

Senate Retreat Minutes – 5.17.19

Meeting called to order at 9:03

Standing Committee Reports (See Powerpoint presentations and other documents available online for details.)

Academic Policies – Deeanna Button

We had eight big projects:

1. Academic Honesty Procedure – change from suspension following second offense to following third offense. We now have an Academic Integrity Form that will make the process simpler. We also created a sanctioning rubric, which is optional. We also created prevention training recommendations, adopted the new second offense procedure and language, and adopted the edits and additions to the Academic Honesty Procedure.

Comment: It doesn't seem like the administration is taking this seriously, so we should push this. I am also worried that the rubric will be seen as mandatory. Can we put in writing that each school will put membership on the committee up for election?

A: From our end, we've done this though it has not been done by administration.

C: They should be tenured faculty on this committee.

A: I believe we've done this.

2. Course Audit Procedure – The committee reviewed the course audit policy and procedure to make course auditing more accessible and affordable. There was general support for reducing the cost of audit requests to a flat fee of \$100 per credit. This would be cost-neutral since we are not making money on this now.

Q: What was the cost prior?

A: \$400

Q: Do you get access to Blackboard?

A: Yes, they get access to everything other students get.

3. Low-income Senior Citizens audit.

4. Athletes Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time. The current practice includes students providing written documentation to instructors. We recommend to use a hybrid approach – written documentation or verbal notification with Excel confirmation. Also we recommended that they develop a practice that includes students emailing faculty.

5. Intellectual Property Policy – We reviewed practices at Stockton. With the help of the Union, the legal offices are taking a look into how to move forward. This is all Union-negotiated.

6. Discrimination Policy and Procedures – We reviewed the procedure for internal complaints alleging discrimination in the workplace. The committee recognizes that this is an important issue that is beyond the scope of our committee. We recommend that a Task Force be formed to look deeper into this. We also recommend reviewing the procedures in place for cases of complaints of discrimination and bullying.

Comment: Regarding the training we have been receiving, and most of it is focused on bullying rather than the specific harassment provided for in the law.

C: We can vote to form a Task Force on this in the fall, working with Student Senate.

C: I would like to see an external audit of the current practices of the office that investigates these cases because it is my perception that this office does not follow the procedures they should, though it is difficult to know since the process is so opaque.

Q: How understaffed is our office compared to other schools? There are only two people in the office.

C: I want to agree that there needs to be an audit of the office given that there is no documentation that any investigation is done.

7. Policy on Double Majoring – When students double-major they can either choose two BA's or two BS's. We want to consider changing this so students can major in one of each.

8. Language for Statements on Syllabi – There was debate about what is mandatory for faculty to include on syllabi. We recommend the development of a centralized location on the Blackboard homepage for statements on Title IX, The Clery Act, Accessibility, and Academic Dishonesty.

C: Some of our policies seem to be inconsistent with the law, so I would recommend that we wait on this until the policies are reviewed.

Q: The idea is to use Blackboard rather than put these on syllabi?

A: Yes.

Finally, our committee has become very busy. We have created a "Request for Consideration" form that you can submit if you want our committee to consider anything. We have difficulty with faculty attendance (not attending) and we request that we have an attendance policy.

C: An attendance policy would require a Senate vote, which we can do.

Academic Programs and Planning – Doug Harvey

We considered a number of new majors and minors (see report). We also discussed an attendance policy for faculty and student representatives.

Administration and Finance – Arleen Gonzalez

We met three times. We also had attendance issues, with faculty missing. We suggest a different times or places for meetings in order to increase attendance. As many of you have heard, we have done a swap between the Carnegie building and the Boat House, which did not include input from faculty. We discussed our concerns related to shared governance with administration. They told us that we have not yet defined what "shared governance" is. We were told that it is all reported in the BOT meetings. The problem with this is that when they announce these in those meetings, it is already done, so there is no opportunity for shared governance. We also discussed needs related to space for faculty who have received grants and need space to go forward with the grants. We discussed other issues related to support and information related to grants. We will be taking up this issue more in the fall.

We were told that we do not have any policy for evacuation for disabled students. We have serious concerns about this and we hope this is something that the Senate will consider in the future. We also have concerns about evacuation policies, generally.

Comment: Related to shared governance, on Monday there is a meeting on the Strategic Plan. We can get into the details in these meetings rather than sticking to their very general agenda. So I recommend we attend and also that we have people get more involved, informing administration.

Question: Are you sure that the swap of buildings you discussed a done deal? I've heard otherwise.

