1. **Call to Order at 2:40pm**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of February 2019 Minutes**
   Approved by unanimous consent

4. **Report from the Administration**
   Sumner: 3 main topics for today:
   a. **Strategic planning**
      Cote-Bonano: First draft will be available to CUE next week, meeting on April 8th. They will review first and then send out to the rest of the community. It will not be on the website yet, as it is public facing. Only the final copy will be available on the website. Canvas community for reading and feedback, as well as an email account. Two open forums in last week of April and first week of May. Provost and leadership will then pull all feedback together and final version will be up for approval by the Board of Trustees, hopefully summer 2019.
   b. **General Education**
      Hood: You should have received an email message from Mary Colon, inviting you to sign up and participate in focus groups on the topic of Gen Ed. There will be focus groups starting April 12th. Those focus groups are led by faculty and we invite your feedback and participation in the process. After groups are concluded, a summary will be written and a task force will do the work over the coming years.
      Alvares: Is there a Canvas or site for groups to upload documents? We are working on setting up a Canvas site that will hopefully be live tomorrow, we already have documents on the general landscape of gen ed nationally that we hope the focus groups will read.
      Misra: When do college and department discussions happen?
      Hood: We are talking about the broader issues right now and focus on student learning and experience. The focus groups are established from all locations and will have diverse groups.
      Misra: What’re you going to do to make sure each College is equally represented?
      Hood: I can’t control that or make people sign up.
      McDermid: 12 sessions means space for 120 faculty members. Will someone making a cursory check to make sure there is a good mix within each group.
Hood: We’ll have that list and we’ll monitor that.
Field: Were instructional or clinical specialists included?
Hood: Only full-time faculty, as they own the curriculum
McDermid: Can we collect thoughts from other groups and forward to your office?
Hood: Yes.
Greenwood: Focus groups are informal, adjuncts and specialists should be included
Sumner: Based on their contract, it would be improper.
Field: I think it’s important for people who are teaching a lot of classes to have a voice and contribute to this conversation.
Sumner: Curriculum is not part of Specialist duties and responsibilities.
Field: But in practice, Specialists are running programs, course coordinators and designing curriculum in many of the colleges. Specialists have something to offer to this discussion given the number of students they see in a given semester. It a conversation.
Trubatch: When we go from input to decision making is an important distinction.
Greenwood: To clarify- the focus group does not supplant curriculum, its minimal in its review.
Hood: We will go back and look at the process to think about how adjuncts and specialists might be heard
Alvares: How will it impact them as citizens, they are citizens before they are workers.
Wallace: I hope you do consider including adjuncts, as they work in many fields and bring an important perspective on what those fields need from students.
Hood: Definitely. Our plan is to do outreach to others, not just employers in terms of what MSU graduates should possess.
Trubatch: Collect information, education on concerns, then actual design- is that the goal of the taskforce? How will it be constituted?
Hood: That has not been determined at this time.
Trubatch: The phrasing on Curriculum Guide on website says, ““originates from the faculty”

All Chairs Meeting

Sumner: This past Friday we had our semester meeting with all department chairpersons. In recognition of the unique role that chairpersons play in curriculum development and staffing, we’ve invited them to a two hour-forum in April [April 15] to discuss the Gen Ed. A second Chairpersons forum later in April will address issues related to course scheduling, including year-long scheduling, and final exam scheduling. We are trying to work in a more participatory manner to address University-wide issues.
Greenwood: Not all Chairpersons are faculty. I’m not saying they shouldn’t participate, but to clarify.
Trubatch: Schools [Communications, Music] have directors but departments have chairpersons who are members of the Faculty. Unlike Chairpersons, School directors are not elected.
d. **120 Credit Limit for UG Programs**

**Cote-Bonano:** The limit is not new, for those of you who remember the big push from 128 to 120, this has now gone a step further because the State legislature now requires it by law, Statewide. We have to precisely explain in a narrative justification why any bachelors-degree programs go over 120 credits. When programs were submitted to the state to the Secretary of Higher Education in the Governor’s office, the programs were sent back because they were more than 120 credits. Everything needs to be in place by September, 2019. The Teacher-Education Program not easy to change as it comes from the Department of Education at the State level. We’ve done a lot of work and people have been creative and cooperative to make sure the programs will comply. During the month of June we have to program these into Banner so they are in the catalog for September 2019.

**Kurze:** It seems that everyone is complying but what if a department or program grapples with this, and through procedural measures cannot get it done, what are the consequences?

**Cote-Bonano:** They will take the program off the inventory which means it is not an official program. We ask the Chairs to work on the justification if they cannot meet the requirement.

**Sumner:** Other institutions that have submitted justifications for over 120 credits, are more often being denied.

**Trubatch:** Were the college/department curriculum committees and University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee notified of the expedited process?

