

K E A N

FULL SENATE MEETING
MINUTES

May 9, 2023
3:15 p.m.-4:15 p.m.
Zoom Webinar

Senators in attendance:

•Ahlawat, •Anderson, •Boateng, •Bonillas, •Boyd-Jackson, •Brandwein, •DiVirgilio, •Donovan, Dowdell, •Evans, •Farrokh, •Gover, ab-Gubi, •Halper, •Konyk, •Mack, •Marks, •Martinez, •Mayhall, ab-Pena, •Pintado-Casas, •Roebuck, •Rodriguez, •Rosa, •Rosen, ab-Sanchez, •Sargent, •Verdi, •Webber, •Yucetepe

Student Representative:

None

Guests: Casale, Eckart, Lorentzen, Moskovitz, Traynor

[•=present ex=Excused absent=ab]

Meeting called to order by Chairperson Ahlawat at 3:20pm

I. Minutes – May 9, 2023
A. Motion:
B. Second:
II. Curriculum Items for Notification-Notification and Vote or None
III. New Business-
<p>Chair: First the minutes, I hope you've had time to review those and if anyone would like to make a motion to approve them or you want some time to review that would be fine too. Jack is making a motion to approve any one second.</p> <p>All in favor Anyone against so the minutes are approved. There are no Curriculum items for this meeting. No old business. The first item I thought I would have the election results but I don't. I reached out to American Arbitration. They said they will be certifying and sending the results today. So maybe by the time we end up meeting up, I would have the results and then share them otherwise I will forward you the email as soon as it comes from but election the voting actually ended at 5pm Yesterday. One item on the agenda was the academic reorganization. I'm going a little bit out of order in the agenda just because some people needed more time to join the meeting and make the presentation. The Board of Trustees did grant the authorization to the president and the provost to establish the academic</p>

departments and the chairs instead of it is I think the elections are pretty much completed Joy Am I right? For the department chairs.

Joy Moskovitz: Elections that need to proceed because it was pending final action by the board some movement of programs. So most of those elections that were outstanding will finalize this week. I would say between this week and next week, we should be wrapping up.

Chair: I believe I understand from KFT that there are issues still to be resolved, for example, the summer compensation for the chairs and the associate chairs that has not been finalized sometime that would be negotiations on the letter of agreement 34 That is what my understanding is. And then there were some concerns raised about the implementation. And I did inform people who had reached out to me that at this point the Senate does not have a need to be involved, etc. Let's wait for the implementation to be completed. And next year. We could review once this process has been completed and then we can review how the implementation has gone. But so far, it seems to be proceeding smoothly. Any questions on this?

Joy Moskovitz: session if you don't mind, I would encourage anyone who has any questions or concerns. The DCI website is still up and running and being updated as we go the DCI college pages with those links are still open and available to receive any type of feedback questions or concerns. I would encourage anyone at any time to utilize those links so that we could see what those questions and concerns are and address those either directly or through updates to the website.

Chair: All right. The next item that I would like to move to is the G committee. That item was on their agenda. Rachel is the chair of the G committee. And we also have two visitors who are members of the GE committee Dr. Lorentzen and Dr. Casale and I forwarded to you a document that GE committee by Dr. Evans had sent to me for your review, and that way we could save some time. I mentioned to Dr. Evans that given that we have a lot of items on the agenda today to take about 15 to 20 minutes at the most on this particular item. And then it can be revisited in the fall when the Senate reconvenes. Thank you. So it's all yours if you want me to share the screen, but that document I'll be happy to do that.

Senator: Thank you some background information is just that. After two visits to the G committee by the Provost and following the march 16 presentation by the GE Task Force, members of the GE committee felt like they wanted to reach out to the Senate with some requests about the process that's undergoing with the revision of the GE curriculum. The members of the committee drafted this request to the Senate at the end of March, and then needed to have a vote amongst its members to approve the language in this document. And then it was forwarded to Sucheta at the beginning of April. And it's just taken us until now to be able to present this document to the full Senate for your review and consideration because I am both to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest. I've decided not to provide further commentary today and instead; Laura and Dean are here to speak on behalf of the Senate GE committee.

Laura Lorentzen: Thank you, Rachel. As a member of the Senate GE committee, I simply wish to provide you a short readout at the end of the academic year to go alongside you see on the shared screen now. Please understand that the present GE concept of the GE Task Force is either approved or disapproved by the Senate GE

committee, or does it present a task force GE concept? A restructuring document, which as per the UCC manual is required by the task force would first be once created given to MPC and then go to the Senate G committee or Senate GE committee has asked the GE Task Force for details for assessment data of our present GE curriculum, and we have submitted our questions and concerns to the GE Task Force. Our intention is to continue to seek information and be engaged in a collaborative process. My colleague, Dean Casale, also a member of the Senate GE committee, will now make a few comments about process.

