**New Jersey Presidents’ Council**

**Academic Issues Committee**

January 8, 2021 10:00 a.m.

Zoom Link <https://NJCU.zoom.us/j/93354644426?pwd=QXZNN0laUUF4VGFiVHFLYWpMeFIzZz09>

Meeting ID: 933 5464 4426, Passcode: 05778965

MINUTES

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

**Present by Zoom:**

Sue Henderson, AIC Chair – NJCU

Nurdan Aydin – NJCU

Marsha Pollard – Berkeley College

David Stout – Brookdale Community College

Rafael Castilla – Eastwick College

Chris Capuano – Fairleigh Dickinson University

Joseph Marbach – Georgian Court University

Jeff Toney – Kean University

Robert Schreyer – Mercer County Community College

Linda Scherr – Middlesex County College

Rekha Datta – Monmouth University

Willard Gingerich – Montclair University

Joanne Cote-Bonanno – Montclair University

Basil Baltzis - NJIT

Deborah Preston – Raritan Valley Community College

Roberta Harvey – Rowan University

James (Jim) Burkley – Rutgers University

Jon Connolly – Sussex County Community College

Jennifer Palmgren – TCNJ

Jeffrey Osborn – TCNJ

**Also present by Zoom:**

Jennifer Fitzgerald – NJCU

Allison Samay – NJPC

Eric Taylor – Office of the Secretary of Higher Ed.

1. Approval of Minutes of the December 4, 2020 Meeting

Dr. Connolly moved for approval of the minutes of the December 4, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Toney. Minutes were approved. Dr. Stout, Dr. Baltzis, and Dr. Castilla recused.

1. Report from the Chair
2. Quorum

The AIC manual does not indicate what a quorum is, but attendance is generally high at each meeting.

1. Representation on the AIC By Sector

The Presidents’ Council allows provosts to represent an institution on the AIC. The AIC mimics the same balance the Presidents’ Council maintains between sectors. Both committees try to have representatives from: four to five community colleges, three state colleges/universities, two to three independent institutions, and one from a proprietary institution. Going forward one president from each sector should attend the AIC meetings.

1. New Programs
2. **Berkeley College** 
   1. M.S. in Nursing, CIP 51.3801

First Reader: Roberta Harvey, Rowan University

Second Reader: Rafael Castilla, Eastwick College

Dr. Harvey stated the proposal is extremely detailed and exhibits an exceptional level of due diligence. The institution will seek Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) accreditation for the program. Standard components are adequate in terms of program objectives, design, and assessment of the educational program. The consultant is appropriately qualified and provided a substantive report to which the institution responded. The consultant affirms alignment to the accreditation expectations and the College’s strategic plan. Employment demand analysis is extensive and provides recent data projecting an exponential expansion of demand for nurses holding advanced credentialing. The degree program has two specialization tracks directly related to the demand and emerging trends. There were five letters of support and two letters of objections. One letter of objection suggests an expansion on the proposal. The second letter of objection states the program is duplicative to which the College responded highlighting its unique LPN to BSN pathway. Program objectives are informed by The Essentials of Master’s Education in Nursing. Learning outcomes assessment plans are lengthy and a detailed mapping of program learning objectives to the essentials of nursing is provided. Dr. Harvey recommends the proposal for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Castilla concurred with Dr. Harvey and added it is an excellent program that will give long term opportunities to many underserved students. Dr. Castilla seconded the recommendation to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Dr. Pollard recused.

1. **William Paterson University**
   1. B.A. in Community Development and Social Justice, CIP 44.0201

First Reader: Jeffrey Osborn, The College of New Jersey

Second Reader: Rekha Datta, Monmouth University

Dr. Osborn stated this would be the only standalone program of this type in the state of New Jersey. The program fits within the mission of the institution. The institution does not plan to seek separate accreditation for the program. The consultant was highly qualified and wrote an enthusiastic report recommending approval for the program. The consultant considers the program objectives to be appropriate for today’s social and educational environments. The consultant did not have the detailed evaluation plan available to him, but cited the core competency design balances academic rigor and curricular flexibility. A learning outcomes assessment plan is provided as well as a detailed curriculum map. There will be an ongoing cycle of assessment. After the initial assessment cycle, the program will follow the department’s regular program review cycle. Program review will include both course and program level assessments that will include both direct and indirect measures. The proposal is consistent with the institution’s strategic plan. Although minimal additional resources would be required due to the use of existing faculty forces, the consultant noted the institution would benefit from broadening the diversity of the faculty at the institution and in this potential program. The institution responded to and concurred with the consultant’s main recommendations. Dr. Osborn recommends the proposal for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Datta concurred with Dr. Osborn and added the program is very timely. Dr. Datta seconded the recommendation to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

