**New Jersey Presidents’ Council**

**Academic Issues Committee**

January 21, 2022 10:00 a.m.

Zoom Link   <https://NJCU.zoom.us/j/98060955209?pwd=dS9Ed0daelBtUTZPM1haM1ZKK05xQT09>

Meeting ID: 980 6095 5209, Passcode: 69927551

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

Matthew Whelan – Caldwell University

Rafael Castilla – Eastwick College

Chris Capuano – Fairleigh Dickinson University

David Birdsell – Kean University

Robert Schreyer – Mercer County Community College

Linda Scherr – Middlesex County College

Pamela Scott-Johnson – Monmouth University

Kimberly Hollister – Montclair University

Joanne Cote-Bonanno – Montclair University

Basil Baltzis - NJIT

Deborah Preston – Raritan Valley Community College

Roberta Harvey – Rowan University

David Wolcott – Rutgers University

Jon Connolly – Sussex County Community College

Also present by Zoom:

Jennifer Fitzgerald – NJCU

Eric Taylor - OSHE

Lori Harris-Ransom – OSHE

Donna Rogalski – OSHE

Zaneb Ghanem - OSHE

1. Approval of Minutes of the December 3, 2021 Meeting

Dr. Connolly moved for approval of the minutes of the December 3, 2021 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Birdsell. Minutes were approved.

1. Report from the Chair
2. New Programs
3. **Eastern School of Acupuncture and Traditional Medicine** 
   * + 1. Doctorate in Acupuncture, CIP 51.3301

First Reader: Roberta Harvey, Rowan University

Second Reader: Jon Connolly, Sussex County Community College

Dr. Harvey stated the institution has operated in the State since 1998 and currently offers an accredited Master of Science in Acupuncture. The proposed doctorate exceeds the programmatic mission of the school which appears justifiable in this case because of the credentialing. The move to doctoral level preparation has been has been in process since the organization of the profession in the US in the 1970s and now reflects its stature as a practice based in a system of medicine. Licensure is required to practice and accreditation will be sought from the Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Herbal Medicine. The proposal exhibits clearly stated and sound objectives and principles. Curricular design and plans for assessment appear to be at an acceptable level of development for a program that will be accredited. Demand analysis cites data on physician shortages. Additionally, the demand analysis cites pandemic related declines in the overall healthcare workforce and infers that doctorally prepared acupuncture practitioners will contribute to the overall betterment of health and serve as a component of the healthcare team. There is a credible discussion of existing programs nationwide that demonstrates demand for such programs, while also demonstrating a need in our region that the institution is well positioned to meet. Existing resources are discussed. Necessary investments in faculty and systems and plans to generate revenues through a doctoral student clinic are listed. However, the overall proposal document has several deficiencies, including extraneous material as well as missing required elements. Course numbers are shown in the assessment plan, but no description of the curriculum and degree requirements is presented. A reference is made to a color coded outline of the curriculum showing course sequence credit hours and modes of delivery, but it was not included. There are no enrollment projections and no enrollment data for the existing master’s and certificate programs, nor for the comparable programs. The proposal notes that a consultant has been engaged and their CV is included, but the required consultant report, consultant recommendation, and institutional response to the consultant report were not included. There is a statement that a governing board approved the program, but it is not included. Responses to the program announcement were not included with the proposal. The second reader Dr. Connolly concurred. Both readers agree to send the proposal back to the institution to address the areas of concern and resubmit the proposal. The resubmitted proposal will be evaluated under the old AIC guidelines since the original proposal was submitted prior to December 31, 2021.

