

University Senate Meeting

December 17th | 2:00 P.M. | SBUS 255

- Meeting Minutes: S. Sangregorio

Voting Members in Attendance:

A. Aidala, J. Alexandre, S. Baglieri, C. Baird, S. Bellum, J. Bilek, M. Chaifetz, S. Collins, C. Dilkes, D. Falloon-Blake, C. Flores, B. Garlick, S. Ghoshal, T. Gorman, C. Gunhouse, P. Haggerty, K. Handeli, E. Jacobson, R. Kunstadter, N. Kurzynowski, L. LeFever, F. Lauby, P. La Fountain, Y. Luo, S. McCarthy, S. Nicholas, I. Ren, C. Reinisch, J. Robinson, C. Rodriguez-Unalt, A. Rzepka, S. Sangregorio, L. Simeon, A. Spadaccini, W. Sullivan, A. Talamo, A. Toro-Carnevali, D. Trubatch

Voting Members Missing:

Y. Bai, H. Benton, D. Peterka-Benton, C. Challenger, D. Chong, W. Colucci, O. Gharehgozli, M. Kamenetskiy, L. Carr, S. Mamonov, R. Misra, S. Nowak, N. Panorkou, M. Smith

Meeting Minutes

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iDdPtBwMY7kerEh5Na1h5AbHVY270ryLdbhq8C-1bjo/edit?usp=drive_link

1. Call to Order

- **Call to Order:** 2:06 PM
- **Shannon Bellum** called the meeting to order.

2. Call for Quorum

- **Shannon Bellum** asked to confirm the quorum.
- **Sarah Sangregorio** confirmed that there was a quorum.

3. Land Acknowledgement Statement

- **Shannon Bellum** read the land acknowledgement statement.

4. Approval of Minutes

- The minutes from the November 19th meeting were moved for approval by **Sandra Collins**, with a second by **Kevin Handeli**. They were unanimously approved by acclamation.

5. Senate President's Updates

- **Shannon Bellum** reminded the group that unauthorized recordings are prohibited except for those requiring accommodation. The minutes of this meeting shall stand as the official record of University Senate proceedings.
 - Because quorum was hard to track at the last meeting, senators were asked to notify **Sarah Sangregorio** if they leave early (via Zoom message or a tap on the shoulder) to help maintain accurate quorum counts.
- **Shannon Bellum** reminded the group to follow orderly discussion procedures:
 - Use the hand-raise function on Zoom or in person.
 - One speaker at a time will be recognized.
 - Senators who have not yet spoken will be prioritized over those who already have.
 - Non-voting attendees will be recognized after voting members.
 - Comments on Senate actions should be held until the Voices of the Community section.
- **Shannon Bellum** stated that the agenda has been adjusted:
 - Voting and discussion items moved to the top.
 - A 2:30 PM stop is scheduled for an administrative presentation.
 - We are still refining the meeting template.

6. New Business

University Committees & Advisory Bodies Task Force

Introduction

- **Shannon Bellum** introduced a new agenda item and requested that materials be displayed on screen due to several items being finalized shortly before the meeting.
- Context & Rationale:
 - **Shannon Bellum** stated that the Executive Board developed this proposal following multiple conversations throughout the

- semester, including internal discussions and consultations with President Koppell.
 - The purpose is to create a more consistent and collaborative process for determining how peers are selected for various university committees.
 - Task Force Charge:
 - The proposed task force will be responsible for:
 - Compiling information and producing a comprehensive report on:
 - The formation, organization, and operations of all university-wide committees, councils, working groups, and task forces.
 - Clear definitions for the various types of bodies.
 - How these groups coordinate with the administration, union officials, and the University Senate.
 - Existing reporting structures.
 - Membership selection processes.
 - Effective practices currently in use by existing bodies.
 - Comparable practices at peer institutions.
 - General organizational and operational principles that support shared governance in the creation of new bodies.
 - Collecting additional information as needed, based on the expertise and discretion of the task force members.
 - Submitting the completed report to the University Senate for approval.
 - Forwarding the Senate-approved report to the University President.
 - Making formal recommendations to the Senate, if warranted.
 - Membership & Structure:
 - Membership will be determined according to University Senate democratic procedures.
 - No members have been identified yet; **Shannon Bellum** issued a call for interested participants.
 - **Shannon Bellum** noted that she anticipates a short-term timeline, with completion expected by May, and expressed willingness to lead the task force to ensure timely progress.

The University Senate establishes the University Committees and Advisory Bodies Task Force. Membership of the Task Force will be determined following the University Senate's democratic practices.

Purview

The University Committees and Advisory Bodies Task Force (UCAB) will gather information and create a report for the University Senate that pertains to the formation, organization, and operations of University-wide committees, councils, Working Groups, Task Forces, etc. The report and its findings will be provided to the University President upon completion and approval by the University Senate. In addition, if warranted, the Task Force will make recommendations to the University Senate.

Specifically, the Task Force will,

- A. Identify existing University committees, councils, Working Groups, Task Forces, including,
 - a. definitions of each type of group or body,
 - b. examining the arrangement for coordination among the different bodies, the Administration, Union officials, and the University Senate,
 - c. establishment of, and reporting structure for each,
 - d. membership selection processes.
- B. Examine the existing bodies' effective practices.
- C. Examine practices and processes at other Universities
- D. Propose organizational and operation general principles for the creation of new bodies that support shared governance practices.
- E. Gather other informational items as determined by the Task Force members.

