

1 William Paterson University – FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – November 9, 2021  
2 FACULTY SENATE WEB PAGE <http://www.wpunj.edu/senate>

3  
4 **PRESENT:** Alford, Andreopoulos, Brillante, Christensen, Crick, Diamond, Duffy,  
5 Elleithy, Fuentes, Gazzillo Diaz, Hack, Helldobler, D. Hill, Hong, Jurado, Kaur, Kecojevic,  
6 Kollia, Macdonald, B. Marshall, Monroe, Natrajan, Nemeth, O'Donnell, Orr, Powers, Rosar,  
7 Schwartz, Simon, Snyder, Steinhart, Swanson, Tardi, Tosh, Vega, Verdicchio, Wallace, Watad,  
8 M. Williams, S. Williams, Wright

9  
10 **ABSENT:** Gonzalez, Kamara, Nyaboga,

11  
12 **GUESTS:** Alaya, Andrew, Astarita, Bartle, Berg, Bolleia, Boucher, Bowrin, Brenensen,  
13 Broome, Cammarata. Cannon, Cauthen, Chauhan, Chen, Choi, Davis, Decker, DeLoatch, De  
14 Veyga, Diaz, Fanning, Felson, Feola, Ferguson, Galetz, Ginsberg, Goldstein, Green, Griffin,  
15 Grimes, Gramiccioni, Gritsch, Guenther, Guo, Guzman, Henry, S. Hill, Jackson, Jian, Jones,  
16 Kashyap, Korgen, Lauby, Lever, Liautaud, Lim, Lincoln, Lockhart, Lowe, Lubeck, Marks, I.  
17 Marshall, McLaughlin-Vignier, McNeal, McMahan, Milanes, Miles, Milling, Moore,  
18 Nassiripour, Owusu-Ansah, Panayides, Park, Peek, Pinkston, Potacco, Rabbitt, Ricupero,  
19 Refsland, Rosenberg, Ross, Schneider, Schwartz, Sharma, Torres, Suess, Weiner, Zeleke, Zeman

20  
21 **N.B.** If you were in attendance and your name does not appear above, please e-mail the  
22 Secretary directly ([duffy@wpunj.edu](mailto:duffy@wpunj.edu))

23  
24 **PROCEDURAL NOTE:** Only senators and presenters should attend the meeting live in the  
25 Library Auditorium. Everyone else should join via Teams. When someone viewing remotely  
26 wishes to speak s/he should type SPEAK in the Chat box. Duffy will keep track of those desiring  
27 to speak and will recognize each in order. When recognized, the speaker will then unmute the  
28 microphone. Only the Chair's screen will be visible. The session will be recorded, but only the  
29 Secretary will have access to the recording.

30  
31 **PRELIMINARIES:** Chairperson Wallace called the meeting to order at 12:32pm. Natrajan  
32 and Orr moved acceptance of the Agenda, which was adopted without objection. Kaur and S.  
33 Williams moved acceptance of the Minutes of the September 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, which were approved  
34 unanimously, after one correction.

35  
36 **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL: BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH**  
37 **SKILLS CERTIFICATE:** Broome and Diamond moved acceptance of the Council's resolution.  
38 After brief discussion and clarification about the flexibility for other courses being accepted  
39 (Hong, McNeal, Kecojevic, Lincoln, Brenensen) the resolution was approved unanimously.

40  
41 **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL: BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH**  
42 **SKILLS MINOR:** Broome and Jurado moved acceptance of the Council's resolution, which  
43 was approved without discussion.

44  
45 **CHAIR'S REPORT:** Wallace reported on the Executive Committee's meeting with the  
46 President and Provost. Regarding the branding discussion, it reiterated details of the We Promise

47 YoU model that it presented at the October 12<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting and pointed out how many  
48 aspects of this proposal could be worked into a How approach to rebranding the University.  
49

50 The Executive Committee continued to stress the importance of faculty serving as advisors and  
51 our ability to positively impact retention. It noted that any proposed changes to advisement must  
52 be vetted by the Advisement and Registration Council for presentation to the Senate.  
53

54 A social justice approach to the UCC was discussed as part of citizenship training for students.  
55

56 In a separate meeting, the Executive Committee met with M. Cammarata and F. Diaz to discuss  
57 ways that there could be more cross-division collaboration between Student Development and  
58 Academic Affairs to better support retention and the academic mission of the University. All  
59 agreed about the need to make concrete connections between what happens inside and outside  
60 the classroom.  
61