A: I'm not entirely sure, but the point is that we learn about these things from the newspapers, rather than administration telling us, and I'm told that it's pretty much a done deal.

Comment: What the BOT was voting on regarding the swap, was to give the University the power to make the deal. It is not a done deal, but it suggests that it is being seriously considered but still being negotiated.

C: Proposal have been submitted making requests based on academic merit and all decisions were based on revenue generation. The proposal that I have submitted some time ago has never been responded to.

C: The problem is lack of shared governance. We are asked to submit proposals, but decisions are not made with our input.

C: I have concerns about use of space on main campus too, where allocation of space does not seem to be done with consultation with faculty.

C: There seems to be many different space committees.

C: What happened to flat-rate tuition? Nothing. They are ignoring us. I think the Senate needs to push back more, telling the administration that they need to stop ignoring us on issues that they just don't want us involved in.

General Studies – Elizabeth Pollock

We need to think of assessment processes for Middle States. We also considered the problem of programs requiring specific G courses. We also considered what courses are being used for comparison for IDEA. Now all G courses will be compared to courses in general education.

Comment: I want to add that we are considering an audit to see how many programs are using G courses as foundation courses. The concern is that faculty are being encouraged by programs to offer specific courses as G courses, which are actually meant to serve their program.

Information Tech and Media Services – Manish Madan

We considered Blackboard Ally – costs (\$30,000), use, and accuracy. We hope to look more into these. We also considered allocation of computer labs and whether we need a standby lab for faculty use for courses. We also considered use of various citation programs. Stockton has chosen one that is free and it is available to everyone. We also discussed having a webpage that will have a list of faculty expertise, so it is easily find faculty to help with issues related to their expertise. Finally, there was also a discussion of the Blackboard. Some faculty use Google Classroom or others. We discussed providing faculty support for use of these alternatives to Blackboard. Even more finally, we considered adding a hotline for sexual assault. We are looking more into this.

Comment: There is a hotline that has been put in place.

Question: Was there a request sent out for faculty to submit expertise? I suggest they send out requests to faculty to submit their expertise.

Library – David Lechner

We did not have a lot of activity. Attendance has been an issue because of conflict with other meetings. We have three ex-officio members. One position is open and another is held by an administrator who never attends. We are simply noting this.

We met four times, mostly for the Library Director to inform members. There has been some reshuffling among librarians. The library is transitioning in some shared software, which should improve inter-library loan. Regarding our budget, which we discussed at last year's retreat, nothing has happened. But we have been told that our budget will be cut, and that LexisNexis will be cut.

Research and Professional Development – Kory Olson

We had several meetings. The website has a list of all the projects that were funded.

Student Affairs – Emmanuel Small

We examined opportunities for students to ask for help when they are struggling. We had a poster contest for students for a poster to encourage students to seek help. We want students to feel like it is okay to ask for help.

Question: Did your student rep attend meetings?

A: No.

Business Meeting

Our last meeting did not include first readings for these proposals because of time, so we need senators to move to fast-track the proposal so we can vote on them today. Otherwise, they will be forced to wait until September.

Minutes from last meeting accepted.

Clinical Nurse Leadership track in Masters of Sciences in Nursing

This will provide a lot of new opportunities for student in terms of careers. We will need at least one more full-time faculty. We will also need to restructure the Nursing Program, though I can't address that here. The other question was about vulnerable populations, which we have addressed throughout. There are no other similar programs in South Jersey, so we are excited about the opportunities this will provide students of South Jersey.

Question: Will the requirement align with the requirements for other related programs?

A: Yes.

Question about need for new faculty line and coordinator.

A: The new faculty line would not be needed to start the program, but would be needed in the second year.

Motion to fast-track this proposal

Discussion of motion:

I support the motion, but am concerned about using the fast-track as rushing the process. It seems like our concerns have addressed.

Vote on motion to fast-track proposal.

Motion passes 30-2.

Resuming discussion of proposal:

Q: The coordinator would be the new faculty line? How could they teach four new courses if they are only teaching two courses?

A: They wouldn't be asked to teach beyond the normal course load.

Q: Can you say that someone who is going to be hired will be the coordinator?

A: We aren't sure that the new faculty would be coordinator. It may be someone else.

Q: What is the expected size of cohort?

A: In the first year, we expect 6-8, but that it will grow substantially.

