KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING MINUTES
28 OCTOBER 2025 3:20PM-4:20PM. KH 127 [In Person]
Full Senate Meetings: Zoom webinar link Meeting ID: 921 4068 6642; Passcode: 232451

I. Call to Order.

Chair CK Called the meeting to order at 3:23 after congratulating those who have been selected for Presidential Excellence Awards. Distinguished professor Robin Landa was acknowledged for receiving two significant awards: the 2025 Steven Heller Prize for Cultural Commentary from AIGA & induction into the NJ Advertising Hall of Fame. Professor Konyk also noted that the Brazilian SENAI research students and faculty are visiting on campus for the next two weeks and extended a warm welcome to them.

II. Approval of Minutes from the Last Meeting.

Minutes of 10/14/25 [copy enclosed].
Motion to approve Kathy Curran, second Julia Navarez. Unanimous approval.

III. Curriculum Items for Notification and/or Vote.

A. None

IV. President's and/or Provost's Address to the Senate.

(At the President's/Provost's discretion.)
Both the President and Provost are at the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities Annual Conference 2025 in Baltimore, thus no addresses this week.

V. Old Business.

A. Departmental ARTP Documentation Finalization Update – The documents prepared by departments will be returned to the departments and ARTP committees for a final review. CK asks Senators to alert their respective departmental ARTP committees

B. Writing Emphasis Committee Q and A – Chair Konyk welcomed Drs. Christopher Friend and Lisa Sisler, Co-Chairs of the Writing Emphasis Committee to address some lingering questions and suggestions (see summary items below; i.-vi.) from the Senate suggestion box.

i. No limit on number of pages.
ii. AI suggestion – partially cut off by limitations of form. CK will reach out to author.
iii. Needs of Hennings College science departments require different styles of writing than the document describes.
iv. Assessment section missing.
v. Scientific writing versus creative writing.
vi. Course goals and course caps need to be realistic. Rationale for cap of 25 not provided.

Actual Suggestions from the Senate website for WE Course Designations are added post-meeting below:
1/ I do not recommend having a limit on the number of pages that a student needs to write for a particular course. In fact, I would recommend that we revisit "writing emphasis" in the era of AI. Could we do effective communication instead? What if we ask students to write on a topic and present it? This way we know that they are not submitting something straight out of ChatGPT.
2/ Very concerned about the writing emphasis document as it doesn't address the needs of Hennings College Science Departments where we do technical writing including data graph illustrations in lab

reports and do not require a certain number of pages. Additionally, short of having students in class in person write in a blue book how to encourage no plagiarism or inappropriate use of AI. Furthermore, the document lacks plans for assessment of the program.
3/ Please work with the WE committee to make sure all aspects of writing are covered in the WE designation. Scientific writing is different from creative writing and must be accounted for. Also, please create realistic goals in terms of course cap and credits for faculty teaching WE course. 1/ Writing Emphasis Caps: The proposal requires 25 as a cap (up from 20). No rationale/criteria are given Kean has many at-risk students, who benefit more from extra support/feedback. With more students, faculty will give less feedback, which will result in less learning and higher DFWs in ENG 1025/1030.
4/ Writing Emphasis cap for Capstone courses: Does the cap of 25 apply to senior level capstone courses? If yes, this proposal must be modified.
5/ In the Writing Emphasis proposal, the phrase "under the guidance of the provost" (III.1) should be deleted. No ex-officio member should have that much control over a faculty senate committee.
6/ I think a three year wait before any evaluation is done is too long — it needs to be done after year 1 and 2 and both students and professors must be asked about the course.

