

**New Jersey Presidents' Council  
Academic Issues Committee**

November 4, 2022

10:00 a.m.

Zoom Meeting Link

<https://raritanval-edu.zoom.us/j/82649963849?pwd=YzRPSTNHV0srci9FUklQTzhscEdqUT09>

Meeting ID: 826 4996 3849, Passcode: 179572

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Diane Recinos – Berkeley College  
David Stout – Brookdale Community College  
Matthew Whelan – Caldwell University  
Peter Ubertaccio – Caldwell University  
Rafael Castilla – Eastwick College  
David Birdsell – Kean University  
Deborah Preston – Mercer County Community College  
Linda Scherr – Middlesex College  
Pamela Scott-Johnson – Monmouth University  
Joanne Cote-Bonanno – Montclair State University  
Nurdan Aydin – New Jersey City University  
Donna Breault – New Jersey City University  
Edwin Hou – New Jersey Institute of Technology  
Cindy Jebbs – Ramapo College  
Michael McDonough – Raritan Valley Community College  
Sheri Pontarollo – Raritan Valley Community College  
Roberta Harvey – Rowan University  
Leamor Kahanov – Stockton University  
Jeffrey M. Osborn – The College of New Jersey  
Jennifer Palmgren – The College of New Jersey  
Eric Taylor – OSHE  
Donna Rogalski – OSHE  
Lori Harris-Ransom – OSHE  
Catherine Sackey - OSHE  
Allison Samay - NJPC

**II. Approval of Minutes of the October 7, 2022 Meeting**

Dr. Rafael Castilla moved for approval of the October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022 meeting.  
Dr. Leamor Kahanov seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.

### III. Report from the Chair

Mike McDonough offered a very brief summary of his continuing engagement with the New Jersey Center for Teaching & Learning, and about the need to move forward with more careful guidance about the qualifications, role, and reporting responsibilities of the consultant.

### IV. New Programs

#### A. **HPI College**

1. Petition for Initial Licensure to Offer the Associate Applied Science-Registered Nurse and the Applied Associate in Occupational Therapy Assistant Degree Programs

**First Reader:** Deborah Preston, Mercer County Community College

**Second Reader:** Linda Scherr, Middlesex County College

#### Petition for Licensure

Dr. Preston assessed HPI College's application for licensure. She began by noting that both consultants found HPI College "not sufficient" in every single category and in every single sub-category of the required standards. Dr. Preston then highlighted the most significant weaknesses in the application:

- that the institution lacks adequate space and facilities to offer these programs;

- that HPI College's proposal fails to document how it will offer the required general education courses;

that the multiple documents submitted by the institution in support of the application offered both contradictory and confusing statements;

- that the institution failed to provide a realistic or authentic budget;

- that the institution failed to identify the needed additional clinical sites need for the hybrid program, and did not offer hint at how they would assess the instructional effectiveness of these program offerings;

- and that the institution did not respond in any meaningful or substantive way to the comprehensive reports from the consultants.

Dr. Scherr echoed many of Dr. Preston's remarks, noting that HPI College submitted five major documents in support of the application but that the weight of the inconsistencies made all five unreliable, and that the consultants also expressed concern over these documents and struggled to incorporate these documents in their reviews. Dr. Scherr

also highlighted the institution's unrealistic budget and their inability to document the course sequences, the learning outcomes, and the ways in which students would navigate the program. She noted, too, that the consultant's provided a clear set of essential revisions but that HPI College did not pursue any of those opportunities.

#### AAS- Registered Nurse

Dr. Preston noted the following concerns regarding Standard One:

- nursing faculty were not sufficient in number to sustain the program;
- there were no faculty to teach the general education component;
- the institution seemed to lack the resources needed to launch, support, and sustain the program;
- there was no effort to align program outcomes to the institution's mission or institutional outcomes;
- there was no effort to provide a scaffolding of the courses or to document how the course sequences support program learning outcomes;
- there was no plan for continuous program assessment; there was only marginal evidence of a relationship with external groups, especially employers;
- the college failed to provide any substantive curricular or program comparisons.

Overall, Dr. Preston noted that the institution provided a very weak response to the regulations in Standard One, emphasizing that these core academic weaknesses are significant and prevent the program from being approved at this time. Dr. Preston also noted that HPI College's proposal failed to meet the regulations in Standard Three: failing to provide any evidence of the differences in HPI College's program to other existing programs in the state, and that the institution offered no realistic timeline for accreditation.

Dr. Scherr stated her support for this analysis, concluding that the proposal did not meet the regulations in Standard One or Standard Three.

#### AAS – Occupational Therapy Assistant

Overall, Dr. Preston framed her review by noting that this proposal revealed the very same problems and weakness that characterized the Registered Nurse application. In Standard One, Dr. Preston listed the following concerns:

- the institution failed to provide adequate detail about the qualifications and number of faculty dedicated to the program, including those faculty needed to provide the general education component of the program;

- that there was no plan to expand current instructional facilities and no mention of needed equipment;

- that the program objectives were unclear and stated differently in the supporting documents;

that the proposal failed to provide an explanation of course scaffolding;

- that the learning outcomes were “not sufficient”;

- that there were no clear distinctions made between this program and other programs in the state.

Dr. Preston also expressed her concern that the consultant lacked a graduate degree in the discipline.

Dr. Scherr also added that it is problematic to assert that the program is intended to prepare students to sit for the licensure exam; only students enrolled in accredited programs may take this exam. And HPI College is not yet an accredited institution.

### Conclusions

The final resolution was that this application for licensure be denied.

After Lori Harris-Ransom provided helpful clarity about process, these minutes also provide details about the committee’s reviews of the two programs proposals.