The University Committees and Advisory Bodies Task Force will follow the practices of the University Senate, specifically,

- A. The committee is expected to consult with internal and external experts, not already serving on the committee.
- B. The committee may establish smaller working groups to focus tasks.
- C. Membership is open to University employees and students, and subject to approval by the University Senate.
- D. Members of the committee will select a Chairperson by majority vote, and subject to approval by the University Senate.

E. In the event of a contested Chairperson vote, the Senate Executive Board will decide the outcome

before the University Senate votes to approve the Chairperson.

F. If no member is willing to be Chairperson, an Officer or Council Chair of the University Senate

will serve as Chair.

G. Committee membership and Chairperson shall be renewed annually each September, or as needed.

H. There are no term limits for committee membership, or Chairperson.

Discussion of Task Force

- **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for discussion.
- **Adam Rzepka** asked for clarification regarding the urgency of establishing the University Committees and Advisory Bodies Task Force. He noted that the item appeared to have been added to the agenda at the last minute and described the framing as “get in, get out,” suggesting a need for rapid action. Senator Rzepka inquired whether, in the Chair’s recent discussions with President Koppell, any specific developments or emerging factors had prompted the immediate formation of the task force.
 - **Shannon Bellum** responded that the need for the task force was not driven by a single incident but rather by an ongoing, longstanding issue in how university committees are formed.
 - **Shannon Bellum** explained that, for many years, the Senate has often learned about new committees or working groups only after they were already created, requiring the Senate to “chase the train after it already left the station. While no one event triggered the urgency, recent situations—such as administrative restructuring and the formation of groups related to Generative AI—highlighted the recurring problem and reinforced the need for a more formalized, proactive process. She characterized the issue as both persistent and timely, making it appropriate to move forward quickly.
- **Adam Rzepka** asked for further clarification, stating: “So there are no particular trains that spurred this effort?”
 - **Shannon Bellum** replied that while no single incident initiated the effort, the most recent examples included the

ongoing university restructuring as well as matters related to Generative AI, both of which highlighted how often the Senate learns of committees only after they are already formed. She reiterated that these two situations were simply the latest in a long pattern.

- **Adam Rzepka** responded that he felt it was important to be transparent about any factors contributing to the urgency of the task force.
 - **Shannon Bellum** agreed, confirming that although restructuring and AI were the latest instances, the underlying issue is systemic and longstanding.
- **David Trubatch** provided additional context regarding the purpose and urgency of the proposed task force. He emphasized that the task force's role is strictly information-gathering and that it will not be making decisions or policy recommendations. He noted that the underlying need for this effort is both chronic and urgent, as the university currently lacks a centralized, unified record of all university-wide committees, councils, working groups, and task forces, as well as how these various bodies relate to one another.
 - **David Trubatch** explained that the absence of a system-level view has made it difficult to understand the overall landscape, and that dealing with issues on a case-by-case basis has highlighted the need for a more comprehensive and organized overview. He added that President Koppell, being relatively new to the institution, also requires this broader perspective, noting that the lack of written documentation makes it challenging for anyone—new or longstanding—to fully understand the existing structures. He clarified that this observation was not a criticism, but rather a reflection of the reality that “so little is written down.”
 - **David Trubatch** reiterated that the purpose of the task force is to ensure that the Senate and administration share a common set of accurate facts, rather than relying on fragmented or partial knowledge. Senator Trubatch likened the current situation to the metaphor of several people attempting to describe an elephant based only on the part they can touch, underscoring the need for a unified institutional understanding.
- **David Trubatch** sought clarification regarding the nature of the vote. He asked whether the Senate was voting to approve and

establish the task force itself, noting that the appointment of members would occur separately at a later date.

- **Shannon Bellum** confirmed this understanding, stating that the current vote was solely to formally establish the task force. She explained that the Senate would hold a second vote in January to approve the membership roster, once interested individuals had been identified.
- **Adam Rzepka** raised a procedural question concerning the establishment of the task force. He noted that, in past practice, when the Senate has created a new committee or task force, the initial membership list is typically included in the motion being voted on. He asked whether it was appropriate to proceed with a vote without identifying members in advance.
 - **Shannon Bellum** responded that, in this case, the Senate was voting solely to establish the task force, and that membership would be determined later. She confirmed that the roster is “TBD”, and clarified that at present there is technically one member identified—herself—as she intends to serve on and lead the task force. A separate vote to approve full membership will occur at the January meeting.
- **Motion:** Anastacia Spaddachini
- **Seconded:** Sandra Collins
- **Approved by unanimous consent**

Recommendation for Director’s Search Guidelines

Introduction

- **Shannon Bellum** introduced the next agenda item: the recommendation for Director Search Guidelines, presented for a first read. She explained that this proposal originated from the Administrative Affairs Council, chaired by Lauren Carr, who was unable to attend due to her participation in an agreement signing with Union Community College. As a result, **Shannon Bellum** presented the item on her behalf.
 - **Shannon Bellum** noted that a director-level search is either currently underway or about to begin, and that additional director searches may occur in the future. To support consistency and transparency, the Senate seeks to establish formal guidelines similar to those previously developed for Dean searches. She reminded the body that the Dean Search Guidelines, previously approved by the Senate, had

been well-received by former Provost Junius Gonzalez, who described them as a helpful and useful tool.