**ACTION:** The AIC agreed that the proposal be returned to the institution. The institution is asked to resubmit the proposal and provide the following:

1. Complete information regarding Degree Requirements, including a curricular outline showing the course titles and sequence
2. Enrollment projections
3. Report of the external consultant, including recommendations
4. Institutional response to the consultant report
5. Governing board resolution approving the program
6. Statement confirming that a Program Announcement was circulated for commend and noting whether objections were received
7. Copies of institutional responses if any
8. **Georgian Count University** 
   * + 1. Master of Science in Nursing, CIP 51.3801

First Reader: David Wolcott, Rutgers University

Second Reader: Matthew Whelan, Caldwell University

Dr. Wolcott stated the proposal is clearly aligned with the institution’s mission and benefits the strong existing partnership with Hackensack Meridian Health Network. In terms of duplication there are no direct entry M.S.N. programs in New Jersey. There are thirteen relevant program objectives that are appropriate to the program. The curriculum is sound and meets the requirements of the accreditor CCNE and the New Jersey Board of Nursing. The assessment plan is rigorous and informed by the accreditor and licensing board. Given the national demand for nurses the projection of twenty students per cohort appears reasonable. Faculty will be drawn from existing full time faculty and supplemented by up to two new full time faculty members and a number of adjunct professors. A full time faculty member will be provided 25% release time to serve as a program director. Facilities are adequate and the institution has allocated resources to renovate an existing space into a skills lab although the consultant’s report mentioned allocated funds to construct a new building. The consultant is qualified and performed a site visit in November 2021. The consultant recommended approval the program and has no comments or requests for modifications. Dr. Wolcott recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Whelan concurred and seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

1. **Montclair State University** 
   * + 1. B.A. in Urban Humanities, CIP 45.1201

First Reader: Linda Scherr, Middlesex County College

Second Reader: Matthew Whelan, Caldwell

Dr. Scherr stated through partnerships with local nonprofits and other entities the proposal is complete and lays out the case for offering the program. The program is consistent with the three pillars of the institution’s strategic plan. With regards to duplication there are eight other urban studies programs in the metropolitan region, but William Paterson University’s program is the one most similar to this proposal. The curriculum appears logically sequenced. There is an assessment plan that is informed by the goals of the institution’s Academic Issues Committee and Middle States Commission on Higher Education standards. The assessment template shows that there are three program learning outcomes, and each of them is assessed in just one of the three urban humanities courses. The course matrix indicates that all three student learning outcomes are met in each of the three courses, but they’re only assessed in one course. In terms of need the program provides preprofessional preparation for working a variety of fields. Labor market data is not cited. Student enrollment projections are adequate. The proposal notes that no additional resources are required for the major so no budget information is included. The institution has a depth of core faculty and existing courses along with a digital media co-lab that will also support the program. The consultant met the AIC guidelines for a reviewer and provided a report that clearly responds to the AIC requirements. The report did not explicitly reference a virtual campus visit, but there are references to indicate he met with stakeholders. The consultant found the proposal to be outstanding and believes the program will produce highly marketable graduates for public service, non-profit and corporate sectors. Per the consultant, a signature strength of the program is the core faculty. Overall the consultant recommends the program be approved with no modifications. The institution responded in detail to all the consultant’s recommendations. Dr. Scherr recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Whelan concurred, but stated he found the enrollment projections a little weak as reference data was not provided. Dr. Whelan seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

**NOTE:** The AIC suggests the following to enhance the proposal:

1. Add more specific enrollment projection information.
2. Make assessment plan more explicit and robust.
3. **Rutgers University - Camden**
   * + 1. B.F.A. in Visual Arts, CIP 50.0701