62 The Executive Committee met with several representatives of EAB via Zoom to discuss the first  
63 set of EAB reports and recommendations. The Provost will make a presentation of those data in  
64 a few minutes.  
65

66 The AFT Executive Board and the Executive Committee met and reaffirmed their commitment  
67 to work together to address the problems facing the University. The Senate stands in solidarity  
68 with the Union and it will do all it can to address layoffs as they impact the curriculum.  
69

70  
71 **BRANDING AND IDENTITY:** Wallace opened the floor to further discussion of the proposed  
72 branding models, and invited Helldobler to present the results of the informal survey he took at  
73 the last Senate meeting.  
74

75 Helldobler presented the results in a PowerPoint [which is archive in the Packet of this meeting].  
76 The How model got a slightly positive response. The What model was more balanced. Looking  
77 at both models, the How model got more support than the What model (12 to 8). The final poll,  
78 on branding the UCC through a social justice lens received more positive support. He invited  
79 everyone to go to his website to view all the input he has garnered from various stakeholders.  
80

81 Watad asked about the timeline for implementation regardless of model chosen, and what are the  
82 projected costs? Helldobler responded that the details would be worked out during the Spring  
83 semester with a Fall launch. The cost will depend on the details developed in the Spring.  
84

85 Wright asked if the models would require restructuring the University. Helldobler doesn't think  
86 either model would require significant restructuring, but either would require growing some  
87 areas and tactically investing resources, and there may be some structural changes. No details  
88 have been fleshed out yet.  
89

90 Natrajan would like to see the We Promise YoU model discussed and put forward to the Board.  
91 Helldobler said the University would be nimble and flexible in its hiring practices and would  
92 exercise its contractual rights in hiring NTTPs in order to sustain enrollment over time before

93 converting lines to tenure track. This principle would apply to either model, with the ultimate  
94 goal of trying to stave off as many layoffs as possible. He will not present any of the three  
95 specific models. He will recommend to the Board. He will recommend X. If he recommends a  
96 How approach, he foresees exploring elements of the Executive Committee model.

97

98 Duffy read a comment that had been sent in regarding the How and What models: These models  
99 betray no understanding of the real issues behind decreased retention, opting instead for  
100 performative activities that essentially pass the buck from administration to faculty. Helldobler  
101 disagreed.

102

103 Asked again how the Senate model might be employed, Helldobler repeated that he sees that  
104 model as a How model that contribute to the discussion in the Spring.

105

106 Wright is concerned about narrowing in on professionalism will result in abandoning the  
107 democratic goal of equal opportunity for education for first generation, students of color and  
108 others already underserved. Helldobler replied that if we grew specialized programs they would  
109 generate revenue that could be used to support other programs. He can't foresee abandoning a  
110 core curriculum that has done good work turning out well-rounded educated citizens. We might  
111 do that by focusing things through a social justice lens, thus distinguishing ourselves in a crowded  
112 marketplace. He understands the worry that to focus on professional programs would be  
113 detrimental to traditional liberal arts programs, but that's not the case It is a matter of how to  
114 drive revenue that can be used to support those other programs. It's not about eliminating  
115 programs, or colleges or majors.

116

117 Snyder said students want to go to schools that have the majors they want. Helldobler said that  
118 we are not going to have only one type of major; we will have programs. No matter what model  
119 we pick, we will attract some students and lose some others. A student who wants very strong  
120 STEM will go to an NJIT, but some NJIT students find that's not what they want, and they come  
121 to a WPU. The point is to brand the University in a way that will attract more students. We have  
122 to pick a lane.

123

124 Simon said that whatever lane we choose, we need to provide them the support they need to  
125 navigate college. Students with disabilities need such support services. Helldobler noted that  
126 students have gotten more support from Financial Aid, WP 101, the Disability Services Office,  
127 etc. Marketing dollars and messaging must focus on getting the greatest ROI in terms of the  
128 number of populations we bring in. That's one of the reasons that we don't do a lot of program-  
129 specific marketing. We get a lot of the via organic searching on the Internet. Simon asked how  
130 we determine to whom we send enrollment literature? Helldobler said he'd ask Ross and get  
131 back to her.

132

133 Wallace thanked Helldobler for his responses. The Senate looks forward to hearing about his  
134 presentation to the Board and hopes its model figures in you decision-making.

135

136 **EAB (EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD) REPORTS:** Powers and Lincoln presented a  
137 PowerPoint [archived in the Packet of this meeting] describing the first group of reports prepared

138 by the EAB consulting company: Our Programs in Comparative Context with Others in the Five  
139 State Region.