- In discussions with President Koppell and the Interim Provost, it became clear that the Dean Search Guidelines could not be directly applied to Director searches due to important structural and procedural differences. This led the Administrative Affairs Council to draft a set of Director-specific guidelines, which were now being brought forward for review.
- **Shannon Bellum** emphasized that the document is preliminary, and as a first read, it may evolve before the Senate votes on it at the next meeting. The guidelines were displayed onscreen, and Chair Bellum proceeded to read through the document in full to ensure all members had access to the content

Document Text

Recommendation Regarding Procedures and Guidelines for School-Director Searches

December 17, 2025 – drafted by Administrative Affairs for First Reading

The University Senate recommends that the University adopt and document common practices and guidelines for school-director searches in order to support consistency, transparency, and effective shared governance in the conduct of such searches.

The initial review, evaluation, and recommendation of applicants/candidates should be undertaken by a school-focused committee that provides independent recommendations to the relevant dean, for forwarding to the Provost. The steps of review and decision-making among administrators should be clearly specified to the University Community.

Moreover, the Senate recommends that the practices and guidelines for school-director searches reflect the following considerations.

1. Position Description Development

The faculty of the school for which the search is to be undertaken should have an opportunity to review and suggest changes, including amendments, additions, and/or excisions, to the position description to be used in the search, and in any appointment of a director that results. The school faculty may designate a

working group to lead and facilitate such review. The responsible administrator should provide a rationale for substantive changes proposed by the faculty, but not adopted in the position description to be used in the search.

2. Search Committee Composition

The Search Committee should be principally composed of faculty members whose principal appointment is in the school. Committee members external to the school should be selected with careful consideration for their expected contributions to the search process and should not compromise the independent nature of the committee.

3. Stakeholder Engagement

The search process should be designed to elicit broad-based, substantive participation by, and input from, members of the Faculty and Staff, as well as students, including in small-group meetings and open presentations by finalist candidates, with follow-up surveys of participants.

4. Inclusive Scheduling

Meetings with stakeholders and opportunities for stakeholder input should be scheduled at dates and times, with sufficient advance notice and time to reply so as to maximally facilitate meaningful participation. Particular attention should be given to the accommodation of the school faculty and staff.

5. Transparency and Communication

The search committee should provide timely updates to the Faculty and Staff in the school regarding the progress of the search and expected timelines for further key steps. Once the recommendations of the search committee have been forwarded to the University Administration, the relevant principal administrators should similarly provide such updates in a timely manner.

6. Procedures in the Case of a Failed Search

If a search does not result in a hire, the primary reasons (e.g., insufficient applicant pool, candidate withdrawal, other institutional factors) should be reported to the University Community, and the committee should have an opportunity to provide input on measures to improve the prospects for future searches.

This recommendation is not intended to supersede the legal and regulatory requirements of recruitment and searches, nor University policies promulgated pursuant to such requirements.

Rationale

School directors are the principal administrators for their respective schools and, as such, play a prominent role in school operations. By necessity, school directors work closely and collaboratively with the members of the Faculty and Staff, supporting the Faculty and Staff in their efforts to realize the mission of their school, and the University as a whole. Hence, alignment between the director and the Faculty and Staff within the school is a central factor in the successful operation of the relevant school.

Search committees serve an advisory role by screening and recommending qualified candidates. Participation of faculty and staff from the school ensures that those with the most profound understanding of the area's specific needs, challenges, and goals have input in selecting a principal administrator who can effectively support the school. An inclusive approach promotes collaboration, and trust between the administration, faculty, and staff.

A clear, structured process that consistently engages key stakeholders will support effective decision-making as well as alignment between administrators and the front-line members of the Faculty and Staff within academic units.

Discussion on Guidelines

- Following the presentation of the draft Director Search Guidelines, **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for discussion. No senators or attendees voiced questions, concerns, or suggested revisions during this portion of the meeting.
 - **Shannon Bellum** reminded members that, as this was a **first read**, the document is expected to undergo refinement. She encouraged senators to review the guidelines carefully and to submit any feedback directly to **Lauren Carr**, Chair of the Administrative Affairs Council, or to any member of the Executive Board. She noted that all comments received would be incorporated into the revised draft to be brought forward for a **second read and vote at the next meeting**.

- As no further discussion was requested, **Shannon Bellum** proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. Continuing Business

Academic Calendar and Scheduling Committee

- **Shannon Bellum** provided an update regarding the Academic Calendar and Scheduling Committee. She reminded the Senate that at the previous meeting, the body had solicited additional members—particularly faculty representatives. As a result of that call, the number of faculty members on the committee has now increased to three, and the number of schedulers has expanded from two to four, which she described as encouraging progress.
 - **Shannon Bellum** noted that this agenda item served primarily as a formality, allowing the Senate to view the full list of 13 committee members, which was displayed onscreen and also linked in the meeting chat for reference. She further clarified that although the committee’s co-chairs had been established prior to the November meeting, their names had not been formally recorded at that time. Accordingly, she confirmed for the record that Laura Billings and Lisa Michalowicz are serving as the committee’s co-chairs.
 - Once the membership list was displayed, **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for discussion regarding the updated roster.

