

## University Senate Meeting

April 17th, 2019

In attendance: Abrams, Bal, Bellum, Billings, Brater, Carnevale, Carr, Collins, Connolly, Curnutt, Dinour, Robert Friedman, Roberta Friedman, Gaynor, Gingerich, Greenwood, Ronald Sharps for Gurskis, Hagiwara, Herness, Jacobson, Kelly, Kerrihard, Korotkin, Kurze, Misra, Murray, Nurse, Panorkou, Peterka-Benton, Specchio, Spitz, Strickland, Trubatch, Vernon, Wallace.

---

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Minutes of March 27th Meeting

Approved by unanimous consent.

4. Report from the Administration

a. **Gingerich:** 3 resolutions from last meeting: scheduling of final exams, religious observances, and second common hour. Scheduling for final exams is something we are already undertaking; we are going to try to see how it turns out. 15 week semester with no schedule for final exams at the end. There will be issues, but they are much less and easier resolved than the current exam schedules. The Registrar is in the process of preparing that schedule for Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Common hour: we need time and space for visitors and speaker. It's a great idea, but we are not sure where it will fit in. The obvious would be 3pm on Friday afternoons, but they will look into it. It will be difficult to figure out logistics. Sample text for religious observances have been provided for both instructor and students are under consideration and something similar we will move towards.

b. **Gingerich:** Progress on the strategic plan: The Committee on University Effectiveness (CUE) is steering the plan. They met for a well-attended half day event to comment on the plan. We are in the process of collecting feedback from the CUE and then will revise our draft as needed. We will post by April 26th to a Campus only Canvas community for review. Will schedule two open public discussions of the plan during the weeks of May 6th and 13th. Canvas input will be available until May 28th. Will review all comments in June, and then will have a draft for the President by June 28th. Board of Trustees meeting on July 17th. We should have a plan for them to review.

c. **Gingerich:** Degree program alterations to meet 120 credit updates.

**Cote-Bonano:** 23 Departments, 43 Programs needed revision, 32 were teacher education related. 6 were accreditation concerns and 5 were actually in compliance. We are reviewing everything for final approval and will share with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

**Abrams:** Are other institutions going through the same thing?

**Cote-Bonano:** Yes, but we made a conscious decision to comply with the new law. No one has asked for a waiver or exemption so far.

**Abrams:** Curious if other schools were worried about repercussions or if there was something to learn from them.

**Gingerich:** Some nursing programs submitted request for waivers and they were turned down, so we learned that they were not a shoe in like they used to be. Internally those accreditation requirements weren't as absolute as we first assumed. We haven't heard yet from other schools, but it will be a big topic over the summer.

**Trubatch:** Have changes to the teacher certification been fed back to Department?

**Cote-Bonano:** Yes, we shared all of that to make sure all programs are in line.

**Kurze:** I've heard from constituents that there were issues in Curriculum Committees with general education requirements.

**Cote-Bonano:** That was part of the memo from the Provost. It was allowed with thoughtful consideration.

**Trubatch:** Teacher certification will be changed, but which departments will do that? Officially it might be a co-major?

**Cote-Bonano:** Co-major is off the table. Department of secondary education did P12 and there is a continuous progress.

**Trubatch:** Did the suggestion of first round alterations come from them?

**Cote-Bonano:** Yes, just for the teacher sequence.

**Gingerich:** It was a department-specific process as much as possible.

**Greenwood:** Teacher ed policy committee as well.

- d. **Gingerich:** Gen ed review process, Daphne Galkin, Assistant Dean of Academic Programming in University College.

**Galkin:** Progress on the General Education program from Dean Hood, who wants to first thank all the Faculty involved in focus groups, to date 40 faculty have been involved. 5 more groups left, 1 for instructional specialists held tomorrow. Sign up via link in the email that was sent out last week or email Dr. Hood directly. All full-time faculty are encouraged to check the Canvas as new articles and readings are updated regularly.

**Trubatch:** Only faculty can see it?

**Gingerich:** Yes, only full-time faculty have access to that Canvas site.

**Misra:** What is the relationship between the new taskforce and the Gen Ed Committee?

**Gingerich:** The Gen Ed committee is suspended once all current work is finalized, and then the taskforce will take over. We haven't created the charge yet, we will see what happens in the focus groups.

**Trubatch:** Curriculum design will start where?

**Gingerich:** It will help us understand the expectations from internal community, what the external community saying, and then think about the re-design.

