William Paterson University – FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – April 10, 2012
FACULTY SENATE WEB PAGE http://www.wpunj.edu/senate --

PRESENT: Andreopoulos, Doneghy (for Aktan), Barrow, Martinez (for Bernstein), Bhat, Chung, Garfinkel (for Boroznoff), D’Haem, Diamond, Dinan, Duffy, Ellis, Falk-Romaine, Ferris, Finneghan, Gardner, Gazzillo, Godar, Kearney, Kelly, Kim, Levitan, McNeal, Ndjatou, Nyamwange, Parras, Pavese, Perez, Quicke, Rosar, Scala, Snyder, Steinhart, Swanson, Tardi, Verdicchio, Waldron, Weiner (for Wagner), Walsh, Weil, Weisberg, Wicke, Wong

ABSENT: Cruz Paul, Healy, Lindsey, Schwartz, Sheffield

GUESTS: Becker, Burns, Ciliberti, Fengya, Ferguson, Fuller-Stanley, Furst, Goldstein, Hahn, Harris, Jemmott, Kashyap, Lawrence, Liutaud, Malanga, Malu, Martone, Miller, Noonan, Olaye, Rabbitt, Refsland, Rosengart, Sabogal, Sebetich, Sherman, Trelisky

The Senate was called to order at 12:34 PM.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Adoption of the agenda was moved by Pavese, seconded by Duffy and adopted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Draft Minutes of the March 27th meeting were moved to be accepted Perez, seconded by Godar and approved.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There is a Board of Trustees Tuition hearing on Thursday April 12th at 12:30.

Miller announcement that there would be “A Faculty Forum on e Books” on April 19th in the Atrium Auditorium from 12:30 – 1:45.

IV. CHAIR’S REPORT:

a. Graduate Studies

The Executive Committee met with the President and Provost about the Graduate Council Resolution that the Chair had previously removed from the Agenda. Weil discussed in this meeting that he did not feel that they should formalize a new Council as was stipulated in the new Resolution. Parras informed the joint Graduate Councils of this decision and they are having a joint meeting to discuss this outcome. Parras went onto discuss that Weil handles all graduate matters. It was further discussed during this meeting that there are no plans to have a separate Graduate School of Education. The Executive Committee is waiting to hear back from the Graduate Councils to hear what they would like further agenda items to be regarding graduate studies. Parras proposed that Team One of the Implementation Team for the Strategic Plan should form a Subcommittee for graduate studies.

Parras then asked the Weil if he would like to speak to this matter.

Weil noted that the email he sent out yesterday speaks for itself and that he will be working with graduate directors.

Kim noted that Chinese applicants are flooding graduate schools yet they are not increasing in enrollment at William Paterson.
Parras went on to discuss that a report on the First Year Advisement System was sent out to the Executive Committee last week and this will be discussed by the Committee and put on the Agenda for the April 24th meeting.

Parras discussed that on a broader topic, the Administration wants to change / modify/ revise advisement and wanted to know about our input. He noted that we should offer as much input as possible and asked that anyone with thoughts on improvement should contact him or the Executive Committee. He said that this is also being taken care of through the Strategic Planning process and suggested that maybe there should be an open forum on advisement.

Tardi stated that as President of the Union she wants to caution everyone as the recommendations that we make with regard to the developmental advisement model we have on this campus can impact our contract.

Parras thanked Tardi and then noted that student-faculty contact is correlated with retention. Less contact with faculty is detrimental to retention. He noted that we do not have to have a monolithic system and there should be independence for departments. For example, music and art are not following the new freshman advisement system and there should be a choice for departments.

Verdicchio said that we needed to have clarity in terms of what types of changes we are talking about with regard to changing advisement. Where we ended the term last year as a Senate, we raised the question as to whether departments could have “an opt in and opt out” scheme. He asked if in fact that model was on the table, he wanted to know exactly what we are talking about?

Parras noted that this has not been decided, and that it was his understanding that everything was on the table. He then asked Weil if he would like to comment on this.

Weil said that it is within Goal Two to look at the advisement system, that we have to do this sooner or later so it is best to do it sooner. He noted that there are issues with the advisement system and this was recognized within the strategic planning process.

Verdicchio said that he is not disputing the issue but noted that the new model has been put in place. He asked about the effectiveness of the new model (the using professional advisors for selected freshman and transfer students).

Parras commented that it is the first year of using this model and that it is too early to tell. He noted that he is speaking with the Executive Committee tomorrow about this and he assumes that this is open to modification.

Kelly noted that we are a University, an evidenced-based enterprise. She asked what are the assumptions that we are working off of, that there is something profoundly wrong with advisement? She said that she believes that we will find that what most positively impacts increasing retention is the change made in general education requirements, the difference between a 60 credit GE and a 30 – 40 credit one. She said we need to tease out the difference this made on retention and not focus on anecdotal (not evidence based) tales of advisement. What is “broken” about advisement is not clear. “Stories” about faculty versus professional advisement are not evidence based so we need to move on with our agenda.