## **B. Rowan University**

### 1. Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, CIP 01.8001

**First Reader:** Jeffrey Osborn, The College of New Jersey

**Second Reader:** Kim O’Halloran, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Dr. Osborn began his review by noting the many strengths of this impressive proposal: substantial state and institutional support for both capital projects and for operational expenses; a clearly defined and well documented need for the program; thoughtful program comparisons, emphasizing Rowan’s interest in offering more experiential

learning opportunities and in offering more pass-fail options; and the positive recommendation from a highly qualified consultant.

However, Dr. Osborn, incorporating the written comments of Dr. O'Halloran as well, introduced two concerns about the proposal. Dr. Osborn noted that these familiar issues prompt discussion about the consistency and equity of committee decisions:

- Standard 1, #5(a): while the proposal provides a comprehensive list of outcomes (or “milestones”), it is not clear how these outcomes will be scaffolded across the curriculum. The two readers wanted to see how these very strong outcomes would “fit” into the curriculum – where they would appear, in what courses, and in what clusters?
- Standard 1, #6(b): the proposal did not satisfy the regulation that requires course descriptions. The proposal does provide the course titles and provides a framework for the course outline; however, there are no individual course descriptions.

The final resolution was that this proposal will be returned to Rowan University for revision.

### C. **William Paterson University**

#### 1. Bachelor of Science, Applied Business Analytics, CIP 13.1322

**First Reader:** Pamela Scott-Johnson, Monmouth University

**Second Reader:** Diane Recinos, Berkeley College

In reviewing Standard One, Dr. Scott-Johnson documented the ways in which this proposal meet the regulations: the institution has a highly qualified faculty, has the resources to support the program expansion, especially in the areas of computer labs and industry-related software, has clear learning outcomes, has offered complete course descriptions and program outcomes, has compiled a list of similar programs and has identified elements of difference in this program, and has cemented a number of important industry or data-related collaborations.

Dr. Scott-Johnson also noted that the proposal meets Standards Two, Three, and Four.

Dr. Recinos echoed the first reader’s comments, adding that there was some confusion between course numbers and course titles. Nevertheless, Dr. Recinos expressed her strong support for the proposal.

There was some discussion over the question of budget and whether or not proposals need to include more specific financial information. Some readers argued that the question of budget is somewhat complex and often confusing. Most members seemed to believe that this issue did not suggest that the proposal be returned to the institution for revision.

The final resolution was that this proposal be approved.

2. Bachelor of Arts, Public Relations, CIP 09.0902

**First Reader:** Leamor Kahanov, Stockton University

**Second Reader:** Peter Ubertaccio, Caldwell University

Dr. Kahanov framed her very positive review by noting that this proposal reflects the transition from an already existing “track” into a major. She stated that the proposal was detailed and thorough and that the consultant noted the same strength. Dr. Kahanov also highlighted the institution’s responses to the consultant’s recommendations. She stated that the proposal meet all the regulations, and was especially clear about alignment to institutional mission. She provided two potential areas of revision to the institution: a more detailed benchmarking of other programs and a more detailed summary of the student outcomes in the current track.

Dr. Ubertaccio echoed this commentary and suggested that the institution had satisfied all the standards.

The final resolution was that this proposal be approved.

V. For Your Information

**A. Kean University**

CIP Code Assignments

Kean Program	Current CIP/description	Updated CIP/description
B.A. Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences	13.1099 Special Education and Teaching, Other	51.0201 Communication Disorders, General
M.A. Speech-Language Pathology	13.1012 Education/Teaching of Individuals with Speech or Language Impairments	51.0203 Speech Language Pathology/Pathologist

**B. Sussex County Community College**

Termination of Degree Program: A.S. in Psychosocial Rehabilitation

Degree Type	Name of Degree	Action Taken	CIP Code
A.S. Degree (Jointly held with Rutgers University)	A.S. Occupational Therapy Assistant Program	Program termination at the request of Rutgers University	510803

VI. Old Business

**A. Eastern International College**

Bachelor of Science in Health Informatics (BSHI), CIP 11.0104

**First Reader:** Rafael Castilla, Eastwick College

**Second Reader:** Edwin Hou, New Jersey Institute of Technology

Dr. Castilla identified the ways in which the institution had responded to the suggested revisions: Eastern International College provided information about faculty credentials and experiences, noted how this program differs from other Health Informatics programs, identified likely student revenues, including TAG, linked the program proposal to the existing New Jersey plan for higher education, and included a more detailed budget to support and sustain the budget.

Dr. Hou supported Dr. Castilla’s concise summary.

The final resolution was that this proposal be approved. The committee also notes that this proposal exceeds programmatic mission.

**B. Revised AIC Manual (2022-2023)**

Dr. Rogalski provided some insights into the progress of the working group. Focusing on the question of external guidance, the group is evaluating whether or not to omit all of the material in italics and to create a separate document that provides guidance but that avoids being overly prescriptive. The following members are leading such revisions:

Standard One: Debi Preston and Roberta Harvey

Standard Two: Rafael Castilla

Standard Three: Jennifer Palmgren

Standard Four: Donna Rogalski and Matt Whelan.

Dr. Rogalski suggested that the working group members were also exploring the idea of establishing some training sessions for each standard and then placing the video of that session on the AIC website.

Dr. Rogalski added that the group is also exploring how to provide improved internal guidance, revising,

for example, the reviewer's evaluation form to better capture and curate individual reviews and assessments.

### **C. Licensure Review**

Lori Harris-Ransom concluded the meeting by reviewing the process of licensure petition, especially in light of the newly adopted new program regulations and standards.

### VII. New Business