Dean Casale: Hello, everybody. Thank you for inviting and Rachel, thank you for your sound leadership here. I'm not going to speak so much to the core idea of the curriculum as to the process to date by which the GE Task Force has pursued the goal or the end of revising GE and I think and as I speak I'm speaking of course for myself, but I also think I represent a consensus voice from the GE. The faculty senate committee itself. I think there have been two crucial mistakes or oversights. The first is that the cart has been put before the horse. But we have seen today with regard to the presentations of what the potential program might be for the full-scale revision of je e is really the presentation of an idea and not presentation of a proposal. And yet, the GE Task Force, if we look at their timeline, is looking to implement that is structured develop. Imagine curriculum based upon an idea as opposed to a fully fleshed out proposal. I think that this is very problematic, and I think it speaks to a lot of the confusion that we've expected that we've witnessed so far, with regard to the rolling out of the Listen stop idea. The second thing is that the GE Task Force, well intentioned and hardworking I think needs to in some ways, it's B call upon a little bit more directly. faculty from the disciplines and especially from the GE program itself. It seems to me that the idea, although possibly a good one, did not receive grassroots sort of input from the beginning with regard to faculty and especially with the GE program. So those are two critical sorts of mistakes and oversights. If we look at the document itself, I think it speaks for itself.

The first item the slower timeline, I think is crucial we're asking for a more realistic timeframe. The idea that the curriculum could be implemented by full of 2024 seems very ambitious and kind of unrealistic, especially considering there is no fully fleshed out proposal. As of yet. The second item, which regards to grassroots production, there seems to be to be need to be more of a sort of participatory process in which the GE Task Force is not just informing us about what curricular things might be happening, but there's a sense of there from the grassroots up especially the inclusion of a faculty needs to be considered a bit more.

The third thing about alternate proposals. This does not in any way, serve as a criticism of the Whistle Stop idea without to be abandoned. It just seems to me that before we launch into an implementation of this particular idea that other possible ideas might be considered and that we might also consider what best fits in some ways with cane. And then finally, with something that is so comprehensive as this ambitious scope for this formulation, I do think and the committee feels that there perhaps has to be more consultation and collaboration with the impacted parties to make sure that whatever goes forward is reasonable and doable. So that's just a gloss of what's presented here. In terms of this particular document.

Chair: I open it up for discussion if the senators have any questions, but Dr. Evans being the chair of the task force as well as chair of the GE curriculum committee,

possibly to answer any questions of the concerns that have been raised. So maybe I'll start with a question. Is there any course yet for us to review that has been developed to kind of tell us how these courses will look like?

Senator: in my knowledge, nothing such has been shown to the Senate the committee. I can provide a little bit of a preview update. We're in the process of scheduling events and activities for May and June. Our hope is that there will be the development of an example curriculum based on Friday, Chapman's read givers example, which was alluded to in the March 16 presentation she and other representatives from the task force and the GE faculty are in the process of developing that example, between now and the end of May. Our hope is to do a presentation at the beginning of June, so that people can see and better understand what the curriculum might look like in terms of its coursework. At that same time, revealing that example, we will be opening a call for faculty who are interested in working on transdisciplinary teams, both in June and in July, so that there's an opportunity for additional compensation for faculty that are willing to dedicate part of their summer research time to this service. The other update I can provide is that there are meetings being scheduled at the end of May, for all GE constituents. I will personally be inviting people from GE 1003 1000 GE research and tap the history 1062 faculty, the English 2403 faculty English 1030 The humanities, the social sciences, the math courses, both in Hennings and in the School of General Studies, the science courses, computer science courses, kind of left out developmental coursework.

I'm giving each constituency a block of time to meet with me and other members of the task force so that we can collect some information about both content and pedagogy that is currently working in the GTA program and look for ways to build bridges between current best practices and the vision for the new curriculum. So, it'll be a busy May and June for the campus community to still be involved in this process. Now of the semesters done going to be done, finals will be done, writing completed, and then as part of our responsibility to contribute to the Kean community during the month of June when we're still on contract. We'll be asking for further involvement. I hope that serves as a sufficient preview. of where we're headed.

Chair: So, do you think you might have some courses that you will offer in the fall under this new program or that will be too soon?

Senator: Oh, there will be. I mean, it all needs to go through the curricula. process, as Laura mentioned, that there's a procedure. Our hope is that there might be something like a course outline or two that further details, the curriculum.