Weisburg agreed that we needed to move on and made a specific request that more information about advisement be sent to the Advisement Council. He noted that recommendations from faculty must be taken seriously.

Ferris noted that she agreed with Kelly and that in the past the Advisement Council had held forums and that there is quantitative data, not just anecdotal, and this data seems to have disappeared and needs to be attained and reviewed.
V. VICE-CHAIR’S REPORT:

Falk Romaine announced that there are openings on Senate Councils for the next term. An email went out and another email announcement is coming out. She asked Senators to please encourage colleagues to volunteer, as we would like to get them filled by the end of the term.

VI. Faculty & Prof. Staff Committee Recommendation to cancel the Administrative Evaluations

Parras announced that the Faculty and Professional Staff Committee met on March 27th in a closed meeting and due to several mishaps in the implementation process of the Administration Evaluations, the Committee felt the current process should be stopped.

Recommendation to Cancel the Administrative Evaluation Process was moved by Godar and seconded by Falk Romaine.

Kim asked why, if the company made such a significant mistake in the implementation of the evaluations, are we not getting a full refund? Why are we only getting $750 back? He went on to ask who authorized this? And why are we not getting the money back from this company that we paid them for the Senate elections if we are not going to use them? Or are we going to pay two companies to do the same thing for the Senate elections? Why do we keep using the taxpayers’ money and keep making the same mistakes? He asked who decided to take $750 back and not the full refund?

Parras answered by noting that a full refund was not asked for because the evaluations were not cancelled yet.

Kim asked who decided to take $750?

Parras said that no final decision was made yet; they just gave the $750 back to us.

Steinhart motioned a point of clarification. He said he realized there was a problem with the written comments but asked if there was a problem with the numerical data.

Duffy said that the Ad Hoc Committee was satisfied with the numerical data but there were problems within the Committee regarding using half the data despite the fact that the quantitative was considered quite good.

Snyder noted that we should not view this as an either/or. They did not deliver the product. If they can fix things, then we wait, otherwise, we will contact our lawyer. But, we have been told we cannot wait.

Parras clarified that no final decisions have been made and that Simply Voting has not been paid yet.

Tardi said that with all due respect to Duffy, the process was flawed, this was not a clean process; the process was not an appropriate process. There were two breaches of anonymity, plus the issue with the comments and the comments are an integral part of the process. This is why it was recommended that the evaluations be cancelled.

Ferris noted that the resolution is to cancel the process.

Parras said that he supports Steinhart and questioned why this invalidates the quantitative data.

Gazzillo Díaz reminded Parras of the breach that she found where she was able to go back to her receipt and retake the survey.

Kelly noted that she felt like this was “Groundhog Day” since this was discussed by the Committee and sent up to the Senate. She noted that while she does not know the standards in other disciplines, in her discipline, when there is bad/partial/destroyed data, the research is done.

Finnegan stated that he would like to begin a new process as soon as it is feasible.
Parras said that it should begin as soon as it is feasible.

Weisburg supported Finnegan and said that if the data can be collected and continued as soon as possible then they need to continue and now is the time to make recommendations for continuation.

**Parras put the question and the Recommendation to Cancel the Administrative Evaluation Process passed with four abstentions.**

Parras said the Executive Committee would meet tomorrow and discuss how the Administrative Evaluation Process can move forward.

Tardi stated that she would like to discuss what Weisburg wanted to discuss since the Executive Committee is meeting tomorrow and then they could have the Senate’s recommendations.

Parras said that the Agenda is full and to contact him or anyone on the Executive Committee with recommendations.

Weisburg noted that this is on the Agenda right now.

Parras said it was just on the Agenda.

**VII. Old Business**

a. University Core Curriculum Council Resolution

**Motion that the UCC Council and Review Panels be extended through the 2012-2013 academic year was moved by Levitan and seconded by Andreopoulos.**

Kelly wanted to note how laborious these jobs are and that working on these panels should be recognized as such by promotion committees and by the administration.

Levitan said that she was asked to make an announcement. As they move into their second advisement process, an issue has come up that will not be instantly resolved. It is noted that “students must complete 18 credits to move forward into areas 4, 5, and 6” and will be done at a minimum during their second year. This is how it is programmed into Banner. Therefore, students are getting error messages when they are trying to register if they have not “completed” 18 credits. The way this is currently being handled is that permits are being given to students. This is a problem, it is being worked on, but it is being handled through permits at the current time.

Godar noted that for students who are not under the new curriculum, who are under the old GE, the UCC is on their advisement sheet too so they are being misadvised.

Parras noted that he would pass this on.

b. Undergraduate Council:

Criminology and Criminal Justice Minor

Dobrick announced that this is a new minor to go along with the major.