Discussion on Committee

- **Antonio Talamo** noted that while he appreciated the committee’s organization and progress, he remained concerned that Student Development and Campus Life continues to be underrepresented in calendar-related discussions. He emphasized that student affairs perspectives—particularly regarding student experience and engagement—are essential and should be incorporated more systematically. He also observed that no student representatives currently serve on the committee. Senator Talamo explained that although he raised this point during the committee’s first meeting, it did not appear that an invitation had been extended to his divisional leadership to add a representative. He encouraged the Senate to adopt more intentional processes to ensure Student Affairs involvement whenever student-impact issues such as the academic calendar are being reviewed.

- **Pascale LaFountain** echoed these concerns, recalling her prior service on an earlier iteration of the Academic Calendar Committee. She noted that several important decisions made during that cycle—such as considerations related to student mental health days, student attendance patterns on reading days, and the impact of Monday-as-Friday scheduling adjustments—were heavily informed by input from Student Development and Campus Life. She stressed that the absence of student affairs voices in the current membership could limit the committee’s ability to understand and address student needs effectively.
- **Laureen LaFever** highlighted a chat question that asked whether adjunct faculty were on the committee.
 - Shannon Bellum noted an adjunct had previously served but stepped off; the co-chairs prefer to keep the current group stable for this cycle.
- **Pascale LaFountain** asked which units/departments members represent and stressed the importance of Financial Aid involvement due to Financial Aid rules impacts on scheduling.
 - **Shannon Bellum** confirmed no Financial Aid representative is currently seated.
 - **Lisa Michalowicz** explained that the Registrar’s Office works closely with Financial Aid and will consult them during data collection.
- **David Trubatch** emphasized that the committee’s role centers on data gathering, not unit-by-unit representation, and that an external consultant will ensure comprehensive, organized stakeholder input.
- **Pascale LaFountain** asked a question about the timeline for committee updates and consultant involvement.
 - **Shannon Bellum** noted this would be covered in the committee’s scheduled report later in the meeting.
 - **Lisa Michalowicz**, leaving early, confirmed a plan and written report exist for distribution to Senators.
- The updated membership list was approved by unanimous consent with no objections.

Tuition Exchange Program (Second Read & Vote)

- **Shannon Bellum** introduced the second read of the Tuition Exchange Program recommendation and opened the floor for discussion. She noted that no changes had been made to the core recommendation since the first read.

- An addendum summarizing key takeaways from the University of Delaware’s tuition exchange model had been added to the rationale.
- **Alfredo Toro-Carnevali** attended on behalf of **Lauren Carr** and the Administrative Affairs Council to answer questions.
- No discussion followed.

Voting

- A motion to proceed to a vote was made (**Erik Jacobson**) and seconded (**Nikki Kurzynowski**).
- Voting was conducted by ballot, using a shared spreadsheet visible to members for tallying.
 - The vote was open, meaning the spreadsheet was displayed but individual votes were not tied to names.
 - Clarification was provided that “maybe” responses counted as abstentions.
- A question about the ballot link was addressed: senators were reminded it had been sent via email and would not be posted in the chat.
- With 29 responses in, the measure clearly passed by yeas over nays.
- **Shannon Bellum** allowed an additional 30 seconds for remaining voters.
- The vote was closed and the recommendation passed by a strong margin (not fully unanimous).

Results

- **Total Votes of Senators in Meeting at Time of Vote: 35**
- **Yes: 32**
- **No: 1**
- **Abstain: 2**

8. SGA Report

- No report

9. Report from the Administration

Zoom Phone (Joel Freire, Roger Salomon, Suresh Murugan)

Introduction

- Suresh Murugan, Deputy CIO, introduced the Zoom Phone update and thanked the Senate for the opportunity to present.
 - He explained the presentation would cover:
 - Project overview
 - Rollout timeline
 - Support and training resources for the transition
 - He noted time constraints and indicated the team would move directly into the presentation.
 - He introduced Joel Freire, Director of Voice Operations, as the primary presenter and stated that Q&A time would be provided if possible.

Project Rationale & Overview (Presented by Joel Freire)

- The existing campus phone system (Avaya) is reaching end-of-life, requiring replacement.
- Other solutions evaluated included Microsoft Teams, RingCentral, and updated Avaya options.
- Zoom Phone was selected for being the most cost-effective and fully integrated with the university's existing Zoom environment.
- Migration allows transition away from hardware-dependent phones toward cloud-based communication.

Rollout Timeline (Presented by Joel Freire)

- Migration begins January 7 and continues through the end of March.
- Departments will receive two weeks' notice before their scheduled migration.
- Testing has already begun with a pilot group in IT.
- Each department will have designated Project Champions to coordinate needs and ensure readiness.
- Optional Zoom Phone training sessions scheduled, including sessions on 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM the following day.

Key Features of Zoom Phone

- Zoom Phone appears as a new tab in the Zoom client.
- Enables calling from any device (desktop or mobile) using one's Montclair phone number.
- Calls can be seamlessly transferred between devices without callers knowing.
- Users may convert a phone call into a Zoom video meeting with a single click.
- Voicemail includes:
 - Transcription
 - Audio file delivered via email
- Call history and caller ID customization available.