Senator: I can jump in here for Rachel a bit. I chair the subcommittee of logistics for this group. So, I know that we don't like Rachel said we haven't put anything through the governance process yet to be able to fully offer. But we have, however, started to integrate elements of this into existing courses. So, for example, g 85. That's of course that we can start to look at some of these anchor texts and work out some of these topics that we're talking about. Right? So quantitative reasoning, trying to think of all the other we have a million of these that we're trying to really, I should say millions, we have a good set of them, probably like 20 of them that we're trying to narrow it down. And make sure that we hit so this came from

feedback that we received after March 16 in all of our college meetings. So, an experiential component making sure these are inquiry base. So, all of those pillars that we're talking about, we're really trying to get that settled for the fall of 23. So, we can continue to build off of that. When we develop the curriculum more fully. I do Rachel is back today.

I just want to just address a couple of the points that were mentioned. And I want to start by first thanking Rachel for her exemplary leadership, straddling both of these positions of being the GE Task Force chair, and also chair of the G committees. He's doing a phenomenal job and I want everyone to recognize that because she truly has put in hundreds of hours. So, thank you, Rachel. Yes, clapping is necessary here. So, congratulations, Rachel. You're doing a wonderful job. And the whole committee as well has really been throwing themselves into this work. In terms of, you know, feedback and inclusion. That's pretty much the basis of everything we have been doing for the last several months is trying to you know, we started the committee by identifying who we believe are the key players to be at that point in time right. And have since invited the entire university community to be a part of this. So not just from academics, but nonacademic areas, which will be impacted by this as well. Career Services. They've jumped in and started to help flesh this idea out a little bit more fully. But that's really where we're asking for everyone.

If you or your colleagues or constituents would have vital information to help us work this idea out. Let's do that. And then we will have something that we can present to the UCC for approval. And is that more fully fleshed out? idea you're talking about? So, I appreciate that. And that is we're in route to that. We first wanted to introduce the idea to the community and elicit that help, right? If we got to and we really want to revamp GE but we're not sure what to do. We would have been criticized in that regard. So, we wanted to have an idea. In terms of looking at alternative proposal. We've spoken with the provost about this. And really, we know what works. We have the evidence on our site for that. We know what the goals of university are. So, it did not seem I don't I don't want to say not worthwhile because it certainly is always worthwhile to explore all of our options. But it wasn't prudent for us at this time. Working with the timeline that we have to go through and say this won't work. For this reason. This won't work for this reason. We truly in our heart of hearts believe this is the way to go. And we have the evidence to back that up. So, it's not just a feeling it's a fact. Right. And then in terms of due diligence, again, that just goes back to everything. I was just saying. Get yourself included, be a part of these conversations, fill out the surveys we've sent out we continue to look at the surveys and see what people are saying we've already gone back and adjusted our model. Rachel Kelly rivers, I believe this for public consumption knowledge anyway, we don't have it here today. But we've started to incorporate the feedback we all across all colleges kept hearing. We need me to do courses in the first year we need our students to be engaged in that first year. So, we went back to the drawing board we really worked it. So, there are two major facing courses in the first year. And again, in year two where students are getting to do that exploration. They're able to feel out what works for them or prepare them for that major that they know they want to have later. So, keep it coming. Tell us what you're thinking and we'll certainly do our best to incorporate everything.

Chair: I guess we will continue to have this discussion. I did not fill out the form

because I do not just have enough just have enough So, perhaps if there is a little bit more detailed information, then I'm not a G faculty, but I could if there was something more detail than I could provide because we asked Okay, so that's where if we had developed that particular course, with the new thinking, I could have commented a little bit more. So how the current program will be incorporated into the new if I see some details. I can comment on it. I really do not know how that will fit into the new program. Like I said, I'm thinking in terms of product development from a marketing perspective, I really just see the concept, I do not even see a prototype. So, if I see a prototype, I will give you some feedback. And I was hoping that GE 2021 might be the first course that could be developed into this new system.

Senator: Yeah, so definitely I'd give her an example Rachel is referring to that's exactly what we hope that to do to try to flesh the idea out a little bit more for people so it's not as abstract maybe as it is right now. And you have something a little more concrete to hang on to and provide feedback on and get people excited. To get involved. Do we need that engagement? Right, thank you.

Senator: And thanks to everybody that have been working on this. I was just taking a look at all of the wonderful citations on the GE Task Force website. And you know, I'm you know, I think they show a lot of important perspectives on curriculum development. But my question is, is there any documentation on how other universities have taken on this challenge? And what that might look like that might help me to be able to see things more clearly everything that you have cited on the website, I see as valuable resources for, you know, pedagogy and curriculum development that is active and learner based, which I know is part of your goal. But, again, I'm having a hard time seeing what you want to do. And if there is another university that may have done something at least somewhat similar. It might help me to conceptualize where you're going.