First Reader: Pamela Scott-Johnson, Monmouth University

Second Reader: Robert Schreyer, Mercer County Community College

Dr. Scott-Johnson stated program objectives are very career focused. Student learning outcomes allowed the institution to address the curricular design, student achievement and stakeholder satisfaction, but they will evaluate the outcomes via surveys of graduating student alumni, faculty curriculum committees, and external evaluations of the student performances. There is concern for how the institution is measuring student learning outcomes. In addition to the portfolios produced and student satisfaction there could be a more rigorous way to evaluate the efficacy of the program. The institution did an excellent job of listing the types of courses that the students will take in each of the concentrations. The consultant was well qualified and promoted the program as they felt strongly about the institution’s ability to enroll students in the program based on a regional assessment. The institution’s response to the consultant recommendation was satisfactory and indicated they do not have additional needs for the program. There is significant support from other institutions. Dr. Scott-Johnson recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Schreyer stated the overall proposal is comprehensive, but that was predominantly due to the consultant’s report and the institution’s responses to the report. The institution seems dependent upon on their bachelor's degrees in similar areas as evidence for student enrollment and refer to those other degree programs which could be why the proposal was kept simplistic. The consultant noted they wouldn’t recommend approving the program unless the institution hired a faculty member in photography to which the institution responded accordingly and withdrew that concentration. Dr. Schreyer seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Dr. Wolcott recused.

2.M.S.F. in Wealth Management, CIP 52.0804

First Reader: Basil Baltzis, New Jersey Institute of Technology

Second Reader: David Stout, Brookdale Community College

Dr. Baltzis stated the program seems very worthwhile, but the proposal is not written or presented well as it wasn’t obvious it incorporated the consultant recommendations. One area of the proposal that was outstanding was need for the program as data and a number of trends are presented. The program will leverage assets already present so only one new course is needed. The consultant is extremely qualified and developed a program in this same area. Several recommendations were listed in the consultant report to which the institution responded to adequately. Projected enrollment is low and would seem to be more robust given the demand the proposal discusses. Stackable credentials will be used for people who complete one or both of their existing certificates. Only two of the three student learning outcomes comply with what the AIC typically calls student learning outcomes. The proposal does not mention what the assessment measures, tools, and strategies will be used, and instead states they will use something similar to what they use in their other programs. Indirect assessments of outcomes will be done through surveys of student alumni and employers. There is no doubt the program will be successful given it must be written according to the AACSB standards, but the proposal is not strongly written. The second reader Dr. Stout concurred and stated the proposal was modified significantly after the consultant submitted a report. The consultant disclosed in his report that he has a professional relationship with one of the professors at the institution as they co-authored papers together in 2019 which goes against the AIC guideline that there must be a five-year period between the end of the relationship and any engagement with the institution to serve as a consultant. Dr. Capuano noted the degree nomenclature seems incorrect as there is no Master of Science in Finance. Finance is the major, but the “F” in M.S.F. is not part of the degree nomenclature. It is unclear whether the major is in finance or wealth management. Both readers agreed to send the proposal back to the institution to address the areas of concern. Dr. Wolcott recused.

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

1. Have the program reviewed by a new consultant.
2. Clarify the degree nomenclature.
3. Provide enhanced student learning outcomes and explicitly list assessment measures.
4. **William Paterson University**
   * + 1. Bachelor of Social Work, CIP 44.0701

First Reader: Kimberly Hollister, Montclair State University

Second Reader: Deborah Preston, Raritan Valley Community College

Dr. Hollister stated overall the proposal is strong. The institution follows the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) competencies. An accreditation will be pursued as the program moves forward. Program objectives are clear and follow the CSWE standards. The learning outcomes plan was good as there are nine learning goals each having multiple detailed learning objectives. Mapping is well developed as most learning goals are mapped to multiple courses. A detailed discussion about how learning will be assessed is provided and includes both direct and indirect measures. Connection to the institution’s strategic plan is clearly identified. Need for the program was supported via labor statistics data. Additionally, the proposal points to the existing Social Services concentration in which the institution is unable to satisfy some of the demands of students that want a more rigorous Bachelor’s in Social Work program. This program differs from others in the state in terms of the student population that the institution will serve. Enrollment projections appear to be realistic. There is currently one fully qualified faculty member and a new one is slated to be hired in the first year. That faculty member will also serve as a director of the program. It appears there is adequate space, technology, and library support. The consultant is well qualified and fully supported the program. The report showed there was a lot of consultation with both faculty and administration, and gave several critiques that would strengthen the program to which the institution responded well to. It is noted the educational program listed the full amount of credits but didn’t include a curriculum guide which is typically standard. Dr. Hollister recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Preston stated the proposal was very good, and the emphasis on culturally responsive social work was impressive. Dr. Preston seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