140

141 Powers said we have good data, internally, about our programs. EAB gives us external data. It  
142 looks at what other universities are offering and what is the competitive market space in which  
143 we must compete and the labor market demand, the employment picture for our graduates. How  
144 are we doing compared with our regional competitors. Updates and other reports will come from  
145 EAB the future.

146

147 Lincoln presented and commented on the slides. Powers emphasized that these reports are meant  
148 to help us understand what we're doing and help us do better. It is not about layoffs or closing  
149 programs. He suggested that the seven-year program review process should include an in-depth  
150 intensive analysis after three years. He urged the Senate councils to make use of these data.

151

152 Diamond questioned the validity of EAB's data-gathering methods, some of which is proprietary  
153 and thus not open for us to analyze. Powers countered that much of the data EAB uses is freely  
154 available to everyone (IPEDS, BLS, etc.). The proprietary database is their formulae, etc.

155

156 Hack asked how the administration plans to look at these data when different charts present  
157 different and contradictory data points for the same department? Powers applauded such an in-  
158 depth analysis of the EAB data and said that this is the sort of use he would like all departments  
159 to make of them in reviewing their own department. Lincoln noted that in the first EAB reports  
160 data were presented at a broader, department-level way, while the second report broke things  
161 down to more specific programs. Also, finding that some programs have lower job demand does  
162 not mean that there is no job demand. The place where a program plots on the scatterplot is  
163 relative to other programs we have. Powers suggested that Lincoln could attend department  
164 meetings to help understand and analyze the data.

165

166 Gazzillo-Diaz questioned the reliability of the EAB reports, especially since they don't include  
167 follow-up data from graduates of our programs.

168

169 Andreopoulos found it difficult to analyze these reports and asked if an EAB representative  
170 could come to a Senate meeting to tell us what the meaning of all these reports. Powers  
171 suggested departmental or college-level workshops to dive deeply into the data.

172

173 Tardi questioned the inter-rater reliability of the reports. She also questioned the administration  
174 saying that these data won't affect layoffs.

175

176 Powers said it is important for the undergraduate and graduate councils to make use the EAB  
177 data, He wants us to use these data in a formative way to help improve us. The intent is not to tie  
178 use of them with layoffs.

179

180 Wright questioned EAB's grouping us with universities like Villanova, Columbia and Johns  
181 Hopkins – schools that are not at all like us. These are obvious errors. Powers said the data are  
182 complicated and there are nuanced lenses with which to view things. He wouldn't say they are

183 wrong, but that it tells a story about which we may have different viewpoints. The 360 report is  
184 especially helpful to see what our peers are doing. EAB reports are tools, but not “the” tool.  
185

186 Natrajan asked if EAB could remove the schools that are obviously not compatible with WPU.  
187 Powers replied that we’re already doing that. He has requested the raw data from EAB so we can  
188 do our own analysis.  
189

190 Kaur pointed out that the EAB report does not serve the humanities and other soft skills well and  
191 is driving us in directions diametrically opposite from what other institutions are doing. She  
192 questions the validity of a report that is making us take actions that are aberrant compared to  
193 what other institutions are doing. Powers reminded the body that no decisions have been taken  
194 and that EAB is just a tool and that we may choose to support programs that not market oriented.  
195 Lincoln reiterated that there are no programs with no market demand and for which we have high  
196 competitive opportunity.  
197

198 Christensen noted that the EAB reports use language like “underperforming” – and in this  
199 environment it’s scary to hear that you’re underperforming. What it actually means is there is  
200 opportunity for growth. The reports sound like they’re grading our performance when they’re  
201 really looking at market opportunities.  
202

203 D. Hill wants to know how the administration is using the reports – despite the serious issues  
204 faculty have raised about the reports. Powers said that regardless of the issues faculty have  
205 raised, we are using the reports. He hopes the Senate and the councils will use them.  
206

207 **ADJOURNMENT:** Upon Natrajan’s motion, the Senate adjourned at 1:54 pm. The next  
208 meeting will be on Tuesday, November 23<sup>rd</sup> in the Library Auditorium. This will be the last  
209 regularly scheduled meeting of the Fall semester.  
210

211 Since seating is limited to around 100 persons – fewer with social distancing – **only senators**  
212 **and presenters will be permitted in the Library Auditorium.** The meeting will also be  
213 livestreamed. The Teams link will be sent out prior to the meeting.  
214

215 Please “check in” as early as possible (ideally, before 12:30 so the secretaries can confirm  
216 attendance). Those attending remotely should “check in” via the Chat.  
217

218 Respectfully Submitted: Bill Duffy, Secretary  
219  
220