**Cote-Bonano:** Yes, they were notified.

**Abrams:** I need to revise the curriculum in my program to comply, but as a member of the faculty I want to be clear, this is not a complete curriculum revision through full channels, in doing this revision it is not an endorsement of where we want things to remain forever.

**Cote-Bonano:** Curriculum development is an ongoing process and is a vital part of the institution.

**Specchio:** What about students who change their majors?

**Cote-Bonano:** We bring our credits to 120 credits, that doesn’t stop our students deciding to change, that lands then in advising so students don’t stay too long and lose their funding.

**Greenwood:** Curriculum currently in the pipeline, were those sent back?

**Cote-Bonano:** Yes.

**Trubatch:** Last week the Senate Executive board met with the President of the University and the Provost. We asked if programs could have General Education waived in order to meet the 120-credit limit. The answer was, “maybe.” Could a new course be created? “maybe.” No curriculum changes were specifically excluded.

**Cote-Bonano:** I do not recommend new courses at this point in time.
**Kurze:** The idea of cutting course from a program in order to comply with the 120-credit mandate is one thing, but to make it into a whole new thing would circumvent the usual curriculum review.

**Trubatch:** Any calculation that was done will change again when the General Education changes go through.

**McDermid:** Were any administrative steps skipped to expedite the process?

**Cote-Bonano:** The technical review was still reviewed, chairpersons and deans were involved.

**McDermid:** Comparing the usual process to the expedited one, how many have been skipped over?

**Cote-Bonano:** The chairs are the faculty, the deans as academic head of college, college curriculum committees were allowed but not required to also make a special meeting.

**Curnutt:** What if that body meets but doesn’t approve it

**Cote-Bonano:** The program needs revised in the future or we remove the program.

**Alvares:** Can we do temporary credit adjustments?

**Cote-Bonano:** No, but what change is in the 2019 catalog may not be the same in 2020 or 2021.

**Greenwood:** Does the state require fully developed course descriptions or just the list of credits.

**Cote-Bonano:** Courses that already exist.

**Greenwood:** Not enough to say we are in the works of designing this course to replace 6 credits.

**Cote-Bonano:** They did not give us that as an option.

5. **Council Reports**
   a. **Academic Affairs**

**McDermid:**
- Curriculum Procedures recommendation will be available on Canvas soon for feedback by entire Senate.
- Bill Vicenti from library gave good info on Open Educational Resources.
- Continuing to work on generating university wide learning goals for ug programs and looking at other institutions that use them.
- Provost Office looking to implement Leepfrog to manage course actions.

b. **Administrative Affairs**

**Bellum:**
- Land Acknowledgment Recommendation draft in Council
- Facilities Recommendation being being drafted
- Committee social responsibilities working on recommendation about single-use plastic

**Trubatch:** This committee could use student involvement

**Genise:** I have asked and will continue to.

c. **Student Affairs**

**Misra:** no report
6. **Elections Committee**

Nominations for constituency positions are open. If you’re not sure if your position ends I May, let me know - nominations close next Thursday.

7. **Report from NAL**

   **Curnutt:** new promotional video about importance of union. Statewide negotiations start this weekend. CWA negotiated a new contract. Their health insurance has changed and out of network is far more limited than before.

8. **Committee of the Whole**

   a. **Resolution on Advisory vote regarding a Senate Proposed Senate Recommendation on Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

      **Trubatch:** Directs senate to hold a vote of faculty to endorse a senate recommendation that the university ought to adopt the policy that SSH should not be included in teaching evaluation, especial tenure and promotion considerations. We will hold the vote since it is March, but can we have unanimous consent to agree to accept this at first reading today so we can hold the vote next meeting. Any objection to pass resolution without a second reading?

      Approved by unanimous consent.

      **Field:** Point of clarification- will this have any impact on specialists?

      **Trubatch:** The wording does not exclude specialists. The Senate could modify language of any Recommendation, as long we don’t say anything that is negotiable through Union.

      *Motion to not require a second reading passed by acclamation*

      *Resolution Passed by Acclamation*

   b. **Recommendation on Final Exam Scheduling- second reading**

      **Trubatch:** Is there enough of a consensus to pick a version to move forward with. Any particular questions for the Administration?

      **Carnevale:** Do we know what other universities do?

      **Murray:** Most do it as a universal schedule, no exam-specific schedule.

      **McDermid:** Universities that do a special exam go through similar struggles, I don’t know how well it works in terms of avoiding conflict. Requires a lot of effort.

      **Sumner:** There would be no conflicts if we go to the uniform schedule.

      **Kurze:** Last meeting the Administration said it is difficult to set a final-exam schedule early in the semester.

      **Abrams:** It’s understood that faculty will work it out if they need a longer period for exams.

      **Greenwood:** Separate the scheduling from where the exam is or if it should be given.

      **Korotkin:** Speaking for the more than 1000 adjuncts on campus, the single schedule would be beneficial for them.

      *24 approve, 1 opposed, 1 abstention*

      *Approved to put forth as recommendation to the Administration*
c. **Recommendation on Religious Observance - second reading**

   **Trubatch:** Change from first reading is addition of the third paragraph.
   **Nurse:** Have we been in touch with the Center for Faith and Spirituality?
   **Trubatch:** No.

