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**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Alison Maysilles, Debra McClary, Denise Serpico, Cynthia Vazquez.

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** none.

**STUDENT SENATORS PRESENT:**

**STUDENT SENATORS ABSENT:**

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:**
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University Senate Meeting

Monday 20, April 2020

2:00PM – ZOOM Online Meeting

Meeting called to order by President Shamburg at 2:05pm

1. **Test Zoom Voting**

Successfully completed the test.

**II. Moment of Silence**

**III.  Motion to Approve** the University Senate Agenda

* Motion to approve the agenda by Senate President
* The motion passes

**IV. Motion to Approve** the University Senate Meeting Minutes of the April 8,2020

Senate Meeting

* Motion to approve the minutes by Senate President
* The motion passes

**V.**  **Announcements**

**Passport to Success**

New Jersey City University’s Rotaract Chapter is hosting the career exploration Passport to Success event virtually on line every Friday for the entire month of May. Our goal is to enable Jersey City's rising and current high school students (7th-12th graders) to gain direct access to career exploration & networking. They will have the opportunity to interview professionals from unique career paths. For more information please reach out to Dominique Smith in the Admissions office-- [Dsmith7@njcu.edu](mailto:Dsmith7@njcu.edu)

**Blackboard Learning Site**

There is a course site on the NJCU Blackboard Learning page for NJCU Faculty. There are resources and discussion opportunities. Please check it out. Thank you Nurdan Aydin and Christine Harrington for putting this together.

**VI. University Senate President’s Report**

Dr. Christopher Shamburg

**Incomplete Grade Policy**

The administration is considering a revision of the Incomplete Grade Policy. Please share your thoughts on this. The results will be given to the Academic Standards Committee as they review the policy. If an administration policy is released before the May 4th Senate meeting, it can be an item on the May 4th meeting.

[**https://tinyurl.com/njcuincpolicy**](https://tinyurl.com/njcuincpolicy)

**Election Procedures for May 4th Reorganization**

These procedures are online with the Senate Constitution and the Senate Approved Elections Committee Manual.

The call for nominations for Senate Executive Committee, Standing Committees, and General Education Committees will run from April 23-May 1st. Nominations should be emailed to the Senate office [senate@njcu.edu](https://webmail.exchange.njcu.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=ubVcpp_qSVPu9Nx3lQNJ-s6xOfXAT0uj8lLu8CuDa86xx4tLROXXCA..&URL=mailto%3asenate%40njcu.edu). A person can self-nominate or nominate another candidate with the candidate’s permission. Nominations will also be taken from the floor at the meeting on May 4th.

The Elections Committee and the Senate President will organize the nominations on May 5th and 6th and then have the elections on May 7th and 8th via Qualtrics--voting will be anonymous and only for Senators.

The list of nominees will be in alphabetical order. A person may be nominated for more than one standing committee, but if they win an election, they will be disqualified from subsequent elections. Nominations will be taken from the floor of the May 4th reorganization meeting. The call for nominations will formally come to an end at the meeting.

The reorganization will include elections for the Senate Executive Committee, Standing Committees, and the General Education Committees. A person may be on one standing committee and the Senate Executive Committee and a General Education Committee.

The Elections will proceed in this order.

       Senate Executive Committee

       Academic Standards Committee

       Academic Support and Services Committee

       Committee on Instructional Technology

       Curriculum and Instruction Committee

       Elections Committee

       Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs Committee

       Graduate Studies Committee

       Planning, Development and Budget Committee

       Student Affairs Committee

       General Education Committee on Assessment and Policy

       General Education Curriculum Committee

**Discussion**

A member of the Senate asked for clarification regarding the INC grade proposal.

The Senate President explained that if you get an incomplete now, you have six weeks into the next semester to submit the material. It would be mid-October, otherwise the grade automatically changes to an F. This was initially discussed with the executive committee, and the general sense is that the policy should be more lenient, but we don't know the specifics yet. The academic standards committee handles this however, your feedback on the survey, should you have any questions or comments on the existing incomplete policy, can assist since the policy has not been changed yet. If we provide general feedback from the faculty, staff and students on the survey, we can send it to the Academic Standards Committee so they can review the policy and give feedback. If this happens before May 4th, we could bring it to the Senate floor and discuss it at the May fourth meeting.

