

PRESENT: Andreopoulos, Aktan, Barrow, Bernstein, Bhat, Boroznoff, Cruz Paul, D'Haem, Diamond, Dinan, Duffy, Ellis, Falk-Romaine, Ferris, Finnegan, Gardner, Gazzillo Diaz, Godar, Healy, Kearney, Kim, Levitan, McNeal, Nyamwange, Parras, Pavese, Perez, Quicke, Rosar, Scala, Schwartz, Sheffield, Snyder, Steinhart, Swanson, Tardi, Verdicchio, Wagner, Walsh, Weil, Weisberg, Wicke, Wong

ABSENT: Chung, Kelly, Lindsey, Ndjatou

GUESTS: Alon, Basu, Becker, Berness, Boylai, Burns, Chabayta, Ciliberti, Cohen, Daniel-Robinson, Davis, Fallace, Felson, Ferguson, Furst, Gritsch, Hahn, Jemmott, Kashyap, Lawrence, Liutaud, Maher, Makarec, Maratouk, Matthew, Mohlman, Nauta, Nemeroff, Olaye, Rabbitt, Refsland, Rosengart, Sabogal, Sherman, Tiernan, Trelisky, Vilhauer

The Senate was called to order at 12:38 PM.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Adoption of the agenda was moved by Godar, seconded by Pavese and adopted. Dobrick motioned to amend the agenda because the sociology proposal was requested to be removed by the College Curriculum Committee of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Motion to amend the agenda passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Draft Minutes of the April 10th meeting were moved to be accepted Perez, seconded by Tardi and approved.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A Memorandum on the Needs of the LGBTQA Students of William Paterson University was passed out and summarized by a William Paterson University student from CHOSEN: The Gender and Sexuality Alliance in order to ask for a statement of support from the Faculty Senate. The memo stressed that as William Paterson University's only lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and ally (LGBTQA) organization on campus, the responsibility falls on CHOSEN: The Gender and Sexuality Alliance to speak for those whose voices often go unheard. The student stressed that while the University had a history of supporting its LGBTQA students, thanks to the efforts of the Women's Center and a select few individuals; there are needs that are not being addressed. The needs were justified, at length in the memo, and then the memo asked for the University to fund a fulltime staff member whose sole responsibility is providing LGBTQA support and services; whose office would provide privacy and anonymity. The memo also asked for funding for University sponsored LGBTQA events as well as a LGBTQA student lounge. The memo further went onto ask for a housing option that would accommodate the needs of LGBT—especially transgender—students as well as a University-wide effort to incorporate LGBTQA material into classrooms. Further efforts for creating an accepting and safe campus were also asked for.

IV. CHAIR'S REPORT:

Parras announced that the Executive Committee was meeting with the Provost and President on the upcoming Thursday. He also noted that transportation to commencement is now being provided from the campus and an email about this just went out from Martone. Parras then went onto thank Goldstein for his presentation at the last meeting noting that "marketing is usually the paint that usually comes after the house is built so now we expect the marketing committee to be thinking ahead."

43 Kim then gave handouts and noted the following points in reference to Goldstein's presentation: Facts and
44 Comments on Marketing Campaign by Lipman Hearne:

- 45 1. In June of 2007, L-H was hired by WPU to improve our image, brand name, and reputation.
- 46 2. November 2007, L-H produced a comprehensive report (brand assessment research).
- 47 3. The report says that:
 - 48 a. WPU is a backup school (p.2).
 - 49 b. WPU is a safety school (p. 219)
 - 50 c. WPU is an invisible institution (p. 229).
 - 51 d. Quote says, "If I don't get in, I will just go to Willie P...."(p. 229).
- 52 4. Ramapo College is hard to get in (p. 219).
- 53 5. Ramapo College is recruiting the top 20% high school graduates (show US World Report).
- 54 6. Ramapo is College is recognized as one of the best public college in the northeastern states.