Dr. Friend addressed the variations of writing based on discipline, referring to Policy Section II *"WE courses are:"* bullets 1 and 3. The proposal requests that there be a single course for each major that teaches students writing for that specific major. Regarding course caps – there is no research in writing studies that directly addresses course caps. The closest his research found was a cap of 25-27. The 4 Cs recommends 18-20 in a writing emphasis course, but the recommendation is not supported by data. Regarding page count, Section III 1. Volume, the italicized segments suggest flexibility, noting too, that the writing is not all meant to be graded assignments, but practice in creating written content, some of which is graded.
CK offered the senators the opportunity to ask questions. DC asked about the *"WE courses are:"* section, writing being process-based, noting that the introduction of process will vary by discipline and faculty will need training. Dr. Sisler explained that there are training opportunities relating to writing process for faculty who may need instruction or refreshment. Dr. Friend provided examples of an imagined process for science, noting that process might simply mean anything that takes place in editing or revising the work.
DC spoke about the Capstone course in Literary Studies, which has a cap of 15. He expressed that numbers beyond 15 in this course have an impact on the dynamics of the course. He asks why a hard cap is needed, asking for a rationale, based on experience with student success in smaller classes. Dr. Friend refers to Best Practices for Student Writing, noting that early and regular feedback leads to better outcomes and final products. Acknowledging the labor-intensive process of assessing writing, he suggests that perhaps the union would wish to weigh in on the TCH for a writing course. MN recalled an earlier time when WE courses were required in the major, capped at 25, but SH and TCH were 4 cr.

GV expressed concern about cap. She taught writing elsewhere (public and private) prior to coming to Kean. At the private university, the cap was 15. At the public university, the cap was 25-30. Dr. Sisler pointed to the 25-student max, suggesting that departments may have some flexibility in that determination. HL questioned that, though there is little or no data regarding caps and writing classes, there is ample research about smaller sizes generally resulting in better student success and pass rates. MM shared that caps are smaller in the Chem Dept due to lab spaces available, also noting that writing in the sciences do not follow APA, MLA or other stylistic formats that are common in other disciplines. He suggests that students learn the writing style of their discipline earlier. Dr. Sisler offers the possibility of ENG 1030 being structured like Research & Tech, albeit, by college. Dr. Friend supported this notion. MA suggests that focusing on the outcomes (assessment) and whether DFW research can result in students being assigned to a section based on their potential or their baseline skill level. MA also commented on the past practice of developmental courses hurting students in the long run based on the slowing of progress toward completing the degree. Charles Nelson affirmed that smaller class sizes allow the faculty to provide a greater level of feedback, pointing to research about at-risk students who depend on attention and close feedback. CN also asked about the Provost's involvement in this process, as it seems to be solely a Faculty Senate issue. CK thanked the Co-Chairs for their presentation and the senators for their participation in this discussion.

VI. New Business.

A. Kean IT update – Greg Belotti, SVP of IT and Facilities – CIO-SCIO was invited to speak, having asked to return to the senate to answer remaining questions.

VP Belotti clarified that advising should be done in Navigate (office hours, appointments, reviewing student profiles) not Keanwise. He also reminded all about the various faculty training opportunities, highlighting the poor participation (only 3 faculty attending), and encouraged all faculty to seek any training needed.

Top 4 items being worked on in the migration:

1. Registration opened today – 3600 students were able to register. As of this moment over 40% had done so.
2. Student record errors reduced significantly.
3. Contracts and how that process can be improved (adjunct contracts for example).
4. Student evaluations.

There are 438 other issues that IT is working on. When we get into one system the progress will be evident.

DA asked about Robert Busch School situation on the registration site– specifically the Industrial Design program having no tab for course selection for registration. It is not clear where IT and the Registrar intersect – who is responsible for the problems. She provided an example of students who've graduated receiving emails about advisement.

GDR noted that too many changes were made at the same time, resulting in confusion.

BLee shared an experience training new faculty (who have 75 advisees), having to jump from one platform to another for various aspects (petitions, course selection, timeline). Senators each spoke about Ellucian, Keanwise, and Navigate, illustrating this point.
GV explained the processes associated with the multiple platforms in a single advisement session.
DA expressed that there are two issues at play – content being incorrect and process being ineffective.
JN asserted that training is the bottom line, suggesting a presentation and a glossary of terms.
VP Belotti shared that he learned more about the challenges advisors are facing, and he expressed a sincere desire to solve these issues.

