

Faculty Senate meeting: Nov. 15, 2019

Meeting called to order at 12:49

1. Approval of minutes from Oct. meeting: approved.

2. Informational Items:

- a. Name Change from “Hospitality and Tourism Management Studies” to “Hospitality, Tourism, and Events Management Studies.”
- b. IFD Comments for Provost

3. Creation of Task Force to Assist Design of New IFD/Academic Support Center

People are asked to nominate potential members and to think about what they want the charge to be.

Q: When is this expected to be formed and completed?

A: We hope to have the task force document done by the December meeting. We are unsure of the timeline in terms of restructuring the IDF.

Q: Is the IFD in its current state done?

A: It will be done at the end of June though we have been promised its services will continue.

Q: Is it true that administration wants a larger influence in the IFD?

A: Our understanding is that the intention is to have more faculty involved, directing the smaller parts.

Q: Is there a reason we are undoing what we have?

A: There were a variety of reasons stated.

Q: Will the taskforce have access to the administrations intentions? Will the taskforce include administrators?

A: We hope so. And that might be a good idea.

4. Task Force on Faculty Visas

This taskforce has representation from the difference schools. The charge is to review our policy, considering how other NJ institutions do this. (Full charge and membership available at Faculty Senate website.)

Passes by unanimous approval.

5. Declaration of Declining Confidence

We are considering this as a “major motion,” which means we will not vote on this today, but will have two discussions about this before voting.

C: I support the second draft because it is specific about why we are unhappy with administration.

Q: What is the purpose?

C: Those who created the first draft wanted it as a “shot over the bow” and we feel like this has already had some influence.

Q: What happens if we vote on this and it passes beyond letting them know about this? Is there anything else we can do?

C: Middle States is coming up and this is an opportunity for us to reconsider what is going on at Stockton publicly. I think it is important to consider how we may want to be critical of the administration. Middle States might be more interested in how administrators are doing poor administration. So I like the second draft because it is clear on this. So we should consider if we want to address Middle States and should be careful to consider what Middle States expects on these matters.

C: I prefer the second draft because it is more targeted and letting them know that they cannot act unilaterally when they say they are not. I think the best example of how they have gone off is their proposal for non-tenure track faculty.

C: I think the question about what the point is is important because it seems like there is little we can do. But I like the language in this draft because the administration seems to ask for our input and then ignore it. Now they seem to not even be asking for our input. So I support this document.

C: I like the point about organizational restructuring. Should we include discussion about the proposed changes to GENS? So I think we should put this up front.

C: We can also add that there has been no cost-benefit analysis supporting their claim that this would save in costs. How is this different from a vote of no confidence?

C: This is not a formal vote of no confidence, but just a statement.

C: I agree that we should consider Middle States expectations/criteria when considering the content of this document.

C: The Provost does not seem to understand how interdisciplinary minors work. She doesn't seem to understand how General Studies works. Regarding costs savings, I don't see how these changes would save costs. How can we talk about cost savings? We need to consider administrative salaries. Can we also talk about restructuring administration?

C: Agreement about looking at cost savings related to administrative structure and salaries.

C: This document was originally intended to slow the process that is being set by the administration. This could get the administration to slow down and give us more time before they make sweeping changes. So I would ask you not to put this vote off for too long.

C: My confidence in the administration has declined since they dropped admissions standards and lack of support for General Studies.

C: Are we handcuffed in what we can do today or can we vote earlier?

C: As a major motion, it needs two readings. There could be a movement to fast-track it, however.

C: I'm worried about what happens next? What if the Provost steps down? They could appoint an interim provost, who could be worse.

C: The restructuring would have a harmful effect on the School of Education. And the decisions being made are being done without understanding of how the School works, and this is happening while we are undergoing reaccreditation. There has been no consideration about the costs of restructuring and how it would influence enrollment.

C: We are all part of GENS and the slightest bit of research shows that the proposed change to a University College would not fit. And for all faculty to be able to teach General Studies is important, and the provost does not seem to understand how important this is to the faculty. The majority of my program is in support of this.

C: We've spent a lot of time and money on the Strategic Plan, but these proposed changes never came up in our discussion. And the plan emphasized the importance of GENS. And now they are proposing eliminating GENS.

C: I am in support of fast-tracking this. But exactly what do we want them to do? Can we communicate whatever that is in this document?

C: More expression of the importance of General Studies should be included.

C: Why have we excluded Harvey from this? There is no way the Provost is doing this without his consent.

C: Harvey is letting the Provost act on her own. And there is some thinking that we should not include Harvey because the BOT would be less interested in the document if it addressing him.

C: If we bring in the implications for Middle States, then this might be a more powerful document. We could insert the Middle States language and how the restructuring violates that language.

C: I agree adding Middle States would help, but what is happening is wrong regardless of Middle States standards.

C: Has the Provost had any conversation with the Student Senate?

C: No.

C: Maybe we should reach out to them about this?

C: A lot of the proposed changes seem to be driven by cost-savings.

C: This might be true, but they have not does any analysis of cost-savings.

C: I don't understand why there is a focus on cost-effectiveness. We have more students, so we have more costs.

C: Total, there are 919 teaching credit hours of course releases for coordinators and everyone else included in the agreement, 42% of which are taken as overloads. The costs of these can be calculated in different ways.

C: Can we ask them to do a cost-benefit analysis?

C: Even if the course release goes away, it doesn't mean that the work that is done goes away.

C: The deadline that they are discussing is artificial. The agreement can go for as long as we want it to.

C: I would be in favor of voting on both documents, one for Harvey and one for the Provost.

C: Is there a reason why we don't ask for a walking back on the current restructuring rather than breaking it down?

C: Our thinking is that the latter would do the former.

Motion to adjourn. Seconded.

Meeting ends at 1:56