

1 William Paterson University – FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – September 22, 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, D. Hill,
6 Jurado, Kaur, Kearney, Kecojevic, Kollia, B. Marshall, Martus, Monroe, Mwaura,
7 Natrajan, O'Donnell, Owusu, Powers, Rebe, Rosar, Sabogal, Schwartz, Silva, Simon, Snyder,
8 Steinhart, Tardi, Vega, Verdicchio, Vishio (for MacDonald), Wallace, Watad, Weisberg,
9 Williams, Shekari

10
11 **ABSENT:** Janos, Swanson, Tosh

12
13 **GUESTS:** Andrew, Bolyai, Boucher, Bowrin, Broome, Choi, Davis, DeLoatch, Devenza,
14 Diaz, Fanning, Francera, Galetz, Gelfer, Ginsberg, Goldstein, Griffin, Hertzog, S. Hill,
15 Jackson, Jones, Kalaramadam, Kashyap, Lincoln, Liautaud, Lubeck, I. Marshall, Martin,
16 Matthew, McMahan, McNeal, Mongillo, Moore, Nassiripour, Newman, Owusu-Ansah,
17 Potacco, Pozzi, Rabbitt, Refsland, Ricupero, Rosenberg, Scardena, Schneider,
18 Sharma, Tiernan, Vasquez, Weiland, Wilson, Zeman, Zeleke

19
20 **PRELIMINARIES:** Chairperson Natrajan called the online meeting to order at 12:32pm. Kaur
21 and D. Hill. Hill moved acceptance of the Agenda which was approved unanimously. Crick
22 and Kaur moved acceptance of the Draft Minutes of the September 8th meeting,
23 which were also approved unanimously.

24
25 Natrajan announced that Cindy Simon will serve as the new Parliamentarian for the coming
26 academic year. He thanked Marks for his service in the role.

27
28 **PROCEDURAL NOTE:** Natrajan reminded everyone that all senators microphones should be
29 muted. When one wishes to speak s/he should type SPEAK in the Chat box. Duffy and Ricupero
30 will keep track of those desiring to speak and the Secretary will recognize each in order.
31 When recognized, the speaker will then unmute the microphone. Only the Chair's screen will be
32 visible. The session will be recorded but only the Secretary will have access to the recording.

33
34 **VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT:** Wallace and Kaur moved acceptance of the UCC Review Panel
35 rosters, which were approved unanimously.

36
37 Wallace and D. Hill's nomination of Gian Jeremy Brink Gihane, Jeremie-Brink to the
38 Advisement and Registration Council as the representative of the College of Humanities and
39 Social Sciences was also approved unanimously. Fanny Lauby was nominated by Wallace and
40 Steinhart to be the HSS representative to the Governance Council; the nomination was approved
41 unanimously.

42
43 **GRADUATE PROGRAMS COUNCIL: TEACHER LEADER CERTIFICATE**

44 **PROGRAM:** Choi and Crick moved acceptance of the Council's resolution. Ellis asked what is
45 meant by a group interview. Mongillo replied that such an interview is a requirement for all
46 students seeking admission to the College of Education's graduate programs. How the candidates

47 act in a group setting and how they react to a variety of scenarios are among the factors
48 considered. The Teacher Leader Certificate was approved unanimously.

49 **CHAIR'S REPORT:**

50 **MURLI PLEASE INSERT CHAIR'S REPORT**

51

52

53 **CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF THE RETENTION, TENURE AND**
54 **PROMOTION DOCUMENT:**

55

56 **MURLI: PLEASE INISERT YOUR INTRODUCTORY TEXT HERE – AND ARCHIVE**
57 **YOUR SLIDES.**

58

59 **I am picking it up after I read the Exec Comm's statement when the individual members of**
60 **the RTP Committee spoke:**

61

62

63 **Statement of the Senate Executive Committee:**

64

65 Considerable time has been invested, as part of a faculty driven process both online and in
66 person, for the careful consideration and shaping of the current RTP Document. This process has
67 been ongoing for years.

68

69 It is imperative that Senate discussion of the RTP Document be concluded by October 13th
70 for appropriate mentoring and evaluation of new hires and pre-tenure faculty to take place in a
71 timely manner. In this way everyone will be able to understand and meet the requirements of the
72 new rubric.

73

74 Engaging in endless wordsmithing with detailed parsing of individual phrases will halt progress,
75 impede open faculty engagement, and put a strangle hold on the Senate's work. The
76 Senate should take a broad-brush approach to discussing the major theoretical
77 principles that undergird the Document, and quickly pass it on to the Colleges and the
78 departments. It must be in the Colleges and departments where the more detailed, specific and
79 practical work tailors this Document to meet department needs and be in accordance with
80 specific College mission standards and accreditation requirements.

81

82 We, therefore, respectfully ask the Senate to forward our final review and comments to the
83 President and Provost, expressing our general approval of the document's fundamentals, with the
84 full understanding that the details will be worked out by the individual departments and their
85 respective Colleges.