Senator: I'll just piggyback on what you were saying. Robin and Rachel, I wonder if you could provide an example from a degree or two what the freshman year or even the first three semesters would look like I think that's the kind of thing I'd suggest. Correct me if I'm wrong I was looking for so that we had various disciplines what will happen to the freshman year for the first three semesters, a lot of the concepts are very wonky and very compelling some of them but I think some of us particularly in the more specialized disciplines like music Rachel, I'm sure you're paying attention to this as well. Like what will a progression a year look like? Even if it's not a complete that but it's nice to see, for example, you know, what does the curriculum sheet look like for a theater degree for the first year and a half under this, even if it's not exactly but just something to narrow so we can see what we would be advising on and also we could then start to critique in more detail as the chapter was alluding to how this will unfold for our students.

Senator: Right? Yes. So, we had done quite a few. Robin had done quite a few grids with degree programs to prove how they would work within the 15 plus 15 model that we've talked about on March 16. But since the feedback came in from the college specific meetings, we're currently working with what, for better lack of a better term we're calling wealth of wealth plus, so that the first three semesters include 12 credits of GE, both credits of GE in semester two, and 6 credits of GE

and semester three, and we'll be prepared to show examples of those grids of how that 12 plus 12 plus 6 model might work. During the GE constituent meetings that I mentioned earlier. And there's a specific meeting that's going to be scheduled for the arts programs specifically so we'll be able to address some of that during that conversation.

Senator: Rachel had your back math, don't worry. She's been talking about theater and music and all of those specialty kinds of programs in New York College and then we've met with the other colleges and heard about similar things from architecture and design. And then the science is also needing certain things in that first year.

Chair: So, like I said, we went back to the drawing board and have something to present everyone shortly. Great, and that's why I said I would like to see at least an example of one completely developed course, because that's what I'm saying. It's a prototype of something of the rest of the process. And then I can compare with the existing GE program to say okay, this is substantially improved. The other thing that in our department, we were discussing, one of our students are working and I know there is experiential component to all of this, how much does it how many visits are involved, and how does it impact their balance between school and work? For example, this semester, I think Wednesday was a Monday schedule. And lots of students have a major problem with that, because early in the beginning of the semester, they have planned their class schedule and during the class schedule, they didn't plan for Wednesday to be a Monday. You'll see what I'm saying. And that becomes a big problem. And if we have planned trips, etc. I think it really needs to be considered because our students are also working. A lot of them are working. Senator: We're, you know, we're thinking that it's 2, maybe 3 trips per semester. So, we're not talking about every single week, and the trips would happen during the class time. So, the student is part of the morning program with the new program. They would they would take the trip in the morning on the days when their classes scheduled and be back to campus or able to go to work by the time the class is done, right so that they're think about it more like block scheduling experience in some K-12 scenarios.

Senator: Like Rachel alluding to that actually allows for more flexibility for the students to have, you know, obligations, time for obligations like that family and work and all of those things. Because now they know my morning is filled, I'm taking class, whether that's on campus or somewhere else, you know, during these hours, so I can't work during that time, like someone's going to pick up my kids, whatever it is, and they can pick that for themselves. We're not going to force anyone into a morning schedule when they work a morning job. That's not the idea. Just to piggyback on this to not all of these experiences may take place off campus we have to we have a plethora of resources at our fingertips right here on campus, from which we can leave really valuable experiences for the students. So, we're looking at that to where those sites will be, and giving students that flexibility to work with what they have, right? Whether that's they might be an online student, so we've got to think about that component of it, right? You're creating virtual experiences, students with special needs, you know, whether that's physical or whatever, we have to be able to get them from place to place. So, all of those things are being taken into consideration as we're planning. But again, feedback is always

great. If you've got some hidden treasure or something in your area. Let us know about that. And that might be a great visit for us.

Chair: okay, we can move on to the next item we have. One has additional questions. So, we have Adam Eckert and Patricia Trainor. They are co-chairing the Committee on adjunct faculty and they would like to share the preliminary results. The final report will be put together and presented in September, just like all of us. It's been a busy time and they didn't get around to presenting getting the final report done.

