William Paterson University - FACULTY SENATE MINUTES - February 14, 2023 FACULTY SENATE WEB PAGE http://www.wpunj.edu/senate

PRESENT: Andreopoulos, Christensen, Crick, Diamond, Duffy, Elleithy, Gazzillo-Diaz, Gill, Gerst, Gladfelter, Griffiths, Hack, Helldobler, D. Hill, Hong, Kaur, Kernan, Kollia, Lockhart (for Orr), Marshall, Martinez, Nassiripour, Natrajan, Nemeth, Newman, Nocella, Onaivi, Powers, Pozzi (for Alford), Robelledo, Rosar, Simon, Snyder, Steinhart, Tardi, VanderGast, Vega, Verdicchio, Wallace, Watad, Williams, Wright, Yoo

ABSENT: Shannon<br>GUESTS: Andrew, Astarita, Baron, Barrows, Bartle, Berg, Bliss, Boucher, Brenensen, Brillante, Brito, Broome, G Brown, L. Brown, Cammarata, Cedeno, Chauhan, Chavez, Corso, Davis, De Vega, Diaz, Fanning, Ferguson, Fowler-Calisto, Fuentes, Gerber, Gilzene, Ginsberg, Goldstein, Gordon, Gramiccioni, Grimes, Griswold, Guzman, Harris, Hayes, Hirshon, Jennings, Kashyap, Kearney, Levine, Lincoln, Lubeck, MacDonald, Malindretos, Marks, Mathew, McCann, McLaughlin-Vignier, Milanes, Miles, Mohamad, Morrissette, Najarian, Noonan, Ortiz, OwusuAnsah, Panayides, Pozzi, Puchalski, Reardon-Henry, Refsland, Ricupero, Ryblewski, Salvesen, Seuss, Sharma, Soto, Von Dohlen, Weaver, Weiland, Weiner, Zeleke, Zeman<br>N.B. If you were in attendance and your name does not appear above, please e-mail the Secretary directly (duffyb@wpunj.edu )

PROCEDURAL NOTES: The meeting was held, live, in Ballroom B/C, and everyone else could join via Teams. When someone viewing remotely wishes to speak $s /$ he should type SPEAK in the Chat box. Duffy will keep track of those desiring to speak and will recognize each in order. When recognized, the speaker will then unmute the microphone. Only the Chair's screen will be visible. The session will be recorded, but only the Secretary will have access to the recording. In order to avoid feedback, crosstalk and distortion, all virtual attendees must keep their microphones muted until they are recognized by the Chair and have the floor.

PRELIMINARIES: Chairperson Christensen called the meeting to order at $12: 34 \mathrm{pm}$ and presented the Land Acknowledgment.

She again thanked the anonymous donor for providing a full lunch.
Natrajan and Kaur moved acceptance of the Agenda, which was adopted unanimously.
Wallace and Andreopoulos moved acceptance of the Minutes of the January $23^{\text {rd }}$ meeting, which were approved unanimously.

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL: NEW PROGRAM: CERTIFICATE IN USER INTERFACE AND USER EXPERIENCE (UI/UX): Brown and Diamond moved approval of the Council's resolution. It was approved unanimously.

VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT: The Department of Communication Disorders needs an external member for its RTP Committee. Hong nominated (Duffy seconded) Kernan from Public Health, who was approved unanimously.

The Department of Public Health requests an external member to serve on its DAC. Hong (and Marshall) nominated Davi from Environmental Sciences, who was approved unanimously.

## CHAIR'S REPORT:

## Updates:

Course outlines: Departments are being given lists of courses that have not been taught in a few years and the plan is to delete what is no longer being taught from the system. Then, departments will be asked to update course outlines that are outdated. This is an important process and I've stressed to the administration that it should be department-driven, with departments making decisions about what needs updating most urgently.

Senate Representation update: We are still working out a potential compromise on the issue of Senate Representation. The President and I met this morning and are making progress working out the details. We should have both a By-Laws change (for the Diversity Council) and Constitutional Amendment (for at large positions) up for discussion and voting at the next meeting. We understand that the composition of the Senate is not a trivial issue. The Senate Executive Committee wants to ensure that any changes we propose will strengthen the Senate as the body representing faculty in the critical area of academic policy.