**VII.  GECAP**

**Speaking:**

* Jason Martinek
* Yufeng Wei
* John Grew
* Josh Fausty
* Others from the floor…

Two Resolutions on General Education (***Attachment #1)***

**Motion 1:** Starting in Fall 2021 we require that students hit each of the six Learning Outcomes at least twice in the General Education Program, phasing out the Modes of Inquiry requirement.

**Motion 2:** Because over half of first-time, first-year students are receiving some form of nine-credit exemption/substitution in the General Education Program, we are calling for the reduction of the program at the Tier I level by 3 credits and at the Tier II level by 6 credits

A member of the GECAP committee began the discussion on the first motion. He stated GECAP is a faculty led group of Senate elected representatives with an especially strong representation by faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences. These members invested time looking into the concerns raised on standards three and five of the middle state self-study. They feel that the General Education Program is not working. One of the biggest issues is the Modes of Inquiry Requirement. This was created with the goal of ensuring students receive disciplinary areas over the course of the General Education phase, however, this is not what is happening. Their investigation revealed that over half of students are not hitting each mode of inquiry at least twice over the course of the program. Moreover, students are tending to take general education courses within a narrow range of disciplines. Between departments requiring their majors, students take anywhere between 3 and 21 credits of General Education in their home departments, and the high number of waivers and substitutions is getting worse. There was no workable solution that allowed to keep the modes requirement and ensure that students hit each of the six learning outcomes at least twice over the course of the program. Replacing the modes with an outcomes requirement alone will go a long way toward improving program assessment results, and better preparing students for Advanced Study in their majors and minors. To accomplish these things, the framework of a General Education Program must be smaller. A skills based General Education program does not mean the lack of disciplinary or interdisciplinary breath. The fast track course recertification process referenced in this report, through better strategic planning, ensures that students have the opportunity to get the disciplinary and interdisciplinary breath that is crucial to a liberal arts education. Passing these motions will give GECAP the tools it needs to address the problems identified and ensure that students leave the program with exposure to all the essential skills that are crucial to their success.

A member of the Senate responded saying, if we leave only the Learning Outcomes because the concern is regarding the breadth of the coverage, it may not solve that problem. He believes there's missing data and would like to see the data for each of these learning outcomes from each discipline such as Language, Humanity, Pseudoscience, or Natural Science and Math. How many courses in these disciplines are covering these learning outcomes?

Another member stated for the last 10 years this program has not been student oriented. There was no student voice in any of the discussions when this program was first built as it was modified going forward. The program should be built around student learning outcomes, and work to develop and assess those. It should not only account of how many classes students take that address those areas.

It was also stated, that the current proposal was approved on May 14, and it's been necessary to propose and approve revisions to the program. However, he does not support the current proposal. People were asking about an alternative proposal without eliminating the modes of inquiry. It is available on the second page of the document to which the link links. The alternative sketched is only meant to show that there's an alternative. There are ways of not only making sure that students hit all the learning outcomes in exactly the way this proposal would ensure, but to do so without eliminating the modes of inquiry. It can be done by reducing the General Education program by six credits or two of the ten courses. GECAP ought to look at alternatives that they’ve haven’ considered yet. This proposed change is more radical than the 2014 proposal that the Senate passed. Formally, it was essentially the disciplines that were defined by areas A through F. We preserved those knowing that we might have to tweak it to ensure that students got full coverage of the outcomes, but there are ways of doing that without eliminating the modes of inquiry.

An executive member wanted to make three points to the discussion.

1st point - He questioned whether it would be possible for a student to take all of the students courses in General Education and in their major within one single department. His sense is that the answer to that question is yes. He asked to hear a response to that question.

2nd point – If we will be focusing on the six outcomes in the absence of the modes of inquiry, but those outcomes were prepared years ago in the context of there also being those A to F substantive categories, then if we eliminate the modes of inquiry, which is all about the breath of subject, would we be going back and looking at those outcomes in a different context?

3rd point – Since the discussion was through zoom and is such a significant topic, it may be appropriate to potentially consider tabling the discussion, because this is an important topic.

A member of GECAP responded stating that there is one department that requires 21 credits in their home department, and this is with the most requirements. Therefore, it's already happening. The Senate did put to a vote to limit that kind of thing, and the senate vote majority was no. Perhaps we could possibly re-raise that issue and have a vote that limits the number of credits from the home department that could apply to a student's General Education, however this has already been done, and in failing we have to look at other options.  
  