Adam Eckart : Thank you very much I am an assistant professor in exercise science. here with my colleague, Pat Traynor. from marketing, adjunct professor. So, as I said, we are representing the committee the ad hoc committee on faculty needs. So, these are preliminary results, they are not comprehensive. So, take it as such, and do the best we can in providing detail provided you have any specific questions. So, as with any research question, or research endeavor, we have we started with the question, what is the adjunct faculty experience at Kean University and what can be done to support their success for the betterment of our students and the university's rising reputation? So, we sought this line of questioning with falling perspectives. We wanted to determine the faculty familiarity with can university resources, identify their time needs and priorities, understand their assignment and teaching experience, areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction while working at Kean University. So pretty. That's kind of what informed the build out of the survey. I do want to acknowledge too we worked in concert with about six or seven other faculty members and I don't want to exclude them. But again, these are just preliminary. So, we had a 43% response rate, which is just great for 394 out of 900. So, we believe that we have good representative sample here. So quick summary of our strengths, the overall satisfaction of the Agile experience is relatively high. kind of break that down in a few minutes. The weaknesses here, this fact satisfaction with technology, training, support, sense of lack of respect and recognition. There's a short time window between course assignment, access to the LMS and the start of the semester. There're two different windows there. So, opportunities that we can kind of pull from these results. pedagogical training, full time faculty mentoring proving preparedness for upcoming semesters and improving the awareness of university support resources.

Pat Traynor: This is a good summary. It was in casual conversation with the adjuncts that I work with that they were just pleased overall to be asked for feedback, which I think kind of introduced in I think it shows itself in the response rate.

Adam Eckart: Absolutely. So, I suppose we'll get to questions. Maybe after this is just going to be very quick. So hopefully we'll get the questions later. Alright, so again, this is just very quick. This is nuts and bolts. So, this first one is about overall satisfaction. So, if we combined the first two categories here extremely satisfied and satisfied, we have about 72% rate of overall satisfaction. That leaves obviously room for improvement, which we know but we were pleased to find out that the experience by and large was pretty good. So, this next piece was about this item was about their experiences preceding information on resources, right so I just highlighted some of the largest absolute values. So, some of those being LMS.

Sorry, in this case, lowest absolute value is LMS. secretarial support, access to teaching materials such as chalk and whiteboard markers and basic office supplies, teaching supplies, and interaction with full time faculty in the department. Any other comments? Am I missing anything?

Pat Traynor : No. This was really about their onboarding and their first experience after being hired.

Adam Eckart: Yeah, this should also come with a caveat that that we were wearing. I jumped with all different varying levels of experience. So, it's possible that some of these adjuncts were here for a long time and LMS was not, you know, it was not necessarily ubiquitous thing on campus. So, obviously, they would answer that they didn't get that, that information. Right. So, we do have to kind of copy on some of these, some of these findings a little bit, but I think the overall themes are still present. They're still there. And so again, we'll continue to flush those out. So here are just some comments there. There was a qualitative aspect to the previous question. So, some of the comments were very minimal assistance when started. Some of the orientations I guess were either in person or zoom, and but they weren't filmed so they couldn't go back and follow along. I received extensive support from my direct supervisor and no one else. I received no formal onboarding or on anything listed. Okay, so the, I guess these would represent some of the more adverse experiences right certainly don't encapsulate

Pat Traynor: overall, we were seeing 70% overall satisfied with their experience. This was when we prompted them to think about their orientation in that first semester. This is some of the feedback we got.

Adam Eckart: Yeah, so obviously, we're looking for gaps. We're going to, focus on some of the negatives here. Alright, so this one went to importance, right. So personal importance. So again, I just highlighted the highest absolute values here. First one is courses offered to teach are in my expertise, so choice, basically, their input. So, into the teaching schedule, this might refer to class times and such. teaching assignments are often a timely matter. That's a big issue. I think we all can, can relate to that feeling of being valued by the university. That was a big theme as well throughout any other commentary.

Pat Traynor: No, I think those were the things that were most important to them.

Adam Eckart : So, the next one was about basically dissatisfaction with satisfaction with those previous items. So again, highlighting the highest absolute values here 26% To satisfaction training to improve teaching 25 for technology support and 30 for technology training. So, we kind of looked at the differences, the broadest differences in importance versus satisfaction. So, the first one courses offered and their expertise, we had pretty wide gap there almost 20 points. teaching assignments offer in a timely matter. Why got there 72 versus 41. And oddly, sport 57 versus 20. And training 41 versus 50. So, these were represented the largest gaps in importance versus satisfaction.

Pat Traynor: And I'll just add, and I think we have some data on this in a bit. I

think with the transition from Blackboard to Canvas looming. That was really top of mind for the adjuncts. The fact that the window of time for when we're notified of our assignment and first day of class, and now on top of that is the transition to Canvas. I think that's why this was really top of mind for so many of the respondents.