* 1. B.A. in Ethics, CIP 38.0104

First Reader: Willard Gingerich, Montclair State University

Second Reader: Deborah Preston, Raritan Valley Community College

Dr. Gingerich stated the program provides both academic and practical skills, and is designed to be a standalone or a second major. The consultant is well qualified and presented a very thorough report that was thoughtful and researched. Additionally, it appears the consultant worked closely with the department to make suggestions and recommendations. Comprehensive program objectives are clearly stated and were adjusted to reflect the minor wording changes suggested by the consultant. Most curricular modifications recommended by the consultant were incorporated into strengthening of the course mapping. The program is consistent in every regard with the mission of the institution and speaks to its core values. The proposal does not present market demand data, but the consultant affirms the expectations of the department and points out employment opportunities are possible. Assessment of learning outcomes lacks details and refers very frequently to the use of rubrics, but a sample rubric was not provided. Dr. Gingerich recommends the proposal for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council and suggests sending recommendations to the institution. The second reader Dr. Preston concurred with Dr. Gingerich and added mapping appears to be missing. There are two areas that are not apparent in how they meet the outcomes. Lack of how the program and course outcomes align leave one to question if everything is being met. Dr. Preston seconded the recommendation to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

Action: The AIC *recommends* the following:

1. A more robust description of the learning outcomes assessment plan.

2. Clarify how all rubrics will operate.

3. Ensure all courses are clearly mapped to Ethics.

* 1. B.A. in Leadership & Professional Studies, CIP 30.9999

First Reader: James Burkley, Rutgers University

Second Reader: Jon Connolly, Sussex County Community College

Mr. Burkley summarized the proposal as a flexible program designed to provide returning adult learners the opportunity to build upon prior academic professional learning through a program of study. Students will have the opportunity to demonstrate understanding of skills and competency through completion of courses and prior learning assessment options. Students will receive admissions and advisement support opportunities for prior learning assessment portfolio review and a robust assessment of credit equivalency options. The consultant was well qualified and provided a thorough report. All consultant recommendations were embraced and addressed by the institution. The proposal makes a general reference to other similar programs, but noticeably did not list several established similar programs. The second reader, Dr. Connolly concurred with Mr. Burkley’s summary and added the program is not unnecessarily duplicative. There is a rubric assessment of learning projects, but the assessment plan is overall lacking in terms of detail. The assessment plan does not explain how learning outcomes will be measured and assessed. Additionally, there is no information that details how prior learning assessment will be measured. It would benefit the institution greatly if they refer themselves to Appendix K in the Academic Issues Committee Manual for detailed information concerning the AIC’s expectations for assessment plans when redrafting the assessment plan and curriculum map. It would be best for them to lay out the Institutional Student Learning outcomes expected of all graduates, then how this connects to the Program’s Learning Outcomes, and then the Learning Outcomes at the course level and how they map to the Program Outcomes. Providing an exemplar of the rubrics they intend on using would be very useful to the proposal. Detail around assessing the portfolios is also called for since the portfolios play such a significant role. The AIC can only evaluate what the authors provide so it is imperative the institution show us what they intend to do to engage in this all-important process of formative -and-continuous quality improvement. Both Mr. Burkley and Dr. Connolly recommended the proposal not be forwarded to the Presidents’ Council and be returned to the institution.

Action: The AIC agreed that the proposal be returned to the institution to address the following:

1. Provide a more thorough and detailed assessment plan.
2. Detail how portfolios will be assessed.
3. Provide an exemplar of rubrics that will be used.
4. Other Action Items
5. **Fairleigh Dickinson University** 
   * + 1. B.A. in Hospitality & Tourism Innovation and Excellence, CIP 52.09999

First Reader: Jeff Toney, Kean University

Second Reader: Nurdan Aydin, New Jersey City University

Dr. Toney stated he found it appropriate the institution asked for a waiver for no consultant necessary since this is a conversion. While the institution mentions how many students are in the existing option, it does not really respond to the need for this program. A market analysis was not provided. Although similar programs in the state are listed there is no real comparison of the program. There is only a general statement regarding program resources. Neither a real assessment of faculty needs nor the expertise was provided. Dr. Toney recommends the proposal for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council pending the institution provides updated information to address the areas of concern. The second reader Dr. Aydin concurred with Dr. Toney and noted the name of the program is listed two different ways within the proposal. Though a small amount of enrollment information was listed within the student outreach section, the enrollment plan needs much more detail and clarification. Dr. Aydin seconded the recommendation to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Dr. Capuano recused.