His response to the second point that asked, *“if we don't have modes of inquiry, would we be going back and looking at the student learning outcomes, because we would be in a much different context than we were in when those learning outcomes were formulated?”* His answer is that he believes they were reconsidered in the context of the new General Education Program.

A member from the floor responded saying there is no such thing as a perfect general education program. She stated in general, they're asked to do too much. If you look at the last program, the goals of that program were almost totally on breath and had some very liberal education goals. The remnant of that is in the modes to try and have students move, get out of breath, and experience taking courses in the four modes. The fact that one department has 21 credits doesn't mean that most departments are moving in that direction. I hope we're not moving in that direction. The one way of limiting that is really through the modes. The present program emphasizes the skills in the General Education document. GECAP is right to think the students are not taking all of the skills. Is there a way of accomplishing that, that does not eliminate the vote? If students are not steered towards the mode, there'll be lots of lots of things that feed into the selection of courses, such as when they're scheduled and what their friends are taking, and intellectual things, things that they might be interested in. The hope with the modes is that students will discover things that they might not have paid attention to before they attended the University. Josh Faust’s plan is one that preserves the modes and at the same time, encourages direct students so that they're taking the learning outcomes equally. This is essentially to assign learning outcomes to particular modes, and particular courses. I was on the GECAP committee for a long time, and strategic planning is not easy to achieve on this on this issue. If part of the plan were to preserve the modes, through some strategic plan, I'd need to hear the strategic plan.

Another member who handles student transfers stated, the one thing that is missing from all General Education planning is that we never considered transfer students. As the director of the transfer Resource Center, how would I implement outcomes for courses that are coming in from other institutions? I would appreciate a fully developed solution for transfer students on how we are supposed to assess courses coming from other institutions into our General Education program.

Another member asked what does it mean from the motion, students hit each of them?

The presenter responded saying that students have to take two courses in each mode of inquiry or in the revised version that we're proposing, they have to hit each outcome at least twice.

The member responded saying that the term hit should be revised.

A brief point was made about double dipping, where the senate rejected a motion to eliminate double dipping, where a course would count towards both the major and the General Education courses. The last live meeting we had on campus, it seemed quite clear that there is broad support for limiting the number of courses a department could require students to take within the department when it comes to General Education courses. In response to what GECAP said, we tried a much narrower version which was to say, no course could count towards both the major and General Education courses, I believe that there's much wider support for limiting the number of General Education courses, that could be required within the major department. The senate might decide that a given department could only require students to take two or three General education courses within the major department and that the rest would have to be taken outside the department. He also stated that the fact that students are currently taking too many courses in their own department for some people's comfort level is not an argument for eliminating the disciplinary requirement. If anything, it's an argument for ensuring that students get broad coverage, which is obviously closely related to that point. It will be extremely difficult to ensure balanced course offerings on a semester by semester basis across the modes and the outcomes if there is no mode to speak of. There is a way to do it without eliminating the modes.

A member then stated, in regard to the comments about involving student perspectives, if any students are online, he would very much like to hear their view. He would want to think about it in terms of both registration for them and opportunity for students. If we were to pass this motion, and if the result happens to affect some departments significantly, because they would end up with considerably fewer courses, especially the smaller departments…Wouldn't the result be, that students would have less of an opportunity on their own to have a wider breadth of courses because there will potentially be fewer courses in fewer departments and more concentration in some departments? If that's the result of this, how would it affect the availability of courses for registration? Does it make the registration process better? Does it facilitate registration, or does it make it more difficult?

The presenter responded saying, if you look at the philosophy department, which is a department of two and offers a ton of sections with adjunct faculty members, they have been incredibly strategic and creative, not only in terms of hitting different modes, but also in hitting the different outcomes. It is a small department that provides a model to other small departments about how to proceed even under these new provisos within the General Education program.

The member replied questioning what would happen to the Philosophy department and not just in terms of faculty load but what would happen to the availability of philosophy courses, if this proposal were to be approved?

The presenter stated that Philosophy offers more courses and Information and Technology literacy than many other departments. This is what he meant about them being really strategic as a small department. They're winners under this General Education program, and they're winners under the revised General Education program because they're incredibly strategic.