- Existing phone numbers will remain unchanged.
- Emergency phones will also migrate to Zoom but remain fully functional.
- Legacy Avaya voicemail accessible until Q1 2026.

Support for Users

- Users who need a headset will receive a link to request one in their departmental migration email.
- Zoom Phone tutorials, quick-start guides, and FAQs available via QR code provided in the presentation.
- IT will provide support before, during, and after the migration.

Discussion

- **Marshal Chaifetz** asked what happens if Zoom is not running:
 - **Joel Freire:** Calls go to voicemail; users can set alternative routing rules.
- **Anastasia Spadaccini** asked about departmental shared lines:
 - **Joel Freire:** IT will review use cases; lines can be renamed or reconfigured.
- **Siobhan McCarthy** asked if Zoom Phone includes AI features:
 - **Joel Freire:** No AI tools will be enabled initially.
- **Courtney Reinisch** asked whether a Zoom number becomes a meeting room:
 - **Joel Freire:** Phone numbers remain separate from Zoom meeting IDs.
- **David Trubatch** raised workflow issues for shared phone lines:
 - **Joel Freire & Suresh Murugan:** Existing Avaya arrangements will be duplicated; champions will verify needs; call centers and delegated lines are supported.
- **Suresh Murugan** clarified the role of Zoom Champions:
 - Verify whether each department's current business requirements are still accurate.
 - Identify opportunities to improve workflows that were previously constrained by Avaya's limitations.
 - Confirm handling for special cases (e.g., shared lines, hallway phones)
 - 90/10 split: Approximately 90% of numbers will migrate through a simple, direct mapping; the remaining ~10% (special cases) require verification to determine whether to retain or adjust their legacy behavior.
- **David Trubatch** asked who would serve as Zoom Project Champions for academic departments and how those assignments were determined.
 - **Roger Salomon** responded that a list of champions is posted on the university website, representing every division and department. David Trubatch was informed that Andrew is the champion for his department.

- **David Trubatch** then noted that it was not always clear whether champions were assigned at the department level, and that communication about these assignments had been inconsistent.
- **Roger Salomon** described recent outreach efforts with the School of Business.
- **Suresh Murugan** clarified further how champions were selected by divisional and departmental leadership, who were asked to appoint appropriate representatives.
 - The champions list posted online reflects those official appointments.
 - Departments may add or change champions as needed. More champions can be included to ensure accurate understanding of business requirements.
- **David Trubatch** recommended improving communication to the campus at large:
 - He noted that widespread emails often become lost or unread.
 - He highlighted a systemic issue at Montclair where messages do not always reach front-line employees.
 - He suggested including in campus-wide emails:
 - A reminder that the champions list exists
 - Instructions on how individuals can identify their champion.
 - Emphasized the importance of preventing a “game of telephone” during a telephone-system migration.
- The team confirmed that champions represent both faculty and administrative units and that they have recently met with the Provost’s Academic Affairs Council (distinct from the Senate’s Administrative Affairs Council).
- **Jean-Wilner Alexandre** asked about adjunct access.
 - **Suresh Murugan** confirmed adjuncts with existing phone access will retain Zoom Phone access.
- **Pascale LaFountain** asked where to find the Project Champions list:
 - **Joel Friere** confirmed a link exists and will be added to the website.
- **Courtney Reinisch** asked how to request a headset.
 - **Joel Friere:** That information will be sent with the initial email letting you know that your department is going to be converted - the link to the headset will be there.
- **Anastasia Spadaccini** noted that they found an email from the Division of Information Technology sent on Monday regarding Zoom Phone that has the link to the Project Champions list before the listed information-session dates and offered to forward the link to anyone who needed it.
 - **Pascale LaFountain** added that the Champions list appears to be hosted as a Google Doc, which is why members could access it even though it was not yet posted on the website.

- **Joel Friere** acknowledged this and stated that their webmaster would update the website accordingly to ensure the list is publicly available.
- **Marshal Chaifetz** commented that although training sessions had already been offered, there had been little advance notice, and recommended that IT provide more lead time for sessions scheduled next semester.
 - He also asked about Duo/NetID outages.
 - **Joel Freire:** Users would rely on personal phones; emergency phones remain operational; ZPLS ensures emergency calling if the internet fails.

10. Continuing Business (Continued)

- **Shannon Bellum** transitioned the meeting back to the agenda item on Constitutional Amendments and noted that this meeting represented the second read, and no vote would occur today.
 - Senators were invited to review the amendments, ask questions of the Constitution Committee, and raise any issues or concerns.
- **Shannon Bellum** indicated the need to waive the 15-day requirement, as the amendments had been distributed on day 13, not day 15, per constitutional rules.
 - Requested approval by unanimous consent to proceed with the second read despite the shortened circulation period.
 - No objections were raised; the waiver was approved, allowing the read to continue.
- **Tim Gorman**, Constitution Committee Chair, acknowledged the delay and apologized for the timing issue. Tim summarized the amendments under review:
 - Two amendments were introduced at the prior meeting:
 - A change to the order of spring elections (election sequencing).
 - A revision to the apportionment of representatives (Senate composition).
 - Only the first amendment—the election sequence change—would receive its second read today.
 - The second amendment (apportionment) would receive its second read in the January meeting.
- **Tim Gorman** reiterated the rationale for the election sequencing amendment:
 - Historically, the Senate holds at-large elections first (typically in February), followed by constituency-specific elections (e.g.,

professional staff not in Dean-administered units, adjunct representation).