55 Kim then asked these questions: Five years later and after WPU spent \$3.2 million dollars for the marketing
56 campaign, how has this impacted our brand name, image, and reputation? What indicators were used to
57 measure our visibility, brand name, and reputation? If L-H was successful, then why are we changing? Why
58 was enrollment flat during this marketing campaign (graduate enrollment went down and undergraduate
59 enrollment did not go up in a statistically significant way). Marketing research shows that 90% of people in
60 the world who drink Coke because its image. I understand that building brand name is not easy and it takes a
61 long time. Five years is a long time. What is our "brand name"? Now it is time to move on. The main
62 lessons we have learned is that accountability is key and we must make sure that the tax payer's money is
63 spent wisely to improve our brand name, visibility, and reputation so that we can serve the students of NJ.
64 Parras said that he did not think this is possible during this meeting or this time in the semester but maybe we
65 can during the end of this meeting if there is time.

66 Verdicchio said that Parras mentioned at the last Senate meeting that there would be an assessment of the
67 Advisement Plan. He noted that we are at the point in the new advisement plan where students should be
68 transitioning from the advisement center into departments for advisement and he asked how the advisement
69 program has been working and if we can get some information on this.

70 Parras noted that there would probably not be time but may be at the end of this meeting.

71 Bhat noted after hearing Kim's comments that the marketing costs were \$3.2 million dollars and maybe the
72 administration should get information from departments about the best use of marketing money in the future.

73 Quicke said that he believed that this is going to happen in the future and that input will be taken seriously and
74 the only way to do this is to meet with faculty, departments, and students and that marketing cannot be generic.

75 Scala acknowledged the ongoing work that Kim has been doing with regard to the marketing of the University
76 and noted that this is an important issue. She said we had L-H but what has improved? She hopes that we will
77 see real change and appreciated that Kim keeps this on the table as the issues and questions he raised are really
78 important

79 V. VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT:

80 Falk Romaine noted that spots for open Senate Council seats are continuing to be filled and that the aim is
81 to have them filled by the end of May. She noted that at this point, the slots are only four short for full-time
82 faculty and staff and seven for adjunct faculty.

83 Parras said that while there will still be gaps, he hopes to get the Senate Councils are approved at the May
84 3rd meeting.

85 Scala asked if there is payment for adjuncts who sit on these Councils?

86 Falk Romaine noted no, it is purely voluntary.

87 Perras then went onto thank the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils for working swiftly these past few
88 weeks.

89 **VI. Graduate Programs Council**

90 **Lawrence moved to approve the Doctoral Program in Clinical and Counseling Psychology and Dinan**
91 **seconded.**

92 Pavese referred to page four of the proposal, where it notes that students can fulfill adjunct roles. He said it
93 might be more correct that they can fulfill graduate assistant roles, not adjunct faculty roles and he was having
94 difficulty with this language.

95 Makarec noted that what is required is a masters degree to teach as an adjunct so that is correct, many of the
96 students in this program will be able to fill those roles.

97 Pavese noted that this is where he has difficulty, because it is their position in the program, not their expertise
98 that will grant them these positions.

99 Makarac said that no, it will be because of their expertise.

100 Pavese asked for some clarification in the wording.

101 Kim discussed that other institutions have this program and then asked why the students would come here and
102 noted the GRE scores for the program.

103 Makarac noted that only 9% who apply to other programs get in so there is tremendous demand and we will
104 have an emphasis on multiculturalism and wellness.

105 Kim noted that it is a 93-credit program and that is tremendous.

106 Makarac said that includes the masters and doctorate and it is competitive with Kean and Rutgers.

107 Verdicchio discussed how the proposal is laid out clearly. He noted that the rationale is excellent; the writer
108 demonstrates a strong case for the program in New Jersey and supports it. He then asks if they can transfer a
109 masters degree into this institution. He also noted that he wants to support the program and that he does not
110 have a problem with the adjunct piece as they will probably come with a masters degree and if we add these
111 students to our teaching faculty it will strengthen us.

112 Wagner commended this proposal but noted that there seems to be a historical trend to not request library
113 resources due to feeling that a budgetary request will lead programs to being turned down. Unfortunately, he
114 noted that the aftermath is usually having faculty to have students look other places so this should be front-
115 loaded into our requests so we have quality resources.