Actual Suggestion from the Senate website for K-IT discussion are added post-meeting below:
1/ I'm concerned about the IT changes on what constitutes a "Research account" and "Research computer", and software listed as approved/non-approved. I was informed that IT has set up for me and my research students "Research accounts" without explanation or justification on how these accounts will be used. Note that research students change by semester to semester, but IT has denied a creation of one Lab account for safety issues to access research computers for example.

VII. Committee Reports.

A. See above under Old Business.

Notice(s) of Motion.

Motions on Committee Designations and Reports.
JN made a motion to close the WE conversation. MN seconded. DC indicated that closing the discussion seems premature based on the comments expressed during the meeting. NR Parliamentarian clarified that the motion to close opens the voting, which will include a yes, or an option to send the policy back to the committee.
The results of the Qualtrics Anonymous Voting are (see below):
Vote to Approve WE Course Designation Document in its submitted form:

YES - 11
NO (Return for Revisions) - 10
ABSTAIN - 2

Thus, Vote to Approve WE Course Designation Document in its submitted form is APPROVED.

VIII. Question/Discussion Period.

Open further discussion on Agenda items. (Time Permitting) – none.

IX. Adjournment MM motioned, BS seconded. All approved adjournment at 4:27

X. Upcoming Meetings

A. Senate Executive Committee – 10/21/25 In Person; Room J-302 + Zoom. 3:20pm

KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING MINUTES
28 OCTOBER 2025 3:20PM-4:20PM. KH 127 [In Person]
Full Senate Meetings: Zoom webinar link Meeting ID: 921 4068 6642; Passcode: 232451

B. Full Senate Meeting – 10/28/25 Kean Hall 127 & Zoom Webinar. 3:20pm
C. The complete meeting schedule for the fall semester is available at: https://www.kean.edu/offices/university-senate/meeting-schedule-2025-2026-executive-committee-and-full-senate

Senators in attendance

1	Mukul Acharya [MA]	P
2	Craig Anderson [CA]	P
3	Denise Anderson [DA]	P
4	Billie Bailey [BB]	P
5	Norma Bowe [NB]	P
6	Dean Casale [DC]	P
7	Kathleen Curran [KC]	P
8	Gilda DelRisco [GDR]	P
9	Adam Eckart [AE]	P
10	Edward Farnum [EF]	P
11	Gabriel Fuentes [GF]	**
12	Aaron Gubi [AG]	E
13	Will Heyniger [WH]	A
14	Ipek Kocoglu [IK]	E
15	Craig Konyk [CK]	P
16	Barbara Lee [BLee]	P
17	Brenna Levine [BL]	P
18	Holly Logue [HL]	P
19	Patrick McManimon [PMcM]	P
20	Matthew Mongelli [MM]	P
21	Mahchid Namazi [MN]	P
22	Julia Nevarez [JN]	P
23	Raza Rafique [RR]	P
24	Nicole Rodriguez [NR]	P
25	Benito Sanchez [BS]	P
26	Galia Shokry [GS]	P
27	Dawn Smith-Jeffries [DSJ]	P

KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING MINUTES
28 OCTOBER 2025 3:20PM-4:20PM. KH 127 [In Person]
Full Senate Meetings: Zoom webinar link Meeting ID: 921 4068 6642; Passcode: 232451

28	Zakeeyah Speight [ZS]	**
29	Gail Verdi [CV]	P
30	Veysel Yucetepe [VY]	P

P = Present A = Absent E =Excused [ ] = Proxy * = Late **=Remotely

Student Representatives:

KEAN

FULL SENATE MEETING MINUTES

28 OCTOBER 2025 3:20PM-4:20PM. KH 127 [In Person]

Full Senate Meetings: Zoom webinar link Meeting ID: 921 4068 6642; Passcode: 232451

1	
2	

Guests:

1	Joy Moskovitz
2	Jonathan Mercantini
3	James Castiglione
4	Solman Ahmed
5	Maryanne Gass
6	Robyn Roebuck
7	Greg Belotti
8	Chris Friend
9	Lisa Sisler
10	Charles Nelson
11	Bridie Chapman
12	Catricia Shaw
13	
14	
15	