1. Other Action Items
2. **Rowan College of South Jersey**
   * + 1. Conversion of A.A.S. Business Management, Entrepreneurship Option **to** A.A.S. in Entrepreneurship, CIP 52.0701

First Reader: Jon Connolly, Sussex County Community College

Second Reader: Deborah Preston, Raritan Valley Community College

Dr. Connolly stated the proposal checklist is complete. An accreditation will be sought from ACBSP. The program is for students that plan to pursue a baccalaureate degree in entrepreneurship as the institution has direct articulation agreements with several universities. The assessment plan matrix is easy to read and appropriate, but rubrics were not provided. The layout of the plan is good though there is concern that the program review takes place once every eight years as that is quite a long time. There is an annual mini review process, but the proposal doesn’t list what that process looks like. An interesting analysis of the need was provided. The institution exercised their right not to have a consultant review the conversion proposal. In such cases the institution must give a critical review on a series of questions as outlined in appendix H of the AIC manual, and it is confirmed all nine questions were answered throughout the proposal. The curriculum reflects a lot of revisions done in consultation with a task force which consists of representatives from multiple chambers of commerce. Dr. Connolly recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Preston concurred and seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Dr. Harvey recused.

1. **William Paterson University**
   * + 1. Conversion of Exercise and Sport Studies M.S., Exercise Physiology Option **to** Exercise Physiology M.S., CIP 26.0908, Seeking waiver of external review process.

First Reader: Kimberly Hollister, Montclair University

Second Reader: David Birdsell, Kean University

Dr. Hollister stated the same objectives and assessment plan used in the current track will be used in the standalone program. The program is guided by the American College of Sports Medicine and the National Strength and Conditioning Association, both of which are recognized nationally and internationally. The current track and standalone program prepare students to meet both certification requirements. A detailed explanation of program goals, student learning goals, and student learning outcomes was provided. Mapping is comprehensive in terms of how the coverage of material is. A strength in the assessment plan is each student learning goal is assessed in multiple courses. It would have been a stronger proposal had they included rubrics in the assessment plan. The program is clearly aligned with the institution’s strategic plan. Student enrollment is adequate and reflects the current enrollment rate for the track. Labor statistics data is provided. Of the four similar programs in New Jersey none are offered as a standalone M.S. degree. The same resources used for the track will be used for the standalone program. All questions in appendix H were answered. Dr. Hollister recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Birdsell concurred and stated there isn’t a substantive change in the conversion. Dr. Birdsell seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

* + - 1. Conversion of Exercise and Sport Studies M.S., Sport Administration Option **to** Sport Administration M.S., CIP 31.0504

First Reader: David Wolcott, Rutgers University

Second Reader: Pamela Scott-Johnson, Monmouth University

Dr. Wolcott stated the proposal is complete. The two current tracks in the program are very different and share very few courses leading the desire to create a standalone program as well as increasing enrollment in this specific track. As an existing track that program is aligned with multiple goals and the university strategic plan. With respect to duplication there are two public universities in New Jersey that offer similar graduate programs. No statement of objections was received. The curriculum was designed to meet the requirements of the Commission on Sport Management accreditation, however, the institution does not intend to pursue accreditation and this time but didn't really articulate why that was the case. The assessment plan is complete, rigorous, and is informed by the standards of the Commission on Sports Management Accreditation. The assessment plan includes; student learning goals, student learning outcomes that are mapped to courses, assessment tools, and frequency. Forty predominantly part-time students are anticipated within five years. Bureau of Labor Statistics data is cited stating sports related jobs will grow by 22% by 2030 which is faster than average. The proposal did a nice job of going out and looking at position descriptions within New Jersey and showed that many entry level and most advanced career postings in the field now require or prefer a master's degree. Faculty would be drawn from existing faculty within the concentration. No new financial resources or facilities are needed. The consultant is qualified and conducted a site visit in December. The consultant recommended approval and suggested minor recommendations to which the institution responded. Dr. Wolcott recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Scott-Johnson concurred and pointed out the reviewer commented that the four plus one option has some innovation. The AIC agreed the consultant acting as a grant reviewer for the institution in January 2020-February 2020 is not a conflict of as there was not direct individual faculty engagement. Dr. Scott-Johnson seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried.