Another member stated that he is opposed to this amendment. He believes it compromises the philosophy of a Liberal Arts education. He doesn’t see how it's going to preserve the diversity of disciplines that was originally intended by the program. He agrees with what was said earlier, that this program can be tweaked to optimize it without making such a radical surgical change. The issue of people taking all of their General Education courses, or most of their General Education courses within one major, can be addressed simply by putting a limit on the number of courses taken in the major. The outcomes were developed in conjunction with the modes themselves, so if you're going to rethink the modes, or get rid of them, you might as well rethink the outcomes as well. If we're talking about cutting down on the number of classes our students need to take and making sure that they hit the learning outcomes, then we need a conversation about which outcomes perhaps are the most important and do we have to hit each outcome two times. For example, the civic engagement outcome does not have to be covered twice. It can be covered effectively in a tier three seminar, but it can be covered effectively before that. He believes we need to revisit the outcomes but doesn’t really understand the impetus behind getting rid of the modes of inquiry. The modes of inquiry are absolutely essential to the way the program was developed to make sure that students actually go outside of their majors and their disciplines and that get a broad based liberal arts education. He doesn’t see any reason to throw out the modes and believes they just need to be tweaked.

A member of the Philosophy department stated that they’ve been very strategic in trying to ensure they have a wide range of courses that teach many outcomes and are in a variety of modes of inquiry. They have been insistent that the students take no more than three courses double dip. It would be great if they could let students take lots of their major courses in General Education. It would be beneficial to their program, but it's not beneficial to their students. They are not letting them do it, even if it's a risk, instead, we're broadening our General Education courses. They can't support these motions, and they’re a large General Education service department, because in the absence of a limitation on the number of courses that students can use to count towards a simultaneously a major requirement and a General Education requirement, it won't guarantee any level of breath.

Another member stated that as an outsider perspective, it is really important to stream line the transfer process for transfer students. It’s also important to think about what is trying to be accomplished and how this can be communicated with students. The rationale for reduction of the General Education courses should be based on retention issues. This would allow for more flexibility and freedom for students. When you reduce General Education courses you have more room for elective courses and additional opportunities.

In addition, another member wanted to offer the perspective of someone who sat on GECAP committee and stated that there was a great deal of deliberation that went into the proposal. We were convinced by the data that a change was needed. We appreciate what was said about making this useful for transfer students and believe that is a conversation they didn’t have. We hope that you would want to participate moving forward. Another part is that we are hearing a lot of the opposition to this proposal coming from people who are in the humanities and who are in social science programs. However, we don’t hear anything from Nursing education, Psychology, School of Business, Criminal Justice, Fine arts, and are not sure if that's because there's no opinion. We would like to hear from colleagues in these areas. In response to the statement about moving to learning outcomes, and whether it solves the problem of interdisciplinary or of disciplinary breadth, the modes I don't believe are working to actually accomplish disciplinary breadth? I feel that learning outcomes are actually more interdisciplinary than they are non-disciplinary. I support the move in that direction. Students would have to take courses from across the university to accomplish the learning outcome, therefore I'm not worried that they would get soloed in one place. This proposal offers a lot of revolutionary potential that we haven't quite talked about. We've talked about what we think we're losing but haven't talked about what we're gaining. In the committee, we talked about how this proposal might offer a lot of opportunity to build us into the digital humanities realm. We also talked about how it might allow us to bulk up our civic engagement offerings and requirements of students, which will be part of strategic plan coming forward. This is presenting new opportunities to build and expand in different ways that we haven't tried before and we're going to need that now more than ever. A radical change is therefore needed. Students are not required to take classes in learning outcomes, so what's the point of having them? At the same time, students are assessed in learning outcomes, so we have this mismatch between what they're required to take that's not being assessed, what they're being assessed and that they're not required to take, and it just doesn't match up. It’s impossible to have both modes and learning outcomes. I support the proposal as true.