86

87 *****

88 Members of the RTP Committee made brief statements and addressed specific aspects of the
89 Document.

90

91 Crick recapped the history of the Committee over the past four years. He is happy to have
92 participated in a process wherein faculty can create and shape a formalized representation of who
93 and what we are, something we can tell students and future faculty. He focused on Creative
94 Expression and expressed satisfaction that multiple lenses can be employed by various
95 departments in evaluating their faculty. The RTP Document has a concrete and more inclusive
96 approach to reviewing creative research and scholarship, and provides a roadmap for those
97 engaged in non-traditional forms of scholarship. He sees no reason to delay sending the RTP
98 Document to the Colleges and departments.

99
100 Fuentes spoke on the issue of how the RTP Document begins to address issues of inclusivity and
101 equity, specifically to broaden and expand notions of research. A book, *Presumed Incompetence:
102 The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia* helped to focus the discussion.
103 Chapter 10 deals with lived experiences of faculty across the United States. “Existing academic
104 structure facilitate different realities and rules of the game for members of historically
105 underrepresented groups as compared to those of their white heterosexual colleagues.” “Women
106 of color are the canaries in the academic coal mine and warn us of the toxic nature of academic
107 workplaces for members of underrepresented groups.” The Provost urged us to embrace
108 expanded definitions of research, and to encourage and reward the kind of work that’s needed at
109 an institution such as ours. We asked how do we ensure that our existing structures serve our
110 students and faculty equitably? What are our educational imperatives and how do our protocols
111 reflective our priorities? The Document’s Preamble offers an expanded view of scholarship
112 based on a holistic view of excellence. The Boyer model offers a way to move from the previous
113 sole method of describing research products to embrace the full diversity of contributions needed
114 to meet WPU’s education imperatives. Unfunded grant writing, mentorship and contributions to
115 the community need to be considered. He ended by noting that Kuhn’s *Structure of Scientific
116 Revolutions* describes how difficult paradigm shifts are. We need one at WPU to meet the
117 educational needs we know exist on our campus.

118
119 Davis related the intensive work of consensus building on the Committee. Everyone’s voice was
120 heard. Teaching holds primacy of place in line with our mission, and the boundaries of
121 scholarship have expanded, but service must be front and center as well. She wished there were a
122 concrete document such as this when she was going through the tenure and promotion processes
123 years ago. The Document provides clarity regarding expectation for tenure, especially in
124 attracting, mentoring and tenuring new faculty members.

125
126 Powers stated that the RTP Document is intentionally designed to be general, so that greater
127 specificity can be engaged at the department and college level where it’s appropriate to those
128 disciplinary norms and standards. University, college and department policies and practices need
129 to align, so departments will need to review and perhaps revise their By-Laws. What are the
130 appropriate standards for tenure and promotion in our college and department? What forms of
131 evidence are appropriate for the three areas – teaching, research/creative expression/scholarship,
132 and service? What does an inclusive understanding of scholarship look like? Those things have
133 disciplinary meanings and norms. The discussion is expected to take place during the 2020-2021
134 academic year. The administration would engage with the Union to assure that anyone currently
135 in the pipeline for promotion who came when there were previous standards and expectations
136 will have a period to adjust to the new standards.

137 Natrajan next introduced representatives from the English Department (and posted the changes
138 that the Department suggested) and invited any other chairs to address the issues as well.

139

140 **MURLI: Please post Raje's document here.**

141

142 Kaur stated that the latest version of the RTP Document reflect many of their suggestions. The
143 still believe that colleagues going for promotion to full professor feel that standards have been
144 changed mid-stream and the goal posts have been moved. She views this as a pre-COVID
145 document, and the events of the past six months have imposed tremendous burdens on faculty
146 (e.g., teaching via several different modalities), making it extremely difficult to do research.
147 There is apprehension about the level of ART and Sabbatical support in the future. She also
148 noted that attention must be given to the differences between the humanities and the sciences and
149 the social sciences.

150

151 Jackson sent further suggestions to the Chair. **[MURLI: please add here or archive in the Packet]**

152

153 Tardi presented a detailed list of concerns she and Andreopoulos developed. They highlight
154 concerns Union members have since the Document will affect member's lives. If substantial
155 amendments are made, the Document should go back to the RTP Committee for revision before
156 going to the departments. She said that there are inconsistencies and points that need clarification
157 before the Document could be approved. (Marshall asked Tardi to stop her oral presentation to
158 allow others to speak. The complete Tardi-Andreopoulos list is included here.) Andreopoulos
159 echoed Tardi's comments and stressed the importance of the Document.

160 RTP Draft of Clarifications, Modifications, and Deletions

161 Submitted By: Susanna Tardi and Giuliana Andreopoulos

162 Lines 33-34 Explain meaning of "respect"; some senior faculty confuse this with deference

163 Line35 "mastery of the three criteria" --contradictory with later requirements provided for full
164 professor

165 Lines 46-47-Some colleges are more homogeneous in terms of departments, college, and dept.
166 norms?

167 Lines 91-92—Assessments by students and department chairs— (Contract violation—chairs
168 cannot assess faculty as members of the bargaining unit).