**Trubatch:** The task force will not be charged to redesign the curriculum?

**Gingerich:** They will make suggestions.

**Curnutt:** What kind of task force do you see making the changes?

**Gingerich:** We will be open minded. It's a big challenge and it will be a committee with faculty from across campus.

**Greenwood:** Why is Gen Ed separate from the UUCC?

**Gingerich:** What would the role of a subcommittee be in relation to the open conversation we have now?

**Greenwood:** That is a question we need to ask. There seems to be a disconnect between the UUCC and Gen Ed. It's about moving forward. UUCC is the umbrella and then a subcommittee.

**Gingerich:** We will look into it. Previously they didn't seem to be involved in these questions.

5. Report from the Senate Representative to the CUE

**Strickland:** Productive meeting, three pillars with a foundation and ceiling. The 2011 Strategic Plan notes "faculty" 21 times, and the current document has it 34 times so there is more faculty focused plans. When the document appears on the website please review it and give feedback.

6. Council Reports

- a. Academic Affairs

**Trubatch:** Draft recommendation for curriculum review guidelines. As we've seen through the 120 credit process, we hope these guidelines will help fill the gaps in our previous procedures. Academic Information Technology Committee working on a recommendation to develop open and affordable resources for courses, proposal in progress. We need student input, encourage them to tell the Student Government Association. EAB will replace Starfish.

**Galkin:** EAB Navigate will launch this fall with advisors and then faculty to follow. It will have more analytics about students.

b. Administrative Affairs

**Bellum:** Active business we have is recommendation in progress of early family leave, we received Facilities recommendation and Land Acknowledgement back for revision. Committee please review. Safety Committee report attached. Social Responsibility Committee recommendation is close to being completed.

c. Student Affairs

**Misra:** No report.

7. Elections Committee

No report.

8. Report from the NAL

**Curnutt:** Negotiations are ongoing right now/ They are going over proposals. News in relation is that Rutgers has a tentative deal they still need to ratify. They took a strike vote and the local supported them. Encourage you to be involved and supportive as possible.

**Wallace:** First Adjunct Negotiations on May 10th.

9. Committee of the Whole

a. Amendment on Nomination of the NAL- third reading and vote

**Trubatch:** Any discussion?

All in favor: 22, Opposed: 0, Abstain: 0

*Amendment passes.*

b. Recommendation on Policy regarding the Evaluation of Teaching- first reading

**Trubatch:** Result of the survey were very informative. There were over 300 that agree that the Senate should make this recommendation. One change to the recommendation was also to include all Instructional Staff. Are we ready to vote today after one reading? No objections. Move to pass as Senate recommendation today. Any discussion?

**Strickland:** Point of clarification. It's a formula for those of us who teach in labs that are caps with 20. Faculty should not be punished for that. I am in support of this recommendation.

**Greenwood:** This needs to be discussed as the Gen Ed revisions move forward. SSH's and their impact on faculty need to be worked out.

**Strickland:** This will also impact Graduate programs.

*Passed by unanimous consent.*

10. Report of the Senate President

**Trubatch:** The Gen Ed focus group I attended was just two people but we've heard that generally attendance has been pretty good. We as the Executive Board raised several questions. They are posted to the Canvas page, but also in your packet. Is this worth setting up for contribution from all senators?

**Kurze:** How would we do this?

**Trubatch:** Create a Google Doc, then the Executive Board would edit for coherence.

**Sumner:** I think it's shocking that you put these questions in the meeting. We have had several open forums for people to be engaged in the process. To take it apart into a set of questions undermines the process when it's been transparent.

**Trubatch:** These questions are already accessible on the Canvas site, so we did not think that would be undermining.

**Sumner:** It's not the same experience when you have people who are trained to facilitate the conversation. It cannot be reduced to an online discussion.

**Trubatch:** It was not intended to be disruptive, but I do believe online discussion is productive.

**Kurze:** When I participated in the focus group there were 10 participants in the group. It was not an issue that the questions were posted beforehand, but that people didn't do the readings. We need to get more people involved with constructive feedback with different strategies.

**Greenwood:** Is there a UCC meeting scheduled? One suggestion would be to make that meeting a focus group.

**Cote-Bonano:** David is being invited to that meeting for a similar purpose.

**Trubatch:** I want to emphasize that this was meant to be constructive and not undermine. We want more voices involved. Do we want to create some kind of statement from the Senate as a whole? I will make it available for further discussion next meeting. In addition the Senate Executive Board came up with a set of questions and concerns in relation the Gen Ed revision and the need for redesign. It is in your packet and available on Canvas.

**Trubatch:** Do we similarly want to have a Senate response to the draft of the Strategic Plan when the draft becomes available?

**Trubatch:** Senator Adams created a report on what happened at the Board of Trustees Meeting and is in your packet.

**Gingerich:** Board of Trustees meeting revealed there has been a large increase of theft, mostly computer equipment. Make sure your offices and labs are as secure as you can make them. Lock them in your desk or take them home.