116 D'Haem noted that she believed that a doctoral degree in counseling was already passed by the Senate and she
117 asked if there could be both?

118 Makarac said that she believes that we can, that they are aware of this and that there is a different professional
119 identity between the two. That this program meets APA standards and that she does not see the conflict.

120 Diamond answered D'Haem's question by noting that there are different approaches in both fields and that
121 theirs is a clinical approach, they deal with persistence. He then went onto discuss that at national and state
122 levels the criteria is to have a degree in psychology for a private practice.

123 Finnegan returned to discussing the GRE scores and noted that they are in the bottom 50%. He asked why do
124 we have that low of a range.

125 Makarac noted that these would be the minimum acceptable scores but we would be seeking the best students.

126 Finnegan asked who sets these scores and if we have a minimum standard at the University.

127 Jemmott noted that the average is 450 for a masters degree and it is set by the Curriculum Committee for each
128 department but no, the University does not have a minimum.

129 Parras said that as the implementation goes forward, this is something to think about.

130 **Parras put the question and the motion passed.**

131 **VII. Undergraduate Council**

132 a. Minor in Business Administration

133 **Dobrick motioned to pass the Minor in Business Administration and Levitan seconded.**

134 Levitan discussed how there is a large student demand for this and how she supports this minor. She noted that
135 it works well for a number of majors including hers. She then asked if it was the presumption for the minor
136 that they will have taken macroeconomics as part of the UCC.

137 Gritsch noted that the microeconomics is required in the minor and we would like them to take
138 macroeconomics as part of their UCC courses.

139 Andreopoulos noted that for this minor, it is not only a question of students gaining knowledge and skills but
140 they can also take an internship so they can try and see how the market works; students will be able to combine
141 knowledge, skills, and practical knowledge.

142 **Parras put the question and the motion passed.**

143 b. Liberal Studies Program

144 **Dobrick motioned to pass the change in the Liberal Studies program and Levitan seconded.**

145 Dobrick discussed how the 3-credit internship changed to an experiential learning requirement to make it more
146 manageable for students.

147 Levitan asked a UCC related question. She wanted to know, for example, if students are student teaching,
148 does student teaching then count as experiential learning, civic engagement (UCC), and therefore triple count?
149 How many times can one course count and meet different objectives?

150 Steinhart noted that he did not see this particular issue with the Liberal Studies Program although he could see
151 it occurring anywhere. He did note that there did need to be a more general discussion about this topic and a
152 uniform policy as it is an important issue but it was not a particular issue with this program, it was a general
153 issue pertaining to the UCC and many programs.

154 Lawrence noted that in terms of student teaching, it is far more credits than the Liberal Studies Major would
155 have taken for their experiential learning course.

156 Ferris noted that as we tie experiential learning into courses in support of the strategic plan, we need to have a
157 central place or office for experiential learning and she supports this.

158 Verdicchio supports the Liberal Studies Program but is in agreement with Levitan that this is a “thorny issue”
159 so we need to refer this back to the UCC so we can move on.

160 Trelisky noted that all but one of the Experiential Learning Courses are 4000 level courses except one, which
161 is a sophomore level course.

162 Vilhauer noted that this was a matter of practicality in case the students could not take any of the other courses.

163 **Parras put the question and the program passed with one abstention.**

164 c. Women’s & Gender Studies: Social Justice Studies Minor

165 **Dobrick motioned to pass the Women’s & Gender Studies: Social Justice Studies Minor and Barrow**
166 **seconded.**

167 Sheffield noted that the College Curriculum Committee approved the correct proposal but a different one was
168 sent to the Undergraduate Council.