- This structure routinely leaves unfilled seats, requiring an additional fall at-large election to complete the roster.
- The proposed revision would streamline the process by holding constituency and non-at-large elections first, followed by at-large elections.
- All documents and revisions are available in the Senators shared drive.
 - No reread of the amendment text was requested.
- **Tim Gorman** confirmed that the amendment's third read and vote will take place at the January meeting.
- No further discussion was raised.
- **Shannon Bellum** noted that, due to **Tim Gorman's** upcoming sabbatical, the Senate will have another representative from the Constitution Committee step into the chair's role for the spring semester.
 - Senators were reminded that if they identify any needed changes or concerns during the second read of the amendment, they may contact any Constitution Committee member.
 - Committee members available for consultation include:
 - Shannon Bellum
 - Erik Jacobson
 - David Trubatch
 - Marshall Chaifetz
 - JW Alexandre
 - Senators were encouraged to reach out to any of these individuals with questions, issues, or suggested revisions related to the constitutional amendments currently under review.

11. NAAL Report

- **Catherine Baird** reported:
 - AFT Local 1904 announced that scholarship applications for 2026 are now open.
 - Scholarships available include: Becker, Keenan, Moore, Brooke, Uhia, Waller, the Of Nello Nun, and the Bloomfield College of Montclair State University awards.
 - Eligible students must be:
 - Full-time undergraduates in any major
 - Enrolled for Fall 2026

- Holding a minimum GPA of 2.75
 - Each award is \$500.
 - Applications require a letter of recommendation from a current AFT Local 1904 member.
 - Deadline: Friday, April 10 at 4:30 PM.
 - The union will re-announce the scholarships at a future meeting to ensure wide visibility.
- The next AFT membership meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 21 at 2:00 PM on Zoom.
- In closing, the Local extended holiday wishes, offering hopes for a peaceful and restful remainder of the year to all members, their families, and their communities.

12. Adjunct Union Report

- **Mary Wallace** offered a brief final remark, wishing everyone “Happy holidays and enjoy the rest.”
 - She added humorously that no one should contact her during the break.

13. Council and Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Council

- **David Trubatch** shared a link to the report, noting the document had not yet been added to the official Senate Drive but would be uploaded soon. He noted the following key items:
 - **Curriculum Development / UCC**
 - The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) will meet on December 22 to finalize its proposed committee charge.
 - The finalized charge will serve as advisory to the Academic Affairs Council.
 - **David Trubatch** noted that this work reflects the broader conversation about improving structure and clarity around university-wide committees, aligning with the Task Force discussion.
 - **Academic Policy Committee**

- Although not a university-wide body (it is a Provost's Office committee), the Academic Affairs Council has a designated representative: Adam Rzepka.
 - The committee is working to make the policy review, development, and approval process more streamlined, transparent, and better organized.
 - David Trubatch indicated these improvements are ongoing and expected to strengthen over time.
- **Center for Teaching and Academic Innovation (CTAI)**
 - The university has reorganized teaching-related professional development, moving these functions out of the Office of Faculty Excellence and into the new Center for Teaching and Academic Innovation (CTAI).
 - CTAI is under Vice Provost Jessica Murphy.
 - A new director has been hired and will meet with the Academic Affairs Council in the spring; once ready, they will address the full Senate.
- No questions were raised following the report,

14. Foundation Report

- **David Trubatch:**
 - **David Trubatch** serves as the Senate's representative to the University Foundation. He attended recent events, including:
 - A celebration for Shea Scruggs, the new director of the Cali School of Music.
 - An annual donor celebration.
 - These events provided opportunities to share a faculty perspective with donors and alumni.
 - **David Trubatch** observed that President Koppell addressed the CHSS restructuring at both events, delivering consistent messaging similar to what he shared with the Senate and the Board of Trustees. He noted that the restructuring is clearly an issue of broad institutional visibility and concern.

Senate-Led Giving Initiative

- David is seeking senators interested in developing a Senate-focused philanthropic initiative.
- He clarified that donating to the Foundation means supporting university programs, not giving money to one's employer.

- He encouraged senators to help identify specific programs or areas that could become funding priorities.
- The Goal: finalize an initiative in time for One Day for Montclair (Spring).
- He invited interested senators to contact him directly; emphasized that others' ideas are just as valuable as his own.

15. Council and Committee Reports, Continued

Student Affairs Council

- **Pascale LaFountain** had filed a written report and did not require time on the floor.

Discussion

- **Shannon Bellum** opened the floor for questions.
- **Adam Rzepka** asked about student representation, noting the Senate traditionally includes one voting undergraduate representative, and one non-voting graduate representative.
 - **Adam Rzepka** expressed concern that the graduate seat appeared vacant and asked what steps were being taken to fill it.
- **Shannon Bellum** clarified:
 - Layla Simeon is the voting undergraduate representative and was present on Zoom.
 - The non-voting graduate representative seat is currently unfilled.
 - **Shannon Bellum** has been in ongoing communication with the Graduate Council, but they have not yet identified a candidate.
 - Attempts were also made earlier with **Stephanie Brachfeld** when she was in her role.
 - A brief surge of activity occurred, but no candidate emerged.
 - **Pascale LaFountain** added that Layla Simeon has been instrumental behind the scenes in shaping Student Affairs Council work, particularly bringing issues from the SGA. She emphasized that Layla's contributions extend beyond her visibility in full Senate meetings.
 - **Antonio Talamo** suggested a potential pool of graduate candidates, recommending outreach to the Higher Education program, which has strong students who would benefit from Senate participation. He noted that Anna oversees that program and could help identify individuals.