ACTION: The AIC would like the following additional information:

1. Clarify whether title of degree program is Hospitality & Tourism Excellence and Innovation or Hospitality & Tourism Innovation and Excellence.

2. Provide a demand analysis.

3. Clarify the enrollment plan.

4. Provide assessment of faculty resources and expertise.

Please provide the requested information to the AIC by January 14, 2021.

1. **Rutgers University – Camden** 
   * + 1. Conversion of Option to Full Program: M.B.S in Business and Science, Computer and Information Sciences Option **to** M.B.S. in Computer and Information Sciences, CIP 11.0199

First Reader: Basil Baltzis, New Jersey Institute Technology

Second Reader: David Stout, Brookdale Community College

Dr. Baltzis stated the proposal is very well written. The idea of this program is to educate professionals in the essential skills that are relevant to managing cross disciplinary technology base themes especially those in an industrial or corporate setting. There is a very compact and accurate mapping between program objectives, student outcomes, and courses. The institution takes an interesting approach to assessment by evaluating students on projects and providing intervention advisement on both a monthly basis and in the middle of the term depending on the performance of the student. Correspondence between the grades and the rubric used to make sure the outcomes are being reached appears to be lacking. Expected enrollment is very small, but this is not unusual for this type of professional masters. Current students will be given the option to either obtain the new degree or the original degree indicating the Computer and Information Science as an option. Dr. Baltzis recommends the proposal for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Stout concurred with Dr. Baltzis and seconded the recommendation to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Mr. Burkley recused.

VI. For Your Information

1. **Brookdale Community College**

* Degree destination change **from** Health Science Option, Social Science A.A. **to** Health Science Option, Social Science A.S., CIP 45.0101
* New Certificate of Achievement in Women’s and Gender Studies, CIP 24.0101
* New Program Option, Data Science Option in the Mathematics/Science A.S., CIP 30.9999

1. **County College of Morris**
   * + - New Certificate of Achievement in Data Analytics, CIP 30.7101
2. **Fairleigh Dickinson University**
   * + - Nomenclature change **from** Master of Science in Hospitality Management **to** Master in Hospitality Management Studies, CIP 52.0901
3. **Hudson County Community College**
   * + - New Certificate in Culinary Business Innovation, CIP 12.0500
4. **Kean University**
   * + - Degree Designation Change **from** B.A. in Economics **to** B.S. in Economics, CIP 45.0601
5. **Rowan University**
   * + - New Certificate of Undergraduate Study in Global Climate Change, CIP 40.0601
       - New Certificate of Undergraduate Study in Product Development, CIP 14.3601
       - New Certificate in the Anatomical Sciences, 26.04
       - Termination of Certificate of Graduate Study in Engineering for Educators, CIP 13.1309
       - New Program Option, Concentration in eSports within the Bachelor of Arts in Sports Communication & Media, CIP 09.0906
       - Nomenclature change **from** Minor in in Community Health **to** Minor in Public Health & Wellness, CIP 512201
6. **Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences**
   * + - Degree Designation Change and Nomenclature Change **from** Ph.D. in Biomedical Informatics **to** Doctor of Health Informatics, CIP 51.2706
       - Post-Master’s Certificate in Pediatric Acute Care Nurse Practitioner, CIP 51.3809
       - Graduate Certificate in Population Aging, CIP 51.2299
7. **Rutgers University – Camden**
   * + - Graduate Certificate in Modern Financial Technologies, CIP 52.1399
8. **Rutgers University – Newark**
   * + - CIP Code change, B.S. in Management Information Systems **From** CIP 52.1201 **To** CIP 52.1301
       - Change of credit requirements for M.S. in Global Affairs, CIP 45.0901
9. **Rutgers University – Newark and New Brunswick**
   * + - Change of credit requirements for M.S. in Digital Marketing, CIP 52.0208
10. **Rutgers University – New Brunswick**
    * + - CIP Code change, Master of Human Resource Management **From** CIP 52.1001 **To** CIP 52.1301
11. Old Business
12. **AIC Manual Update**

External Consultant Guidelines

The External Consultant Guidelines were refined more. The committee agreed to make a few additional adjustments and send the final version to the Presidents’ Council for approval. Motion was carried.

3 + 1 Program Proposal and Evaluation Criteria

Designated members of the AIC will meet to review the criteria, and both simplify and categorize problems.

1. New Business