

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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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