For background, I encourage you to read the document in the Senate Packet that was prepared by the 2019-2020 Senate Exec Committee. It summarizes issues of representation and the role of the Senate in shared governance and will be helpful going into our next meeting.

FACULTY MENTOR PLAN: Powers and L. Brown presented a PowerPoint [archived in the Packet of this meeting].

Powers began by discussing Career Clusters, an organizing structure that links what they're here doing to what's to come.

Brown continued the PowerPoint displaying the Dual Model, comparing Professional Advisors and Faculty Mentors.

Diamond asked what percentage of undergraduates change their majors. Duffy quoted old data: 3.4 times. Powers said that's the number of advisors they've had. It's 1.2 times at WPU. Powers also said that if a student changes majors, there would be a new mentor in the new major.

Onaivi asked about who will be issuing PINs. Christensen said the Professional Advisors would be discussing course planning. They will also handle all the routine administrative work (e.g., has student completed Alcohol 101, FASFA, etc.). The Faculty Mentor will acclimate the student to the discipline.

Weiland raised a number of issues involving Education majors. Who will handle field experience
paperwork, including creating resumes? Brown said that the student would work with the Mentor prior to their professional course work. Mentors would also assist with ADRs, recommendations to the chairs and permits, and guiding students in careers involving required examinations (like Education and Nursing).

Weiland noted that Education majors cannot start their coursework until they have completed 60 credits and have passed the PRAXIS Core. Brown replied that this new system will work well for Education majors since Faculty Mentors will be paired up with students at 30 credits.

Weiland said that transfer students wouldn't be able to complete in time. Brown said that it's 30 college credits, not 30 WPU credits.
[Other comments in the Chat that were not voiced during the Senate meeting are listed here so that Brown, Christensen, Powers or Helldobler may reply directly to the questioners.

Weiland: Knowing the complications of education, is difficult. It takes so much time and experience to understand. Will specific advisors be assigned to learn these complications? As we have more non-traditional teacher candidates (e.g., paraprofessionals who work full-time until 4 or 5) will the advisors be available at non-standard hours?

Ginsberg: If a first-year student ( $0-30$ credits) wants or needs faculty mentorship to proceed in the major, what will be the process of connecting students to faculty? Will chairs be the contact faculty for students until they reach 30 credits?

Andrew: Question of clarification: are students assigned to a faculty mentor if they have 30 credits OR a year of college or 30 credits AND a year of college?]

Snyder likes the career communities. Where would a student who has a major like biochemistry go? Can they join two communities? Powers said yes.

Hack stated that Sports Management has 113 students and only two faculty who specialize in that field. How would mentoring be handled? Brown said perhaps not by program, but by major. Since some programs have few majors it might be better to assign by major. Christensen agreed, but noted that there would be inequities. If a faculty member elects to take on more mentees, it would count as service.

Tardi is concerned about how the students will get to the Faculty Mentors since they don't go to the Advisors unless they must in order to get the PINs. Christensen discussed this with her students. They liked the idea but admitted they wouldn't go to the Faculty Mentor unless they were required to do it. Perhaps it could be a zero-credit requirement (like WP 101), and the student would have to meet with the Faculty Mentor twice, Fall and Spring, to pass the course.

Tardi asked: Is mentoring voluntary? Powers said that each department would have the ability to decide how a mentor would be assigned, and it could decide that not everyone would do it, so in that sense it's not required of everybody, but it might be necessary in some departments. Tardi said that it's either mandatory for everybody or voluntary and some faculty may choose to take
on more mentees, but there would be a gross inequity if you don't make this voluntary, Helldobler this must be discussed with the Union.

Helldobler said that it is also a process of socialization. Professional Advisors must be intentional in connecting students with the Faculty Mentors early on. Students are used to the high school system where the guidance counselor is typically not a faculty member. The Professional Advisors and the Faculty Mentors are part of the Success Team for each student. He thinks the idea of a zero-credit course deserves more exploration. Tardi recommended that the administration look at the Stockton model.