- **Shannon Bellum** acknowledged the suggestion but noted that, per the Senate Constitution, the Graduate Council is formally responsible for appointing the graduate representative. Therefore, outreach must proceed through them.
- **Anastasia Spadaccini** mentioned she believes a faculty member in her department serves on the Graduate Council and could inquire further. She also clarified she serves as a non-voting graduate council member herself.
- **Adam Rzepka** added that the Constitution also allows for the position to be elected (presumably through student governance) rather than only appointed, and requested that student representative information be made clearly visible on the Senate website. He explained it had been difficult to confirm whether the seats were filled based on the current webpage.
- **Shannon Bellum** and **Christina Dilkes** clarified:
 - Layla Simeon is listed on the Senate webpage as the undergraduate voting representative.
 - The page also lists the graduate representative position as vacant.
 - **Adam Rzepka** acknowledged he must have been viewing a different version of the page.
- With no further questions, the discussion concluded.

Administrative Affairs Committee

- **Alfredo Toro-Carnevale** on behalf of **Lauren Carr**

Tuition Exchange Program

- Already reviewed earlier in the meeting; recommendation was considered and adopted.

Workday Student Update

- An updated timeline for Workday Student has been posted in the University Senate folder.
- **Delavar Basha** was expected to provide a verbal update but was not present in the room or on Zoom at the time of the report.

Generative AI Committee Report

- The committee's written report is included in the Administrative Affairs Council materials.
- **Yi Luo** reported that:
 - The committee held its final meeting of the semester—the first time all members were able to attend simultaneously.

- Discussion focused on AI-related risks and concerns across instruction, learning, and staff workflows, underscoring the need for a university-wide AI policy.
- Updates from the University AI Working Group include progress across five subcommittees:
 - Website & Database Development: Creating a website to house AI information, enhancing transparency and enabling community feedback.
 - Curriculum Intervention and AI Fluency/Competency Development: Working jointly to draft a framework outlining AI literacy, competency, and fluency expectations.
 - AI Opportunities Subcommittee: Finalizing processes for prioritizing AI initiatives, evaluating requests, and establishing an AI governance structure.
 - AI Policy Subcommittee: Developing institution-wide AI policy aligned with the Senate's GenAI efforts.
- Once the draft frameworks are ready, **Yi Luo** will share them with the entire Senate.

Academic Calendar & Scheduling Committee

- The committee's written report is included in the Administrative Affairs Council Report.
- Neither **Lisa Michalowicz** nor **Lora Billings** was present to provide a verbal summary.

Safety Committee

- **Marshal Chaifetz** informed the Senate that emergency response procedures differ between the Montclair and Bloomfield campuses.
 - On the Montclair campus, individuals should call the MSU Police emergency number: 973-655-5222.
 - Montclair State University Police are the primary responders. Local police serve as backup.
 - On the Bloomfield campus, individuals must call 911 rather than the MSU number. Bloomfield Police respond first.
 - Montclair State Police provide backup assistance.
- **Marshall Chaifetz** emphasized that community members who travel between campuses should be aware that physical location determines the correct emergency procedure.

Elections Committee

- **Christina Dilkes** reviewed the coalition representative election, including the timeline and procedures required for selecting Montclair’s representative to the NJ MADC.
- **Shannon Bellum** explained that the committee will wait for the statewide coalition to finalize its own structure, roles, and expectations before creating election parameters or a timeline locally.
- Elections will proceed once the coalition defines representative responsibilities, ensuring Senate procedures align with the coalition’s formal organization.
- The Elections Committee will meet next semester to discuss:
 - Potential implementation of ranked-choice voting, and
 - Necessary adjustments due to college restructuring, as the recent academic reorganization may affect seat distribution and election categories.
- Additional procedural refinements will be developed once the committee has full clarity on coalition expectations and internal election logistics.

Discussion

- **Shannon Bellum** asked for questions.
- **Adam Rzepka** raised concerns about the election of Montclair’s representative to the New Jersey MADC coalition.
 - Noted that the Senate’s resolution to join the coalition explicitly calls for an elected representative.
 - Pointed out that the coalition is holding a January conference at which each participating Senate will send a representative to help draft the coalition’s constitution.
 - Expressed concern that Montclair will not be represented by an elected delegate at this foundational meeting.
 - Asked why the Senate could not simply hold the election at the January Senate meeting to comply with the resolution.
- **Shannon Bellum** responded, noting that both she and Erik Jacobson attended the multi-institution coalition meeting where the issue was addressed.
 - Explained that the coalition has not yet defined the role, responsibilities, or number of representatives each Senate will appoint.
 - Stated that Montclair cannot run an election for a position without clarity on what the elected representative would be expected to do.
 - She does not want to elect someone into a role described as “a black hole,” where neither duties nor scope are known.
- **Shannon Bellum** further clarified:

- The coalition has asked that Senate leadership from all institutions—including Montclair’s nine Executive Board members—attend the January summit.
- Those leaders will help shape the representative structure and define expectations.
- Once the coalition finalizes the role and representation model, the Senate will run an election with accurate parameters.
- Elections may include one or more representatives, depending on what the coalition ultimately decides.
- At present, there is no urgency to elect someone prematurely, since the coalition itself has not finalized its constitution or governance framework.
- The Elections Committee (Christina and team) has been instructed to hold until more information is available.
- **Shannon Bellum** committed to continuing to update the Senate as coalition details emerge and confirmed that elections will move forward as soon as the role is clearly defined.