Vote on proposal: Passes 31-1

Coastal Zone Management Masters Degree

This program will teach our students what the natural environment is like, what the urban environment has done to the natural environment, and how the two can exist together. One aspect of the program is to train students about issues related to how to use coasts and the implications of manipulation of coastal environments and potential consequences of rises in the sea level and the associated risks.

There will be a PSM (Professional Science Masters) and a M.A. degree. We would share courses with Data Science and Strategic Analytics and others. The market analysis looks good – not a lot of completion from other universities. The human element is very important for this degree.

Question: How will the program emphasize human damage to the coast?

A: We work with a number of groups that regulate use of coastal areas, which students will learn about. This is at the heart of what we do here.

Comment: We support your proposal's request for Web Of Science subscription.

Q: What are the opportunities for grants related to this program?

A: A lot of potential grant funding is available for graduate programs like this one.

Motion to fast-track.

Discussion of motion:

Has this gone through AP&P?

A: Yes. They have a plan in place and this was unanimously supported by AP&P.

Vote to fast-track: Passes 31-0

Vote on proposal: Proposal passes unanimously.

New concentrations in Economics

We are asking for no resources for this program. We have few majors in ECON but looking for ways to encourage students to major in ECON. Few students know much about economics and what it is. Many students conflate economic with business. We want to inform students about opportunities for those with ECON degrees. We thought that one way to communicate this is by adding concentrations. These would not add courses, but simply help students understand what is available and what courses to take that will support students seeking careers in these areas.

Our revised proposal includes responses to the concerns that were raised.

Comment: I suggest you considering adding a Social Work course that actually does not require non-Social Work majors to take prerequisites.

A: We will be happy to consider this later.

C: I'm not inclined to support this concentration. At the end of your statement, you said that the primary purpose is to inform students. As part of that purpose, do we have any data suggesting that pre-law concentration are more likely to be admitted to or be successful in law school?

A: We don't have data on this. Our purpose is to encourage students to take courses that would help them in law school.

Q: How many students in ECON go on to law school?

A: We don't have a lot of majors, but we do have students who go to law school.

C: The American Bar Association does not endorse a major, minor, or concentration. I'm concerned that students would be led to believe that this would be helpful in their application, which is not true. So I understand that Economics is a viable major for students going to law school, but I don't know that there is anything suggesting that it will help.

C: I am in favor of the concentration because it will help students to be better informed about what law school is like, which will help them in their decision about whether they want to go to law school. The skills they will gain by taking the courses will also help them in law school.

A: Yes, part of the point is to help students decide about whether to go to law school.

C: The SOBL Dean asked that I mention that she supports this proposal.

C: This conversation came up in AP&P. Part of the support for this proposal was based on this helping students understand that there is not one pre-law major (like Political Science).

Q: Will this actually attract more students?

Motion to fast-track proposal.

Discussion of motion: None.

Vote to fast-track proposal: Motion passes 24-7

Further questions or comments on proposal:

Comment: When AP&P discussed this, we felt like the proposal addressed the concern – that there is a pre-law major, and the committee felt like this was a strong proposal.

C: Further expression of support for proposal.

C: Sometimes students ask me about whether there is a pre-law major and if they find programs with concentration with pre-law, then they will assume that these are the only programs to major in if they want to go to law school.

C: Further expression of support for the proposal.

C: I would continue to take the recommendation of the American Bar Association, which does not recommend these.

C: Other programs do not require internships, so this program should not (it does not).

C: The ABA does not recommend this, but does not recommend against it. And there are considerable benefits of students taking these courses before going to law school.

C: We cannot count on advising to correct students' misconceptions regarding the consequences of taking a concentration.

C: Concentrations in other areas that are pre-PT or others, are clearly no guaranty that they will be admitted.

Vote on proposal: Proposal passes 26-5

Strategic Planning Document

A revised version of the plan has been posted. We have six information meetings scheduled. We are hoping to move forward with this in the fall.

Question: Can you give us a sense of what the Steering Committee thinks of the plan?

A: I suggest you hear from members of the committee.

Member of the Committee: We have gone through a lot of drafts and have had a lot of discussion about tone and content. I am now happy with where we are now because it has been discussed and reviewed considerably.

Another member of committee: I agree that there has been a great deal of discussion and the current draft has addressed all concerns that we have discussed. The implementation state will be another step.

Another member of committee: I also agree, but there is still lots of opportunity for faculty to get involved by serving on committees that will work on implementation.

Another member of committee: I also agree and am happy with the extent of shared governance. It is important for faculty to serve on the implementation committees where they have expertise.