**Greenwood:** It says there was theft from the construction site, external or in their trailers?

**Gingerich:** External, copper.

**Greenwood:** During Major Madness 550 students declared a major, is that a good number?

**Galkin:** Yes, we were very happy with that number.

**Gingerich:** It's not only the number of students, but the success of University College as a whole.

**Galkin:** A measure of success that I would like to see is that students make an informed decision with the major they select is the one they graduate in. Compared to last year, we have data we will be able to report but have some analysis left to do before sharing.

## 11. New Business

**Misra:** Student evaluation question. The date is well within exam week, but last year we were given a choice. Did that happen this semester?

**Sumner:** Last semester, there was one college that has strong feelings for shortening the dates because they didn't think it was appropriate for faculty to be assessed after final assessment as it would be biased. The Senate discussed it, and we went ahead and allowed departments to open and close their data. We found that departments who shortened it to two weeks lost a substantial amount of response. If they do that, you need to get the word out to students. Discussed this issue and challenges at the All Chairs Meeting last month. This semester we went back to a more consistent schedule.

**Greenwood:** A window of time doesn't necessarily have a correlation to response rate.

**Sumner:** I will show you the data with the move to shorten the window. You can look department by department.

**Greenwood:** There are so many other factors, but it sounds like a technical issue and lengthening the window may not resolve the issue of response rates.

**Kurze:** The bigger question is the response rate, but we should give students agency. They will report or they won't regardless of how we incentivize them.

**Brater:** I'm less concerned with punishments, but find them to be very useful for my personal development. I get more response in paper than online. Can we allow faculty to use the method that works best for them?

**Sumner:** The human hours involved in paper form analysis is massive. We have to be realistic.

**Abrams:** Can you prompt them to do the online in class?

**Sumner:** Absolutely.

**Korotkin:** On behalf of Adjuncts, these evaluations take on punitive actions, they can be terminated.

**Curnutt:** These are surveys, not evaluations. Taking these surveys in class in the environment is very different, and can we open and close when we want now?

**Sumner:** No, the amount of programming involved is too massive.

**Misra:** Are any of you tenure track and what is your feedback?

**Brater:** That is why I spoke up.

**Peterka-Benton:** I think anyone who is Tenure Track is concerned with that. I think it is also how you grade, if you post grades on Canvas throughout the semester there is no big surprise for students.

**Greenwood:** It sounds like you can explain why you may get negative evaluations during the DPAC conversations. I'm more concerned with low response rate and the impact of that. We need to figure out how to get the rate up and what does it actually measure.

**Kurze:** Again, what Hugh said, it is a survey not an evaluation. The way they craft their response can vary and there is a discrepancy that can be solved through a higher response rate and cannot be used to evaluate effectiveness.

**Murray:** In every other aspect of Canvas I can open and close, why can't we do that for this?

**Sumner:** It's integrated into Canvas but it doesn't actually live in Canvas.

**Brater:** As part of the Tenure Track Faculty members, my class can be a difficult one in Theater and I'm less concerned with negative feedback and much more concerned with low response rates. I want support for higher response rates.

**Hagiwara:** Who is responsible for getting response rates up?

**Roberta Friedman:** How critical are these in reappointments, tenure and promotion? Film students are working 24/7 at the end of the semester finishing their films and they just don't get around to filling out the evaluations.

**Greenwood:** Don't release their final grades until they complete their evaluations.

**Gingerich:** Yes, response rate is the challenge and we will have to have serious conversations about how to get them up. Ken described what did not work. There is a communication issue as well. What part belongs to whom? These are questionnaires and we know the limitations of students to judge but they have sat through many many teachers, even as freshman. They have a sense of what a good experience is and we can provide some credibility to their attitudes. There are a lot of ways of understanding and we go into reading and reviewing the answers with that in mind.

**Wallace:** I would like to know more about how Adjuncts can improve their teaching?

**Sumner:** It's broadcast through email all the time.

**Fleming:** Weekly email every Friday that comes from Instructional Design.

12. Voices from the Community

**Trubatch:** A student communicated with me that they would like more services from CAPS and have a statement of data that will then be referred to Student Affairs Council.

**Sumner:** CAPS act as a triage. Students arrive with many more issues than we can provide, but they have relationships with hospitals and other departments for them to receive help.

**Greenwood:** Students have sensitive issues, are we just referring students to Ram?

**Trubatch:** However they want to communicate will work.

**Murray:** They may not need to explain the situation but what they were seeking and did not receive.

**Greenwood:** I also have students who have issues with the DRC can I bring to Student Affairs as well?

**Trubatch:** Yes.

13. Adjournment

Adjourned at 4:39pm.