ROWAN UNIVERSITY SENATE
GENERAL MEETING
January 29, 2007

ATTENDEES: Bonnie Angelone, Herb Appelson, David Applebaum, Joe Bierman, Greg Biren, Kate Boland, Luis Brunstein, Bruce Caswell, Jay Chaskes, Kevin Dahm, Robert D’Intino, Carol Eigenbrot, Kathy Ganske, Erick Guerra, John Hasse, Karen Heinz, Vasil Hnatyshin, Elisabeth Hostetter, Cristine Iftode, Frances Johnson, Candace Kelley, Ernst Knoesel, Lee Kress, Phillip Lewis, Yuhui Li, Matthew Lund, Julie Mallory-Church, Mary Marino, Brenda Marlin, Mark Matalucci, Afrodessia McCannon, Yusuf Mehta, Phyllis Meredith, Eric Milou, James Newell, Bob Newland, John Pastin, Anne Phillips, Henrietta Pichon, Robi Polikar, Anthony Robb, Tanya Santangelo, Dan Schowalter, Karen Siefring, Kathleen Small, Tony Smith, Marian Stieber, Don Stoll, Eileen Stutzbach, Susan Taber, Skeff Thomas, Sanford Tweedie, Patrick Westcott, Barbara Williams, Cathy Yang, Tricia Yurak

NOT IN ATTENDANCE/REPRESENTED BY ALTERNATE: Bernadyne Weatherford represented by Belinda Bragg

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Joe Basso, Lori Block, Dorie Gilchrist, Ihsan Isik, Marilyn Shontz, Rob Sterner, Hong Zhang

Introduction of Visitor: Ashley Reese from the WHIT
Call to Order at 10:57a.m. by President Newell.
Approval of the Agenda- by unanimous vote.
Approval of Minutes from the December Meeting- by unanimous vote.

Open Period:
President Farish addressed the Senate on Wilmington College and PACE.
He received a letter in December regarding Wilmington College setting up majors at Cumberland and Burlington County Colleges. Salem was also included, but no degree program was established. He expressed surprise at this action in that ongoing discussions have occurred between the three colleges with Rowan regarding implementation of PACE. President Farish spoke to Oates last week. A meeting is scheduled on 2/21/07 for the three colleges plus Rowan to discuss how Rowan might play a role with their adult learners. The actual petition from Wilmington will not be heard until March.
Dr. Farish stated that there are implications with Wilmington’s move for where education is headed in the state, in particular, removing the middle man to provide courses. Larger issues of providing courses that are economical through a four-year program and of maintaining the quality of the program while insuring rowan’s interests. Dr. Farish was not so much concerned about the future of the College of education as at the long-term implications for education in the state.

Discussion ensued:
K. Small: With Farleigh Dickinson already here, how does that work?
Answer: Wilmington is undercutting both price and quality. Does this serve the region well?
K. Ganske: Rowan may want to enlist the support of the Chamber of Commerce; businesses want a higher standard than the current BA degreeed students
H. Pichon: If we’re asking these colleges not to consider Wilmington, then we ought to also be offering options to their students.
Answer: there are two groups of students whose schedules won’t allow them to attend a four-year program, 1. Students who work full time; for them the 2+2 arrangement works well.
2. Students who are not academically very good and don’t meet our admissions standards. He doesn’t think that open admission is a good idea because of quality issues.
S. Thomas: Is the General Studies Degree what they’re referring to?
Answer: Yes; it’s an attempt to gather those who are scattered across disciplines. He questions whether Wilmington can create the enrollment for this.
Comment: Rowan is actually $5 cheaper, but is adding $100 in fees.; therefore, they are undercutting us.
Answer: Not so much undercutting us as the issue of less expensive faculty.
President’s Report

- President Farish has reconstituted his Advisory council. The first meeting will take place in February.
- Wilmington College has signed an agreement with three New Jersey colleges. The deadline to respond is set for February. There is a concern for the issue of the quality of education that may be provided. Objection would be based on Rowan’s ability to offer the same courses.
- K. Jahan, F. Johnson, P. Lewis and E. Milou have been selected for the PACE advisory group. Two professional staff names were also put forward to the Provost by President Newell and President Siefring (AFT); the Provost then selected D. Gilchrist.
- Interim dismissal policy- students with a 2.0 GPA for consecutive semesters would result in dismissal. This proposal awaits review by the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. The Provosts recommendation applies only to entering students. This standardization policy is used in other NJ colleges, and would replace the use of the existing tiered system.