Watad asked about incentives for students to contact Faculty Mentors and what tangible benefits will the student get from the meeting? Brown said the zero credit might be an incentive, as would the opportunity to meet their peers or even pizza. Different majors might have incentives like permits for courses. This is the biggest challenge.

Lockhart wants to know how and when the Professional Advisors will be brought into the process. Powers said that Ortiz will do this. Christensen added that Will Power 101 and 102 will include discussions of mentoring.

Kaur said that may faculty in all disciplines already mentor students formally or informally. Why the imperative to systematize this plan? There is a sense of Big Brother watching you. Thirty mentees is daunting. How could one arrange a common mentoring meeting for 30 students?

Natrajan sees the need to distinguish between Professional Advisor, faculty advisor and now Faculty Mentor. Otherwise this will be just another mechanical add-on that will be more confusing and tiring or even tiresome. There should be a set of needs that students have. Maybe $10 \%$ of our students are well-informed, self-driven and motivated. The bulk in the middle have different kinds of needs. The remaining $10 \%$ have very special, specific and maybe even severe learning needs. With a variegated approach to mentoring, we can make it stand out. We need students telling their peers the story that mentoring is good. How do we produce those stories? Powers suggested that the Yearly Faculty Mentoring Goals in the PowerPoint could be framed as needs.

Andreopoulos noted that the documentation is very long. Is there a concise way to present it to the departments? What are the expectations of the Advisor? The Mentor? The student? What is the relationship between the mentor, who helps the student sharpen goals, and the advisor who helps choose the courses to achieve these goals? So far we've spoken of the division. It should be a collaboration. Helldobler said that Navigate will enable the Professional Advisor to identify the Faculty Mentor and direct the student there. Professional Advisors cannot substitute for faculty expertise. They should work together. Mentors can add to the Notes which the Advisor can see and use. The Professional Advisors are available year-round. We'll keep refining it as we go forward.

Gazzillo-Diaz foresees extra steps in some cases where faculty know how to do some of the advising parts of the process. If mentoring training is mandatory, it must be discussed with the Union.

Gill asked for an explanation of the shortcomings of the previous system. Why the authority to give the PIN being taken from faculty? Is this a one-year pilot program? Christensen said it will be rolled out with just sophomores, but will eventually be used for all students. Powers reiterated that students change majors often, which is not a recipe for developing a relationship. We do have some great faculty advising, but the Professional Advisors can strengthen the instrumental part of the work. We want to deploy the faculty in the ways they can best serve the students.

Helldobler stated that the major impetus for this change came from the students who repeatedly said they wanted a continuity of care. The want a point person they can go to between semesters and over the summer. That model doesn't fit faculty life. It does fit student life. We'll use Professional Advisors where it makes sense and use faculty expertise where it is absolutely critical.

Christensen asked senators to take this back to their departments for further discussion, and we will vote to move this forward at the next meeting.

DUAL ENROLLMENT: Noonan, McCann and Hayes presented a PowerPoint and took questions.

Simon noted that some schools have high school student in the same classes as the college students.

Diamond asked how can we increase the conversion rate (now 7\%)? Noonan said that a major effort will be undertaken next year.

Tardi asked for a table displaying where the $7 \%$ are coming from. Noonan will provide it.
Helldobler asked if students can use Tag before they enroll here. Noonan said the issue of students using their financial aid during high school has come up and is being done elsewhere in the county. It is worth looking into.

Crick asked what the biggest challenge to increasing the 7\%? Noonan said our biggest competitors have been doing it for years: Seton Hall started in 1977, and FDU started in 1983. Our successes come from our alumni referrals. The community colleges are also competing, and are charging only $\$ 60$ per credit.

COVID 19 TASK FORCE; PART TWO: Hong and Griswold displayed selected student enrollment slides from a massive PowerPoint presentation [archived in the Packet of this meeting].

ADJOURNMENT: Upon Tardi's motion, the meeting adjourned at 1:46pm.

The next meeting of the Faculty and Professional Staff will be on Tuesday, February $28^{\text {th }}$ at $12: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ in Ballroom B/C. Senators are asked to attend in person. The meeting will be streamed on Teams, and the link will be included in the Packet for that meeting.

Respectfully submitted, Bill Duffy.