169 Steinhart asked what the problem was with the one in front of the Senate.

170 Parras noted that the second course does not exist yet; it has not passed through the Senate.

171 Ferris asked when it goes through, will it be required?

172 Sheffield answered no, it will be a UCC course, a directed elective.

173 Parras asked if there were any further questions.

174 **Levitan motioned to amend the second course to be a UCC Civic Engagement Course and Perez**
175 **Seconded.**

176 **Gardner Called the question and the amendment passed.**

177 **Parras put the question and the program passed.**

178 **VIII. Administrative Evaluations—Update**

179 Parras referred to his email on April 12th where he requested from the company a full refund. He noted that he
180 called Glen Jones and then called Simply Voting and then sent the Senate the email from Simply Voting. The
181 company takes responsibility for losing the comments. Jones looked at the email and said that we still have to
182 pay for everything else. Parras went onto say that Simply Voting losing the qualitative data was a “one time
183 thing” and that “it will not happen again” and that we now have time so we can test the system again. He
184 noted that Simply Voting is one we can afford; it is very cheap compared with what is out there. Parras noted,
185 in short, it gives us the best chance; we can test it, through September, get everything done and complete it by
186 September. He then went onto say that we can go to the Board of Trustees for more money to start over as
187 they acted unethically.

188 McNeal noted that yes, Parras noted that they did act unethically but then suggests still wanting to use them.
189 And as for money, McNeal noted that she contacted Campus Vote, who was used in the past, and they would
190 have charged \$1975 and have done summary data and that would have been cheaper than Simply Voting.
191 Furthermore, we cannot go back to Simply Voting because there was other problems that were not disclosed,
192 problems such as one of the Dean’s ratings made available to all people who logged on after the evaluation

193 period had ended. McNeal stressed that there were continuous problems with Simply Voting and they cannot
194 be used again.

195 Weisberg said that the evaluation process needs to start as soon as possible and that it is tempting to use this
196 company again because we will not have to pay again but we cannot afford to reuse it and have them make any
197 more mistakes.

198 Pavese noted that we would be “penny wise and pound foolish” in using this company again and we need to
199 protect the adjunct faculty and anonymity and cannot risk this by using them.

200 Andreopoulos wanted to know about the cost about redoing the evaluations and noted that we need to be fully
201 informed about everything before we approach the Board of Trustees for money.

202 **Parras put the question for the motion for the executive committee to ask the Board of Trustees for**
203 **funding for another set of administrative evaluations and the motion passed.**

204 **Barrow motioned to not use Simply Voting again and Pavese seconded.**

205 Quicke discussed how to him, this letter from Simply Voting is a letter that would get a grade of “D.” If this is
206 the best response we will get then we should look at other companies.

207 Snyder said that we should look into getting more money back and if we are negotiating with them we should
208 not say we are not going to go with them, as we may be able to get more money back.

209 Steinhart pointed out if the Board says that they will not give more money then there has to be a “plan B” so he
210 is not sure that we should be making a motion to not use this company.

211 Gazzillo said do not use this company. They had a conference call with the Ad Hoc Committee and our needs
212 were perfectly expressed, as were the concerns for anonymity and then this company charged us for removing
213 the receipts.

214 Parras noted that their definition of anonymity was different than ours.

215 Gazzillo said this was explained to them in-depth during the conference call.

216 Parras said yes but we made mistakes, we tested it.

217 Gazzillo Diaz said we had a \$750 credit for the comments.

218 Parras said yes, they took it off; it would have been \$2300.

219 Falk Romaine noted that she agrees with Steinhart that this motion should not be made until we are sure that
220 there is a company that can fulfill our requirements.

221 Tardi said that the Ad Hoc Committee was told that Campus Vote does fulfill our demands in terms of
222 anonymity but we were told that it was too much money but now McNeal has pointed out that she had
223 contacted them and they confirmed that they could do it for \$1975.

224 Parras pointed out that now times have changes and we will have to start from scratch and ask for more money
225 and if the Board says no then there will have to be a two year delay.

226 **Parras put the question and the motion to not use Simply Voting passed.**

227 Parras then said that the process should start again he will send out an email immediately.

228 **ADJOURNMENT:** The Faculty Senate adjourned at 1: 45. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held
229 on Thursday, May 3rd at 12:30pm in Ballroom C.

230 Respectfully submitted: K. McNeal

231 THIS AND OTHER SENATE DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ONLINE AT: www.wpunj.edu/senate