169 Line 94-96--If faculty contribute significantly to the honor and success of the student, this should
170 count as a component of teaching effectiveness.

171 Line 108—Eliminate the word scholar; it is redundant in the sentence

172 Lines 117—Add in relation to university support

- 173 Lines 151-152—Eliminate inspirational language; not relevant to policy
- 174 Lines 196-197—Tenure requires service to the department and/or the college or university (not
175 both)
- 176 Lines 197-198—Clarification of “good citizenship” as a requirement for tenure
- 177 Lines 202-204—Sentence needs modification—Change to: Any community service that
178 promotes the reputation of the University will be considered a component of the retention,
179 tenure, and promotion processing regarding service.
- 180 Lines 235—Requirement for terminal degree: change from no reappointment to the 4th year to
181 no reappointment in the 5th year
- 182 Lines 237—Criteria for assistant professor: Question “annual”
- 183 Lines 237-240--Tenure-track faculty hired at the assistant professor rank shall maintain
184 excellence in teaching , select the additional area in which they choose to excel (scholarship or
185 service), and must meet the criteria of continuous growth in the third area in order to be
186 reappointed and earn tenure. Judgment of faculty excellence must be in consideration of
187 available institutional resources.
- 188 Line 243—6 years of professional experience (in the field in which you are appointed?)—clarify
189 at the institution, in academia, industry, health, in a related field.
- 190 Line 246—college service—change preferable to if possible and eliminate chairing one or more
191 committees.
- 192 Line 253—again clarification of professional experience needed
- 193 Line254-256—eliminate as well as instructional leadership? Eliminate instructional leadership
194 and its definition. These are not required criteria for professor rank at reputable institutions.
- 195 Lines 257- 258—Question—Why are the criteria for promotion to full professor less stringent
196 than those for associate professor? This is a question of fairness and equity. Why must associate
197 professors excel in all three areas when the criteria for full only require excelling in two?
- 198 Lines 261-262—What happened to the international level for full professors?
- 199 Lines 262-263—What is meant by sustained contribution through leadership roles? The
200 University does not always provide for these opportunities. If you state you are excelling in
201 scholarship, is this reasonable to require sustained contribution through leadership roles?
- 202 Line 265—Clarify what types of professional activity count toward promotion to full professor.
- 203 *****

204

205 Aktan reiterated a point she made many times before: that the RTP Committee consider adding
206 (at the bottom of page 3 or the top of page 4) the scholarship of engagement – where theory and
207 research findings are applied in practice settings. The RTP Committee should add an additional
208 area that applies to practice disciplines.

209

210 Williams appreciated that the Document expands things not clarified before but said that in lines
211 91-92 the comments about assessments provided by students and department chairs is
212 problematic (even though it existed in previous policy).

213

214 Helldobler said it's important to give honor and voice to colleges and departments. Each
215 department may define citizenship or experience in different ways. He agrees with Tardi and
216 Natrajan that some people sit in positions for long periods, which doesn't give junior faculty the
217 opportunity to take office and begin to develop leadership opportunities. We should have a
218 conversation about rotation or term limits in service, but he doesn't think it such expansion
219 should be included in the RTP Document.

220

221 Verdicchio would like to see all the comments put into the Document and send it to the
222 departments where the work takes place in the University. That's where the stakeholders are.

223

224 Vishio was pleased that, as Crick mentioned earlier, the scholarship of interpretation and creation
225 is taken seriously in the Document and not just mentioned in a list of scholarship possibilities.

226

227 D. Hill took a holistic view and commented about efficacy. After the RTP Document passes, the
228 discussion of how the administration will continue to support faculty promotion.

229

230 Martus noted that he has served on the Promotion Committee many times. It will be difficult to
231 evaluate candidates if each department has a different definition of citizenship. That will be
232 problematic. He emphasized that this is a living document and he would like the Document to
233 explicitly say that it will be reviewed every five years.

234

235 Crick moved (B. Marshall seconded): That the RTP Document be forwarded to the
236 administration with the expectation that it will then be sent to the colleges and departments for
237 further development and guidelines.

238

239 Natrajan said that discussion of the motion will begin the discussion at the next Senate meeting.
240 He noted that all comments sent to him or other Committee members earlier had been shared
241 with the RTP Committee and have been reflected in the Document. He asked Aktan to forward
242 her previous e-mail to him, and apologized for the oversight. Her comments will be incorporated
243 in the Document. Anyone who more comments should send them to him (with the line numbers).
244 He, thus, announced the death of the RTP Committee.

245

246 The Faculty Senate adjourned at 1:51pm.

247

248 The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 13th at 12:30pm.

249

250 **It will be an ONLINE meeting.**

251

252 **Please “check in” as early as possible (ideally, before 12:30 so the secretaries can confirm**
253 **attendance).**

254

255 Respectfully Submitted: Bill Duffy, Secretary