1. For Your Information
2. **Hudson County Community College**
   * + - New Academic Certificate in Accounting, CIP 52.0399
       - New Option, A.A.S. Advanced Manufacturing, Woodwork Option, CIP 46.0201
3. **Kean University**
   * + - Two New Options:
         * B.F.A. Theatre Performance, Musical Theatre Option, CIP 52.0201
         * B.S. Exercise Science, Pre-Athletic Training/Pre-Physical Therapy Option, CIP 31.0505
4. **Montclair State University**
   * + - Two New Undergraduate Certificates:
         * Certificate in Global Human Trafficking, CIP 30.9999
         * Certificate in Climate Science, CIP 30.3501
       - New Graduate Certificate in Customer Experience and User Experience Research, CIP 52.1402
       - Nomenclature change **from** B.F.A. in Filmmaking **to** B.F.A. in Film and Television, CIP 50.0602
5. **Rowan College of South Jersey**
   * + - Nomenclature change **from** A.A.S. Engineering Technology **to** A.A.S. Electrical Engineering Technology, CIP 15.0612
       - New Certificate of Achievement in Entrepreneurship, CIP 52.0701
6. **Rowan University**
   * + - Nomenclature change **from** Certificate of Undergraduate Study in Esports Management **to** Certificate of Undergraduate Study in Esports Business, CIP 31.0504
       - Two New Program Options
         * Minor in Japanese, CIP 16.0302
         * Concentration in Spanish for Public Health & Wellness, CIP 16.0905
       - New Undergraduate Study Certificate in Applied Machine Learning, CIP 14.1099
       - Four New Graduate Study Certificates:
         * Certificate in Business Analytics, CIP 52.0205
         * Certificate in Organizational Leadership, CIP 52.0213
         * Certificate in Human Resource Management, CIP 52.1001
         * Certificate in Management, CIP 52.0201
7. **Sussex County Community College**
   * + - New Baking & Pastry Arts Certificate, CIP 12.0501
       - New Option, A.A.S. Technical Studies, Baking & Pastry Arts Option, CIP 15.9999
8. Old Business
9. **Caldwell University**
   * + 1. B.S. in Environmental Science, CIP 03.0104 (previously submitted 12/3/2021)

First Reader: Kimberly Hollister, Montclair State University

Second Reader: Nurdan Aydin, New Jersey City University

Dr. Hollister stated the two main revisions requested in the proposal were addressed. The updates to the proposal, as well as a detailed narrative that describes how they made the changes in terms of the learning outcomes assessment plan were more than adequate. Better descriptions were provided along with detailed rubrics and dependencies that will be used during the data collection points. A draft of the survey that would be used for indirect measures to understand readiness to enter the workforce was provided. Concerns regarding the lack of foundational environmental science courses, diversity of electives, and too many non-science courses were addressed by adding an environmental science course with a lab. Additional electives that could be developed were identified. In addition to the things that we asked them to address, they also responded to a number of the other comments that were made throughout the review. All concerns were addressed. Dr. Hollister recommended the program for approval to move forward to the Presidents’ Council. The second reader Dr. Aydin concurred and seconded the motion to move the proposal forward to the Presidents’ Council. The motion was carried. Dr. Whelan recused.

1. **AIC Manual**

Final adoption of new regulations is delayed until March 7. The AIC reviewed and discussed the draft of the new AIC manual. The subcommittee will continue working to further update the manual and review the updated version at the February 25 AIC meeting. Revisions will also include clarity on conflict of interest.

1. New Business