Adam Eckart: Yeah, the important thing to know is that the adjuncts that we reached out to were, were current, right, so we're not reaching out to adjuncts who hadn't taught in a few semesters, these were these were current within the last Okay, the next item, please indicate your agreement and disagreement following dealing with technology. So again, with 44% I can count on someone to help me and if I need assistance, we technology support very low, so less than half. Pretty for LMS. Right? So, 51% Agree 22% Disagree. By the way, these don't add up to 100 because we had some in between categories here but we only included the ones that the people are just sort of gaps in differences here. This just goes to the gaps, right? So, you have the gap between getting your teaching assignment and receiving access to LMS and your rosters and such so 57% received their teaching assignment, four weeks or more from the start of the next semester. But basically, the remainder, right 43 plus percent, were within four weeks of getting their teeth, their teaching assignment. So, knowing what course they're going to teach for that semester. So pretty high percentage there.

Pat Traynor: And I can just add from my own experience, we are generally asked if we're available for a particular course or a particular discipline or subject, so we can begin to think about it or maybe if we've taught it before, however, on until it works. Through an HR process for contracts and approval by each of the college deans' offices is this window of time where we do not have our names in cane wise, which therefore means we don't have access to in past Blackboard and going forward, Canvas and simple syllabus without our name officially in the system. Our hands are tied. We can do some of our own work behind the scenes, but nothing can be populated into simple syllabus or the LMS until our name is officially populated into I guess Kean Wise.

Adam Eckart: Yeah, that of course assignment, as we all know kind of triggers that

Pat Traynor: once your name is published, then then we have access to everything but prior to that we can do some work on our own but our hands are really tied on any of the systems. The response here, this three to four-week window is when we see our name and we are authorized to access the systems.

Adam Eckart: Right, exactly. So, this next slide kind of speaks to that over 40% Within two weeks, receiving access to simple syllabus, LMS and rosters and so on. So, this really speaks to kind of time and given for preparedness. You know, especially if there's a new course and right.

Pat Traynor : Enrollment is not meeting threshold. That's understandable why the delays are such.

Adam Eckart: Exactly. Yeah. I mean, we understand sort of why that is and it's for

very practical reasons, but it helps sort of emphasizing and providing some, some numbers to it. Okay, so this speaks to sort of assistance at the local level, whether it's the school or academic program, right is assistance with teaching available to you 29 Say yes. All the time, or 35% Say yes, sometimes. Not a lot of adjuncts seek assistance necessarily. If they do sometimes, was it helpful? That's when we kind of see the values drop off a little bit. So perhaps it's a time issue. We can probably speculate for days on some of the reasons and they're going to, they're going to vary by college by economic unit, and so forth. We're just providing the raw data here. on Audible, are you with each of the five resources again, so this is sort of how our how prepared are adjuncts are in helping our students locate and use resources so, don't know about the resource's students aren't going to know about the resources. 32% not knowledgeable when it comes to career services for students 31% related to LMS chemists. Again, there's other values here. For the sake of time, we're just abbreviating and just focusing on the learning issues. Okay, readiness for the transition to canvass exclusively. 37% are ready, so just over 1/3 And then we ask questions about, you know, what kind of training was going to be helpful? So, the large percent said, online tutorials, it's fine. 26% say face to face, and so forth. We can speculate that the 26% Those are individuals that possibly, you know, are savvy or maybe need a little bit more help in which case face to face makes sense. So basically, basically the takeaways here are the themes are support including recognize support with Canvas and other tech training include faculty members in collaborative efforts, overall input overall more information sharing bringing them in to the fulltime goings on so to speak and recognize earlier teaching assignments and access to LMS and so forth. Again, we're making it sound easy. This is the problem we should now fix it. That's not the case.

We understand that there are some significant barriers here, but it helps kind of again, putting it on the record, putting it in terms of numbers and so forth. And again, this going forward, we may need to do a little an interview, possibly maybe a focus group or something like that. If we want to want to go into depth to there were a lot of comments, qualitative comments that we couldn't really add to this presentation, but that could be informative. We all know too that if you if you give employees the opportunity to sort of vent their frustrations and complaints they're going to do so as well. So, there's, there's, I'm sure a lot of really, really important comments in there, as well. So, we have to we have to sift through that. But again, a focus group or something along those lines might be a little more helpful. So, appreciate everyone listening. This is pretty much all we have. Do you have any questions? We'll do our best to answer.