   Recommendation approved by acclamation

---

d. **Recommendation on Common Periods - second reading**

   **Alvares:** How will this impact the times we offer courses?
   **McDermid:** Part of the motion is that the Administration makes a renewed effort to keep the common hours clear of courses.
   **Trubatch:** It will make it more difficult for scheduling, but will allow us times for colloquiums, seminars, committee meetings.
   **Genise:** Other students were split, CART students were in favor but other students don’t use the common period they already have.
   **McDermid:** Service oriented on Wednesday common hour. It’s the faculty’s responsibility to make the best use of a second hour and to use it constructively and will then impact student activity more.
   **Greenwood:** This will make a lot of people have Friday courses.
   **Trubatch:** Unless the common period is on Friday. We are not recommending when the common hour will be.
   **Kurze:** We already schedule on Fridays.
   **Gaynor:** It might be difficult to implement but in favor of it.
   **Genise:** I think we need to fix what we already have before we create a new one.
   **Sumner:** Agree.
   **Murray:** In our department we have tried to hold events but the original common hour is already full with meetings. Can be dedicated to presenting our research or other events but can we use it for more?
   **Trubatch:** Yes.
   **Curnutt:** When they created the School they did not create another hour for Faculty Meeting, it’s just the School Meeting.
   **Genise:** Student organizations will take advantage of additional time so their meetings don’t overlap but will still cause conflict for students to attend colloquiums.

   **Vote:** 23 approved, 3 opposed, 0 abstained

   Approved

---

e. **Amendment on Nomination of the NAL - second reading**

   **Trubatch:** Any discussion? Main effect is that the Union will communicate a nomination, and the Senate would then approve the nomination.
   **Wallace:** Given the fact that the Adjunct Delegate is new to the Senate, I’m going to ask in the future that it is explained more carefully. There are two negotiating bodies.
9. **Report of the Senate President**
   a. **Trubatch**: We previously asked for a uniform way of compiling and reporting University policies. On Canvas, there is a statement from the University President that the inventory of policies has been completed. The next step is for the compiled policies to be approved by the VPs of the respective units, and then to posted in a user-friendly format on the website.
   b. **Trubatch**: Previously, the Senate passed a Recommendation on the integrity of courses Web spaces in Canvas. The Recommendation was not accepted, by the Administration. Currently, there is no policy that limits the monitoring or changing of course Web pages by parties other than the instructor.
   **Korotkin**: Adjunct wants to develop a course online, is it my intellectual property or will the university own it?
   **Wolfson**: It’s your intellectual property unless the administration asked you and paid you to develop the course.
   **Greenwood**: The Teach Act of 2002, treated on-line aspects of courses the same as in-person teaching. Law supersedes University policy. Point of clarification- Does that include downloading documents or communicating to students?
   **Trubatch**: In fact, very few people have access to our course spaces on Canvas. However, there is no policy that limits access.
   **Alvares**: This is not really good operating practice, the Senate might make a resolution that good practice demands a written policy.
   **Trubatch**: We did that, and it was not approved. The record is on the Senate Web page.
   **Nurse**: Online teaching is relatively new here, have we looked at institutions who have been doing this much longer?
   **Greenwood**: Candice Fleming could probably comment on legal parameters that address our concerns.
   **Trubatch**: We’ll ask her for an update.

10. **New Business**
   a. **Roberta Friedman**: Is there is going to be a policy regarding use of University-owned equipment by Faculty members for creative work?
   **Trubatch**: The Administration stated to the Executive Board that the policies and practices are best handled at the College level. CART will be the first to make policies because there are issues in the College. At the meeting with the Executive Board last week, the President of the University and Provost stated that there would be action on this soon in CART.
   b. **Abrams**: Can we reinforce the AFT Union meetings should not have conflicting meetings scheduled.
   c. **Abrams**: Administrative rights on computers, is there a procedure?
   **Trubatch**: Bring it to Administrative Affairs Council or to Doug Murray.
   d. **Wolfson**: Two weeks from today the BOT is holding tuition hearings. It’s the only time of the year that people get to speak in a meeting outside of myself and the board. It is
woefully under-attended by students. Let your students know they can sign up to speak during the meeting.

**Genise:** Students will discuss the issue beforehand, its intimidating to speak with BOT so Student Trustees will visit to help. I

e. **Trubatch:** All New Jersey state employees pay into a fund for family leave, the new law does not go into effect until July 2020 but have been paying in since January 2019. Will the university allow benefits to be paid before July 2020. The Senate is asked to endorse this letter.

**Wolfson:** The open letter to Susan Cole was endorsed by the Union.

11. **Voices from the Community**

12. **Adjournment:**
   
   Meeting adjourned at 4:40pm