WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY – **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES** – November 10, 2009

WEB PAGE: http://www.wpunj.edu/senate -- EMAIL DISCUSSION: facultysenate@list.wpunj.edu

PRESENT: Andreopoulos, Bhat, Callanan (for Becker), Cho, Chung, Davis, Diamond, Duffy, Ekmekjian, Ellis, Finnegan, Gardner, Godar, Healy, Kim, Knaus, Ku, Lawrence, Levitan, Liu (for Thiuri), Louie (for Donaghy), Mbogoni, Martinez, Martus, McCallum, Mulrine, Nickerson (SGA), Parras, Pavese, Pinkston, Pollak, Potacco, Refsland, Rehberg, Falk-Romaine, Rosar, Scala, Schwartz, Steinhart, Stroppel, Suess, Tardi, Verdicchio, Walsh, Weil

ABSENT: Mongillo

GUESTS: Alaya, Basu, Bolyai, Daniel-Robinson, Fanning, Goldstein, Hahn, Jemmott, Mason, Miller, Olaye, Peterman, Rabbitt, Schaeffer, Seal, Silgailis, Tiernan, Torres-Santos, Trelisky

PRELIMINARIES: Chairperson Godar called the meeting to order at 12:34 PM. The proposed agenda was moved and seconded by Duffy and Martus and unanimously approved. The minutes of the October 27, 2009 meeting were also moved and seconded by Duffy and Martus and unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT: Godar said that the Department of Secondary and Middle School Education has requested that Professors Houser and Catarina be added to their Promotions Committee. Duffy moved and Knaus seconded approval, and this passed unanimously. SGA representative Nickerson encouraged the faculty to attend SGA Academic Affairs Committee meetings and that the University could do a better job of promoting academic resources to the university community. Godar reported on the recent luncheon meeting between the Executive Committee and the three new members of the Board of Trustees. She said that an interesting dialog was begun. She said that among other topics discussed was the upcoming administrator evaluations and that the new BOT members welcomed this information.

VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT: Martinez reported that council vacancies remain: professional staff on Elections, librarian on Assessment, and six adjuncts for various councils.

DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GENERAL EDUCATION: The General Education Council presented a draft implementation plan for the revised General Education Program. Potacco asked about which area or mechanism in the new GE would ensure that courses include and maintain a technology-intensive focus. Levitan said that the GE Council meets soon to consider such details and will report back to the Senate. She said that technology literacy is not the purview of one course but is meant to be suffused throughout the GE curriculum. Finnegan asked why the review panels are needed and said that he considers them an unnecessary extra bureaucratic layer and would severely slow the course approval process. Malanga replied that the panels are a one-time process for establishing the array of approved GE courses and that subject expertise beyond that of the GE Council is needed to ensure that the courses contain the right content. Finnegan moved to amend the implementation plan, removing the review panels. Knaus seconded. There was extended discussion on the function and composition of the panels. Martus asked if the traditional course approval process was being circumvented by this plan and Godar said that it was not and that University Policy 7 is being followed. Upon a vote the motion to amend failed. Davis asked that page 2, item 1 of Review Panels be amended, replacing the word "may" in the last line with "shall." This was accepted. Gardner asked about when the constitution of the review panels will occur. Levitan said that the GE Council will take up this question at their next meeting. Davis asked that on page 3, Goal 3 item d the parenthetical phrase referring to a pilot FYI course be stricken. This was approved. Davis asked that on page 2, 2nd paragraph, the phrase "unique to each model" and any reference to multiple models be deleted. Martus voiced discomfort with the number of review panels being left vague. Godar said that individuals will volunteer to serve on the panels and that the Executive Committee will compose a slate of panels and bring it to the Senate floor for approval. She said that nominations will be solicited at the time of approval. She said that the Executive Committee will follow their customary practice of seeking a mix of large and small department representation and junior and senior faculty. Refsland asked if professional staff will be included and Malanga said that professional staff and adjunct faculty are important participants on the panels. McCallum suggested that faculty be given an extra credit when teaching writing intensive courses and Godar suggested that he take this up with his department's AFT representative. Steinhart called the question, which passed with four nays. A closed ballot was requested. There was a call for explanation of what we were voting on and there was a motion to reconsider, which passed. McCallum moved to separate the question, to consider the GE proposal and the implementation plan separately. There was discussion and the question was called and this passed. The vote to split the question passed with one nay.

CONSIDERATION OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL: Godar explained that at the last Senate meeting the GE Council requested the Senate to choose which GE proposal would go forward and the Senate chose the Alternative Model, which is now on the floor for discussion and a vote. Ekmekjian asked that financial literacy be incorporated in the program. Rehberg asked that financial well-being be separated from physical well-being. Parras moved to amend Area 5 to incorporate ethics into Community and Civic Knowledge, and this motion failed for lack of a second. Davis voiced concern about the amendment process, saying it should be more deliberate and less haphazard. Duffy said that the GE Plan is now on the floor as a regular Senate proposal and is subject to amendments from the membership. Steinhart said that there is confusion among some who believed that the vote at the last meeting in favor of the "Alternative Model" was a vote to actually approve the model. He said that we need to move forward and that the Senate, in voting for the Alternative Model, in effect, approved it. He called the question, seconded by Finnegan, and this was approved. An electronic ballot was taken and the vote was 36 yes (86%), 6 no (14%), and one abstention, approving the GE Proposal.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GE IMPLMENTATION PLAN: Levitan said that the GE Council cannot review new courses until they have been approved via the regular course approval process. Finnegan moved to postpone a vote on the implementation plan until the next meeting and Martus seconded this. Davis said that more consideration and discussion of implementation is needed, and the motion passed. Davis asked about the role of the Director of General Education and this person's relationship with the program. Weil said that now that a program has been approved it is right to discuss the appointment of a new director and that he will initiate the process of selecting this individual. Diamond asked about implementation and course approval and will the panels amend proposals or send them back to the departments. Godar said that the course approval process will follow the policies already in place under University Policy 7. Falk-Romaine asked about the role of First Year Inquiry and Malanga said that connections between GE and FYI promote faculty buy-in to both programs. Levitan said that the review panels are not in place after 2012. Trelisky said that scheduling for Fall 2011 begins in about one year and that courses need to be in place for about 1500 students. McCallum recalled the course approval process when the current GE program was created and that there was little controversy or revision needed.

ADJOURNMENT: The Faculty Senate adjourned at 1:40 PM. The next meeting will be at 12:30 PM on Tuesday, November 24th in University Commons Ballroom A.

Respectfully submitted: K. Wagner, Secretary

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