Senator: Oh, that's fine. We can go in any order. My more comments, questions. So, I'm really happy to see that 38% of the folks are really looking for some kind of online option. We have a lot of times of Canvas training. We have a lot of online options from tutorials to actually online live webinar trainings. We've we have had some number of adjuncts come to those trainings. But it's been difficult because I don't have a contact for them. So those who come have come to the dean, I send reminders to the Deans and the dean send reminders to their faculty and that's what nicely for some people. I would love to work with somebody to figure out a way to really get the list of courses that are available and the options out to faculty so they can really take advantage of it. It's also great news to hear that about 1/3 don't think they are ready for Canvas. That's awesome. Even if they feel that way there I think there's still some supports we can give to them. So, I'd love for all faculty to give

those details. We are looking to try to train anyone who's already hired by King by the end of June 30. That would be great. And so, if you can connect me up with folks, that would really help. Let's see, was there anything else I needed to say? I think that's the key ideas. I don't know if that I think it addresses it really speaks very strongly to a lot of the ideas you know, we've been working to, you know, get the information out. But with, you know, right now, without having that contact information. We're not reaching everybody. That's the challenge.

Pat Traynor: I would add to that. I think the continuation of offering all the Canvas courses is going to be really helpful. That the key is going to be the adjuncts if it is that three to four-week window of when they are assigned to their course. June will be a good overview of canvas of how to get ready. But until that assignment, actually is official, they're not going to be able to load a new Canvas course until four weeks before the start of the semester. So, I think we have to think about both of those windows.

Senator: Yeah, no, I've actually had conversations about them. And let me tell you some of the things that have happened related to that. One thing is we've talked to those departments and said look, if you can give us the adjunct information that you know, every year that teaching for you and they're coming back, let's get them in our system and we're going to set up their shells so that they're ready. I've asked people to try to see whether we can set up even if somebody is not teaching a next semester, if somebody is excited and wants to create a shell, and so they haven't put any semester they teach the course. I think that's a good idea. And if you Patricia can add more maybe power to that kind of comments. I agree with you. We don't want to put anyone in a position that they can play around, and even as a full-time faculty member, I'm going to get some of my shows ready for like spring semester. Well, maybe I teach it every three semesters and I'm just going to want to get it. Ready now. And I think it's just affording the adjunct professor that the same rights and privileges in that way and doesn't mean that we're necessarily because they're afraid if we don't hire you, you know, we don't have the need, then you're going to be upset. But I wonder if we can work around that and maybe Patricia you and I can contact some more people and think about know getting that there for you creating that kind of opportunity.

Pat Traynor: Yeah, I'm happy to do that because I think the message of Did you know you could create a shell even before you're officially have access to Canvas for a particular course and that it will stay stored and you can of course copy it. When in the future you are also assigned to the course I even think that message would be helpful.

Senator: I mean, it's not hard as long as we can do it, you know with it without having the union sorry, I didn't mean to cut.

Adam Eckart: Anyway, I think these numbers go much higher. If there is a university wide effort to disseminate some of this information, just even just if it was an email, Hey, here's what you can do. I'm not I'm not going down the rabbit hole of solutions here but if there was a higher percentage of adjunct faculty who knew about these things, I think you'll see all these numbers improve. I think it's just a matter of where to go. To find out this information. It would be helpful if it

was sort of given to them here it is, but it right in front of them. And now there might be some perception that that's already happening. And that might be the case. But, you know, the results of the survey basically suggest that there's an issue with you know, they don't know what to ask for if they ask someone they don't know. So, there's there seems to be some fragmentation with General Resources, general information of where to go, some sort of navigation center of some kind, because we do offer a lot of these things through CTL and but I guess it's a matter of knowing, right? So, if you don't know, you don't know what you don't know. Right. So, if these are available, no one knows about it. Then it's like they're not available. Senator: Starting last summer in the fall starting in the fall. They have an online onboarding system. And we have quizzes at the end of the system that kind of point out the important things we wanted people to notice. So, for example, in the CTL, one of the questions is where can you find out what kind of courses are listed? So, I don't know who the faculty you're reaching. But if you were reaching people who were just hired last semester, for sure, that kind of already began to change the first semester they had like a narrative that they would write. But when I did redo the course, I really tried to use those questions to make sure as faculty focused on those key pieces of information. So maybe when you rerun the survey, hopefully you'll get a little bit different data with the changes in the onboarding. But we're going to revise over the summer the onboarding for the next round. And I would love it if you and Adam and Tad would be involved and you can take a look at that onboarding, online training, and make any suggestions and improvements that we could make that would be great.

Adam Eckart: Are these Is this a requirement? No, it's not.

Senator: They get paid. They get paid \$75 If they finish it, I think

Pat Traynor : I took that.

Senator: Did you take this one or the one before? No, I

Pat Traynor: took the old the former version? One. Yes, it helped me a little I don't think it really gave me a sense of now that I am teaching a college level course. I think that is the probably the orientation that really requires some sort of a conversation with someone.

Senator: Let's do it. Let's just plan and we'll pick a date in June and we can sit down you can look at what it is and you can

Chair: Sorry to interrupt. But we are coming close. Joy had a hand up and then I want to wrap up with some of the points that I wanted to make.

