years for effects to be felt. Parras said that
88 the English Department is not the only one that teaches literature; that AAACS, Languages & Cultures, and Gender
89 Studies offer literature courses and thus literature is not a privileged domain of the English Department but rather an
90 interdisciplinary study needed by all students. Tardi asked the GE Council whether they will strongly encourage full time
91 faculty to teach lower level GE. Levitan said that the Council did not have this discussion and that some departments set
92 up rotating schedules so that everyone teaches GE courses occasionally. Levitan said that she hopes more full time faculty
93 get involved with GE. Hayden called the question, Finnegan seconded. There were 21 ayes, 15 nays and a 2/3 majority
94 was not achieved. Refsland asked about double counting courses. Kelly said that in the Alternative model only course in
95 writing and technology are assumed to double count. Cho said that there are more similarities than differences between
96 the two models and that that Alternative model seems to require courses that she feels are important for well-informed
97 citizens. McCallum called the question, and Verdicchio seconded. The call failed by one vote. Gardner said that the
98 models are similar in most aspects. Davis said that she is concerned about how learning outcomes are presented in the
99 USP and that we are deferring discussion of important aspects. She called that question and it passed with a 2/3 majority.
100 A closed ballot was requested. An electronic ballot was conducted and the Alternative model received 27 votes (67%).
101 The USP model received 13 votes (33%). The Alternative model was adopted.

102
103 **ADJOURNMENT:** The Faculty Senate adjourned at 1:49 PM. The next meeting will be at 12:30 PM on Tuesday,
104 November 10th in University Commons Ballroom A.

105
106 Respectfully submitted: K. Wagner, Secretary