You don't have to come to all six information sessions or even stay for the whole time. Please attend. First meeting is on Monday. There will be emails reminding faculty of the dates for the other sessions.

Motion to fast-track document.

Discussion of motion to fast-track: None.

Vote of fast-tracking motion: Passes 28-3

Further discussion on document: None.

Vote on document: Passes 29-1

Lunch break

Task Force Reports (see reports posted on website)

Task Force on Hate Speech in Academia

We have a preamble that discusses the important of the issues. We suggest policies be put in place that actively address hate speech. We were tasked with fact-finding – whether this an issue on campus. We found that many have witnessed or experienced hate speech. There was expression of concern that no action was being taken when reports of hate speech were reported. Clearly hate speech is a problem on campus and the University does not appear to be taking it seriously. Staff members have reported that they felt like they were being retaliated against after complaining about hate speech. Recommendations include having a clear definition of hate speech, drafting a hate speech policy, create policy outlining criteria for invited speakers, draft an off-campus conduct policy and online conduct on campus. For the future, we suggest updating the current policies, procedures for reporting hate speech that would

include accountability, and providing education materials which may include mandatory training, perhaps along with our annual ethics training.

Comment: Is there any sort of an ombudsman who could look at this?

A: Our ombudsman was supportive and is open to multiple ways of resolving conflicts in ways that would be more sensitive.

C: There are a lot of other efforts dealing with similar issues. Who will be enforcing this? What office? Will there be one person who will be responsible all these issues?

A: Ideally the ombudsman's office would handle this. I would like it to be housed along with other policies regarding student conduct, and be incorporated into other forms, for example, when proposing an invited speaker.

C: I would urge the administration to include invited "entertainers" along with invited speakers when considering visitors to campus.

Q: The preamble includes "immigration status," but this is not included further in the document. I would propose that we include it in other lists of marginalized groups.

C: There is currently a search for a new ombudsman. I also want us to think about the accountability part of this – what happens when a student (or any other) violates any hate speech policy?

C: I worry about this and sexual assault and others because nothing ever really gets done about these issues by administration.

I have gotten a positive reception to this from administration so far, but I agree that we need to press the administration.

C: I have some questions about some of the meaning of the wording in this document.

C: Concerns expressed about this potentially limited who faculty can invite speakers.

C: I sat on this committee. I've brought in speakers who have been supported by the school and dean, but they were viciously attacked. Some interest groups have been putting money into pushing specific right-wing speakers to visit campus. The current effort on our part is establishing a level-playing field, to ensure that these interest groups, who want to destroy our university environment, will not be successful.

C: What is missing in this proposal is a view for the "privileged" position. That voice should be represented too. How do we balance this?

We have had plenty of conservative voices.

C: This policy is specifically designed protect marginalized groups.

C: I think the concern is that this is meant to shut down the voice of "the right."

C: What we are trying to stay in this policy is about protecting against groups who are trying to get footholds into campuses that have a history of inciting violence.

C: Several members speak in support of encouraging diversity of viewpoints on campus. We should exclude the politics from this.

C: My reading of the report is that politics is not part of this document.

C: Why does this only cover marginalized groups? Conservative groups should be protected too.

C: In terms of language, we can add political positions should be protected as well.

C: The list of people or groups in the document are used as examples, but does not exclude any group. The document should be as inclusive as possible regarding groups or positions protected.

We do not need to address all the specifics of the policies now, but debating the semantics of the language, which we could spend all day on. For now, we can just decide to move this forward to administration. We can continue with this discussion, but not now.

Task Force on LIBA

We did historical research on use of LIBA by the University, which is summarized in the report. We recommend that LIBA remain a student-designed program and support prompts/concentrations, but do not want LIBA to be used in replacement of programs. There should be some process in place for how a LIBA prompt/concentration can move to becoming a program. We do not suggest any new structured LIBA offerings like the EDUC early childhood and elementary education LIBA. There should be equitable compensation for those coordinating LIBAs.

Comment: It sounds like you recommend overlaps with some other efforts, including the lifecycle document and leadership positions.

The administration has agreed to accept any recommendation that we make regarding LIBA.

Motion to endorse recommendations.

Motion passes unanimously.

Task Force on Faculty Leadership Positions

We have met three times and have one more meeting scheduled. We are looking at how coordinators are being compensated and whether they are taking course releases vs. over-compensation. We've also spoken with senior faculty about this, as well as other institutions. We are fielding questions from faculty and we ask for another year to complete our task. We are working in union with The Union.