Joy Moskovitz: Thank you. So, all first-time adjuncts are required to complete the online orientation. And upon successful completion, they are compensated the \$75 all adjuncts receive a welcome letter with their contract. So, this information has been very helpful where we can redirect adjuncts so that they have more points of reference, I think a lot of adjuncts miss the fact that the syllabus, simple syllabus template is a resource for them as well. So that a lot of the information on student resources is built into the simple syllabus but again, I want to thank Adam and

Patricia for their work on this. This is vitally important and really can help inform us as we go forward, especially as we're refining a lot of the work that we're doing and if we can provide more help and resources to support our adjunct population, we definitely want to do that. Thank you very much.

Chair: Last point that we kind of went towards this LMS and simple syllabus, but one other finding was that as your faculty don't feel valued, and that is something that we need to try to address that we kind of didn't talk about that but sometime during the summer we will share final report with you and come back to the Senate and present the final findings once we dig deeper into the results given that we had 43% response rate. Thank you everyone. Then I just want to inform everyone about the meeting that Dr. Purcell had last week, but the college curriculum chairs and the department curriculum chairs, and this was a follow up to the meeting that he had with the Senate. I think it was the Senate exam. And then we had passed some resolution on the course gaps that the administration shouldn't raise the course gaps unilaterally. Right before the start of the semester. We had discussions about the i-sections, even though we didn't pass a resolution but we have been discussing that we need to stop the practice of ice sanctions. And then I had a meeting with Dr. Birdsell and Dr. Salento sometime in December, saying maybe this all surrounds this issue of courses could we come up with global resolution on these issues? And then they talked about so had raised the issue that we need to raise course caps, because financially we cannot support the current course gaps. And in different courses that are different course gaps and so on and so forth. And that's when I have invited him to talk to the departments because the Senate cannot really change the course gaps. He explained to the department, the department curriculum chairs, and I think that is going to be a document coming from the Provost Office.

Joy Moskovitz: So the discussion that Dr. Birdsell had with the department chairs was not a request to across the board raise all of the course caps but rather for the curriculum chairs to consider the current caps that they have for courses and resolve the fact that there are many courses that have varying caps and to come up with recommendations based on their areas of what would be reasonable Caps based on the information he provided. We can circle back and provide some direction but he did ask for each of the curriculum chairs to be in thinking about what would be reasonable and what would be good outcomes so that we can be more efficient in the courses that we offer and also help with the scheduling process as well and the rooming

Chair: and he said they still have a gorgeous still determines the course gaps, but that we should look and review the course gaps that were said years ago. And when we were having that discussion, I mentioned to him that equity issue that the last time when course gaps were raised. In many departments, faculty were not willing to raise the cost gap. And then what happened for the larger programs, the course caps were raised. And I was just saying to him that I hope that kind of thing doesn't happen. And because then the larger programs, both the faculty and the students get penalized. We also had some slight discussion about teaching assistance being provided to departments, etc. To assist in the classrooms and so on and so forth. I just wanted to keep you posted and as developments happen. Maybe the next year, Senate will pick up this issue, but this is something that is pending. Another thing that will be for the next year will be the ad hoc committee on research and the ad hoc committee on teaching and service. Dina Rosen and Susan

Polirstok are leading the effort on the teaching and service. And Chris Bellitto is leading the effort on research and apparently those committees are working. So hopefully by I think it is March or April, something will come together. And then finally, I do want to thank Rachel. Rachel has been a great representative to the Board of Trustees in representing the interests of the Senate and representing us, well, I was there yesterday and she's really nicely I shared with you her statement. I want to thank all of you that you helped me stay afloat during this year. And I appreciate that very much and you let go of some of the things maybe I didn't know all the procedures of managing a big senate meeting, but you helped me along. And for that, I'm really grateful. The Senate reorganization meeting is on Wednesday, May 17.

Please bring your laptops we are going to walk via Qualtrics so it would be more efficient. It would be in Kane Hall 127 from 10am to 1pm. The Senate elections officially ended yesterday, I emailed the arbitrary American Arbitration Association, but their director of elections was not given today. They didn't send me the certified results. As soon as I get the email from them, which I expect sometime today. That's what they promised. I will forward the email and then also forward the results to all the constituents. Everything in the elections went smoothly, except I didn't expect this delay is beyond my control. But I look forward to the results. I know everyone is waiting anxiously. I'm still looking that the results coming. I didn't get the email. Thank you, everyone, and have a good rest of the week and will see you on Wednesday, May 17.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm

IV. Next Meetings

- A. Full Senate - Reorganization Meeting – May 17, 2023 – Kean Hall, Rm. 127 at 3:15 p.m.