**Dobrick motioned to pass the Criminology and Criminal Justice Minor and Levitan seconded.**

Parras put the question and it passed unanimously.

c. Marketing & Public Relations Presentation

Link to Presentation [http://www.wpunj.edu/dotAsset/367141.pdf](http://www.wpunj.edu/dotAsset/367141.pdf)
Goldstein discussed how the goals in the Marketing and Public Relations Department are widespread, and are to build visibility and the reputation of the University. He stressed how word of mouth is key and went on to present his PowerPoint presentation. Goldstein stressed the importance of consistent and holistic messages about the Universities going out.

Weisberg thanked Goldstein for his presentation and for including faculty and a Senate representative on his Administrative team.

Quicke discussed how impressed he was about the process of hiring the new marketing firm.

Kelly thanked Goldstein for his presentation and then noted that her only concern was that the previous firm did focus groups on campus and she hopes the new marketing firm will do this too. She added that while she thought that the old firm did a clever job, and we really “moved forward”, we are “not really there yet.”

Goldstein agreed with Kelly and noted that before, we did not have integrated marketing, so we have moved forward with that. This new firm will look at what we have done. He agreed with Kelly about the campus aspect and noted that Forge, the new firm, will do testing on the campus itself and will be viable on the campus.

Parras said that the Senate could always write to Quicke with concerns, as he is our Senate representative to the Marketing and Public Relations Administrative Committee.

Andreopoulos noted that she is in favor of enhancing visibility and then asked if there is a concise sentence that can be systematically repeated to describe our identity. She noted that we need to find an identity and asked if one has been found yet for the University.

Goldstein explained that there is an “elevator speech” in which we are described as a place rich in possibilities, we put student success first; providing a supportive and challenging environment that encourages students to push themselves, gain confidence and come away with the knowledge that remarkable things are within their reach and this is on WP Connect. He noted that this is a core that we have built on. Furthermore, we have graphics now too. When we add this all together there is more of a whole, and add to that we have more social media, a virtual tour, and it all comes together including a slide show on our home page.

Tardi thanked Goldstein but then noted in terms of goals for the Marketing and Public Relations department, there is only one dashboard indicator category. She then asked if this new marketing firm was asked to develop Dashboard Indicators.

Goldstein explained that they would develop a strategy just for our University. They will then develop unique Dashboard Indicators based on this Strategy just for us and they will be updated regularly.

Tardi then asked about the appropriateness of the budget for marketing. She noted that 56% is spent on undergraduate and 44% is spent on graduate yet this does not reflect enrollment in these categories.

Goldstein said that they did not look at it in this way. He said that graduate marketing needed to be supported and it had not been part of our paid campaign and graduate studies needed increased exposure. Then he said Forge would be spoken to about this.

Kim spoke about how $3 million was spent on Lipmann Herne and wanted to know how this compared to what our sister institutions spend on marketing in terms of what we spent and what we received. He asked what did we get out of this $3 million?

Goldstein discussed how other institutions do not officially say what they spend but from what we “hear”, we spend less than our sister organizations and of that $3 million, $1.9 was for actual media and we are in an expensive media market.

Gardner pointed out that we had an order of the day.
VIII. Governance Council: Emeritus Nominations

249 a. Louis R. Gaydosh

250 Malu moved to award Emeritus Status, with all the rights and perquisites thereunto pertaining to Louis R. Gaydosh and Levitan seconded. Parras put the question and the motion passed.

251 Malu moved to award Emeritus Status, with all the rights and perquisites thereunto pertaining to Eleanor Goldstein and Rosar seconded.

252 Tardi discussed how Goldstein was a dear colleague who is dearly missed, one who stood up for faculty and staff.

253 Fengya noted that Goldstein was a true mentor and she did beyond what the resolutions says and she misses her as well.

254 Parras put the question and the motion passed.

255 Duffy moved to award Emeritus Status, with all the rights and perquisites thereunto pertaining to James H. Mahon and Tardi seconded.

256 Tardi discussed how Mahon was a wonderful colleague and was a Sociology of Religion expert. Ellis noted that he worked with students very well, was a great mentor and it was an honor to know him.

257 Parras put the question and the motion passed.

258 Duffy moved to award Emeritus Status, with all the rights and perquisites thereunto pertaining to Richard Pardi and Sebetich seconded.

259 Sebetich spoke about how Pardi taught in both Biology and Environmental Science and how the two Departments both wrote the Resolution and endorsed it due to Pardi’s contributions in both departments.

260 Swanson noted that Pardi was an environmental scientist in the “early days” and he wanted to emphasize “science” and fostered the interdisciplinary nature of it. She stressed that the department would not be in existence today if it was not for him.

261 Parras put the question and the motion passed.

262 ADJOURNMENT: The Faculty Senate adjourned at 1:53. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 24th at 12:30pm in Valley Road.

263 Respectfully submitted: K. McNeal
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