Vote for giving them more time: Passes unanimously.

Task Force on Sexual Assault

Starting last June a series of law suits have been brought against the University related to sexual assault, which inspired concern about this issue. The WIGS program created a letter on the issues, which was signed by many faculty. Many of us were concerned with what was said at student orientations, which included misinformation regarding consent. The Culture of Respect for NASPA and the "culture of respect" as discussed by Stockton are not the same.

We had five meetings as a task force and many other meetings with various groups and individuals on campus. The University had a "Town Hall" meeting on campus about Culture of Respect (COR). However, it was not a true town hall meeting and only a few questions were taken. We were also told that Stockton was adopting our own, broader, understanding of COR, which emphasizes civility, community and safety, which is very different from the NASPA concept. The NASPA COR emphasizes clear policies, survivor support, self-assessment, schoolwide mobilization, public disclosure, and multitiered education. The Stockton COR does not include these.

One of the clear issues that came up is that the original white paper did not deal with prevention, education, and a positive campus environment. This needs to be made clearer by Stockton. We have strongly encouraged Stockton to undertake an audit that is guided by the NASPA guidelines, and it looks like the University has agreed to this. We strongly endorse this. We have been told that there is an internal audit done that will not be shared with anyone, and focused on legal issues. The Provost, however, has suggested we be part of a group of institutions that conduct a two-year audit based on the NASPA standards. Information about this audit is available at the NASPA website.

We were assigned to review the Campus Climate Surveys, which we have. We think that the core audit will provide needed data on incidents of sexual violence and more. In summary, there is a lot of data on this, but it is difficult to put it all together. In April we had focus groups on campus safety that included over one hundred students, but have not had time to completely analyze the findings. But several themes have emerged, including confusion about the issues among students, as well as fear about being victims and concern about police, who sometimes refuse to accompany students walking home. There were other concerns, including the openness of the campus to the public. Going forward, we will include greater analysis of the data we have collected and hope to collect more data.

We did a lot of research about what other institutions are doing. At Stockton, it is not clear about what to do and what the options are for victims. More clarity is needed. We need to do further research on what other institutions do regarding hotlines and use of student advocates.

Students submitted demands to the BOT, who said all demands would be met, but they have not.

Comment: We have no resolution on any of these things (the lawsuits). I understand the concern. However, anything we do now in response to these allegations can be used against the University.

Several recommendations are made but more time is needed to complete our charge.

Motion to support the task force's involvement in the NASPA audit.

Vote on motion: Passes 25-1

Vote on letting the task force continuing their work for another year: Passes 24-2

Discussion Items

Finals Week Review – Tom Grites

It seems like each year, there are actually fewer and fewer courses using the final exam time for exams. So we want to consider one of two options. One is what we had prior to finals week – the extended class schedule – so classes could have more time if they wanted it for exams. The other option would simply have classes end after the necessary hours are met (40 MWF meetings, for example), essentially just no time for final exams scheduled.

C: I thought we had 40 meetings already MWF.

C: The second option would not work for some courses – it's just not enough time for a final exam.

I think that was the motivation behind this first option – the extended class schedule.

C: Having a reading day has worked. Even if you adjust the schedule, people who don't want to go with the schedule will still not go with the schedule.

C: There should be some survey of faculty and students before a decision is made rather than this body making any recommendation.

C: Is it possible for faculty to op-in or op-out of use of exam rooms?

A: Yes.

C: My students wanted to have the exams on reading day so they could leave early.

C: I agree that some investigation is needed about need for rooms during exams because some of us have final papers rather than exams.

Requests for Faculty Involvement – examine the process

Often when there is a committee composed, administration asks faculty leadership who should be included. Rather than doing this, we could reconsider how faculty get on committees. I think it would be better to put out a call to all faculty about new committees that need members. So we should reexamine this.

Anything else you would like to put as a priority for next year, let us know.

AY 19-20 Priorities

Information Items

Graduation Review

Did not get to this

Atlantic City Updates – Michelle McDonald

Did not get to this

Senate Meeting Dates AY 19/20 – Friday, 12:45 – 2pm

1. 9-20-19 @ TRLC
2. 10-18-19
3. 11-15-19
4. 12-13-19
5. 1-24-20
6. 2-14-20 (Faculty Assembly w/President)
7. 3-27-20
8. 4-17-20
9. 5-14-20 (Senate Retreat)

Meeting adjourned.