Just and Sustainable Practices Committee

- Erik Jacobson reported that the Committee for Justice & Sustainable Practices (JSP) has begun work on two Senate recommendations related to AI:
 - Environmental impacts of AI (e.g., energy and water usage associated with digital tools and large models).
 - Ethical considerations, including the risk that large language models (LLMs) are trained on biased data.
- The committee aims to bring both recommendations for first read in January or February.
- In recognition of Earth Month (April), the committee is planning two major events:
 - Climate Anxiety Event – intended as an interdisciplinary gathering for the campus community to explore emotional and psychological responses to the climate crisis.
 - Waste & Community Impact Panel – focusing on the idea that “there is no away” for trash (a phrase shared by Ben Kelsner).
 - The panel will include local activists who work on issues related to waste disposal and environmental justice, exploring where campus waste goes and whom it affects.
 - This coincides with the university’s planned trash audit in April.
 - The university’s current waste-disposal contract expires in December of next year.
 - The RFP (Request for Proposals) for the next contract is being drafted.

- The committee hopes to gather Senate and committee input to help shape the new RFP, especially around sustainability and community impact.
- Committee members and senators interested in contributing to any of these initiatives were invited to contact Erik Jacobson.

Discussion

- **Yi Luo** noted that the university is developing an AI policy that will address energy costs and the environmental impact of AI use.
 - She suggested holding a joint meeting between the university's AI policy group and the Justice & Sustainable Practices Committee, since both groups are working on overlapping policy concerns.
 - **Erik Jacobson** responded positively.
 - **Yi Luo** confirmed they would reach out to Erik and **Ashwin Vaidya** to arrange coordination.
 - **Erik Jacobson** thanked them and agreed to move forward with the joint effort.

Constitution Committee

- **Tim Gorman** reminded the Senate that he will be on sabbatical during the spring semester. **Erik Jacobson** will serve as the new Chair of the Constitution Committee for the spring.
- Senators were asked to direct any questions, considerations, or concerns regarding constitutional matters to Erik Jacobson during Tim's absence.
- No questions

16. Caucus Reports

Latinx Caucus

- No report

Asian American Caucus

- No report

African American Caucus

- No report

Disability Caucus

- No report

17. Voices of the Community

- **Bill Sullivan** reported receiving an email from a colleague expressing fear and uncertainty regarding what to do in the event of an active shooter, especially in light of the recent incident at Brown University. He asked that the administration address this concern and provide clearer guidance.
- **Shannon Bellum** asked whether the individual was a student or employee; **Bill** clarified it was a colleague who observed student-teacher activity, otherwise they would have raised it personally.
- **Marshal Chaifetz** responded on behalf of the Safety Committee, noting:
 - The university already offers active shooter response trainings, typically known as “Avoid, Deny, Defend” or “Run, Hide, Fight”, under the national CRASE (Civilian Response to Active Shooter Events) model.
 - Trainings are generally offered upon departmental request; when offered broadly without a specific request, attendance tends to be low.
 - The most recent Safety Committee meeting occurred before the Brown incident, so this topic will likely be elevated in the next meeting.
 - Protocols do exist, but visibility depends on whether individuals choose to attend the available training sessions.
- **Vice President Dawn Meza Soufleris** added:
 - The administration is closely monitoring events at Brown University and other institutions affected by gun violence.
 - Chief of Police and Emergency Manager **Michelle Kyte** are continually reviewing and updating university safety protocols.
 - An updated campus-wide safety message will be sent at the start of next semester, including guidance on what to do in an emergency.
 - **Michelle Kight** has developed a concise, updated training program that can be delivered to:
 - Departments
 - Divisions
 - Offices

- Community members are encouraged to:
 - Review newly updated online safety resources
 - Invite Michelle Kyte and Chief Fox to department meetings for in-person briefings and Q&A.
- **Shannon Bellum** thanked VP Soufleris and confirmed that Bill could share this information back with his colleague.
- **Adam Rzepka** asked for a follow-up regarding his earlier question about the student representative listings on the Senate website. He indicated he had seen Layla listed as a non-voting representative online.
 - **Shannon Bellum** clarified that this was an error and noted that Layla Simeon is the voting undergraduate representative.
 - She had already asked Christina Dilkes to correct the listing.
 - The mislabeling was attributed to minor WordPress confusion during website updates.
 - **Christina Dilkes** confirmed the update would be implemented promptly.

18. Meeting Adjournment

- **Call to Adjourn: 3:40 PM**
 - **Erik Jacobson**, Motion to Adjourn
 - **Anastasia Spadaccini**, Seconded
 - **Shannon Bellum**: Adjourned by Acclamation