Committee Reports

Curriculum Committee- Kevin Dahm
For Chemical Engineering, the Committee approved the A/B and C proposals unanimously. Both proposals were moved concurrently. The vote resulted in ten opposed with the motion passed by majority vote.
For the Psychology proposal, Bonnie Angelone was asked to comment. The first proposal is intended to address critical thinking skills, restructuring the upper level courses to build on each other with some new courses. The second proposal changes the prerequisite for all courses by using the old Intro course. All three proposals were brought forward with a motion to approve concurrently; the motion carried unanimously.
For the Biology proposal (P802): It is being proposed to change the prerequisite to reflect then new sequencing, adding a C-average in core courses. This standard will also apply to transfer students. The motion carried by majority vote with one abstention.
A typographical error was noted on the Green Sheet to correct wording from “New Non…” to just “New.”

Technological Resources- Vasil Hnatyshin
There is an issue with the IWS student workers.
Comment: P. Lewis- Expressed concern for all students being required to have laptops (provided examples of hardship cases) Since there was no debate or proposal on the floor, he was asked to save the question/concern.
Comment: M. Matalucci- Students are failing the Excel portion of the technology basic skills testing. There is not the same need for use of this across the board, therefore he suggested that knowledge assessed be basic computer literacy. With computer literacy being a basic skills class, how necessary is Excel?
P. Lewis- We need to know that students are failing in Excel. He suggested having the Committee talk with the Campus Planning Committee regarding updating. He suggested that all information be channeled into one body.

Academic Policies and Procedures-Barbara Williams
Academic Policy Resolution: Chair of Academic Policies and Procedures referred to a proposed change on the Yellow Sheet to be read by the members.
Question: Will this change affect the T&R policy?
Answer: President Newell stated that it is reasonable to assume so; if this proposal is accepted it will affect how the T&R package is written.

Senate Constitution Committee, B. Caswell
President Newell referred to the written format provided for how to discuss the membership issue in the constitution.
B. Caswell suggested that the first question be revised to read “Is the Senate open to expanding the membership?”
Background information: the Senate Constitution does not address membership clearly. The Committee met with the other unions and students groups to discuss this. Additionally, a subcommittee met. Some groups were lobbying to be in the Senate, mostly middle level managers and deans. The committee looked at governance structures at sister colleges also. It decided to eliminate administrators and alumni, although administrators could (and do) serve on committees. Adjuncts, student Government reps and Camden pose differences that affect their opportunity to be elected. CWA and IFTE were part of the discussions. CWA is a diverse group which includes positions ranging from clerical workers to doctors. The group has members who both see and don’t see students. IFTE is also very diverse.

Point of Information: The Senate would be approving in principle before placing the suggested amendments on the floor of the Senate. Today’s discussion is to establish the format that will go before the Senate. President Newell then opened the floor alternating between those speaking for and against whether the Senate should address expanding the membership base.

Against: J. Chaskes:
He has serious questions as to whether opening membership begs the issue of what the Senate is for. There is a concern that the Senate will become a “Super Union” versus looking at the academic life of the campus. He has seen an expansion of the Senate’s sphere of interest during his tenure at Rowan and questions whether it has lost sight of its boundaries. He thinks it is necessary to have a discussion of what the Senate is. (i.e.-who we are, what is the body for).
Discussion ensued resulting in a concern from the floor that there had been no motion to be discussed. J. Chaskes then Motioned to Table the discussion of membership; seconded by K. Boland.
Discussion for and against the motion followed:
Against Tabling: To table will mean pushing the decision back again; it will be messy.
(Question raised: What would make the discussion less messy?)
For the motion: In order to make changes about membership, we have to refer to the Preamble. If the Preamble has been changed, then we can return to the discussion of membership.
Against Tabling: After five years, we should either move the changes or abolish the work.
For Tabling: The Senate should be either one house or the other, not overlapping with the AFT and Senate.
Against Tabling: We should be more inclusive.

Motion to Call the Question- approved unanimously.

The Motion to Table was defeated with 12 in favor of tabling and the majority opposed.

Due to lateness of the hour, President Newell suggested that the discussion of membership would resume in February and asked for a Motion to Adjourn.
Meeting adjourned at 12 noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Mallory Church,
Senate Secretary