Josh Fausty wanted to mention something that dovetails with the question that was asked about faculty outside the humanities and social sciences. The large departments that require 50 or more credits, or who require courses in more than one department have up to nine credits of substitutions approved in this program. That means that instead of 10, required General Education courses, in tiers, one in two students in those majors, take seven. The other three are major courses, you might say it's the epitome of double dipping. These are not even General Education courses; they’re intro to biology, math classes, chemistry courses for students in the sciences and so on. This was always part of the current program. In fact, the program very likely would not have passed in May of 2014 if the nine credit substitution policy had not been part of it. I mention this because the numbers of students who this proposal cites as not fulfilling the General Education requirements includes all of the students who have the nine credits of substitutions. I think it's a little bit unfair to count those students as among those not fulfilling General Education requirements because those substitutions are indeed and have always been part of this General Education program. To summarize, all those substitutions have always been part of the program. They were what allowed a lot of the science departments to support the program as it is now. Those nine credits really could be included in General Education assessment without a whole huge change, because they're probably already covering some of those outcomes.

Another member stated that he chairs one of the science departments that was mentioned earlier and wanted to make one small correction to what was said before. His students are allowed to take the nine fewer credits but that's because an exception is also made for students who have requirements outside their home department within their major program. Roughly half the credits that a BS biology student takes are taken in Chemistry, Physics and Math. Only 36 credits are in the Biology department which is kind of makes it an average size program in a home department. We count on our colleagues in those departments to handle the quantitative reasoning that goes into the Physical Sciences and Math. Two other issues he wanted to address: First as the chair of a large department, his job is to chair the small departments who are in between who advocate for the students and to see to it that they have a clear path to graduation. He has asked several times for some analysis to be done on how the funds are expended in a general education program with respect to the expenditures that go into the teaching courses in various departments. The problem that he faces is that he doesn’t have enough resources to offer enough courses to get my students across the stage at graduation in a timely fashion. We begin every semester with 100 to 150 students wait listed for majors courses, and that causes them to delay their graduation and in some cases leave. If we are not wisely and efficiently spending our money overall, and we don't have a surplus of funds, then that is part of the reason why students are leaving the university. That's a serious matter and it’s more serious than the philosophical underpinnings of what we're doing here. Second point that I'll make is that he just served as a Middle States evaluator, and he handled Standard three; the educational programming segment of the site visit. One of the criteria that standard speaks to General Education, (if we do not reach a conclusion here, in terms of enacting this this modification); I ask that everybody go back and read that. Middle States defines the purpose of a General Education program, according to roughly what are our student learning outcomes are, not by disciplinary areas, and not by modes of inquiry or any other kind of course categorization scheme. It's about preparing students to have the intellectual tools to survive and to prosper in in their discipline and outside of the discipline, both in college and beyond. His last point is that he’d like to make an appeal; if there are any students on-line, Senators or other students on this meeting. Could we please hear from you?

An executive board member stated that he would like to make the motion to table this discussion, or just table the vote on this motion until the September meeting. He would like to have a sense of all those assembled online proposing whether the group is ready to make a decision on this, then a vote should take place. If the group is not ready, he would hope that tabling it would give a chance to hear from students and equally significantly to hear within our proposal, the effect that this will have in regard to transfers as we caught up as a very significant point here.

**He made a motion to table motion one discussion until the September meeting.**

The Senate President asked if he is making a motion to table both the General Education motions?

He replied both motions.

**Motion made and seconded**  
  
The Senate President then asked if there is any objection to tabling these two motions until the September meeting?

The discussion is up for a vote. Tabling is not up for debate.

A member raised a question to table it until May not September.

The Senate President stated that technically if it's tabled, it could be pulled off the table anytime by a vote.  
  
An executive member stated that his motion is to do it until September.

The Senate President replied that technically that a motion to postpone until a definite time, which is debatable.  
  
The executive member stated then it’s motion to postpone until September   
  
The Senate President asked if anyone wants to debate the motions to postpone?  
  
A member from the floor stated that she is always in favor of getting things done as soon as possible and not pushing them off. If we're going to hear anything from students, within the next few weeks. they’ll possibly be overwhelmed. If we postpone this until September, August 31 is when we will be looking to get answers. I think it should be a much quicker timeframe. It's better to have a shorter deadline.  
  
The Senate President asked if there are any other dispute on the postponement?

A member responded saying that we're just going to end up having the same identical conversation again in September. He agrees with a shorter deadline. He said that the GECAP has done a good job working together on this, but believes we need to vote down the highly flawed amendments so that we can then get busy on putting up a more comprehensive strategy for General Education in the fall and one that does not just include GECAP members, but includes students and other faculty, as well. He would rather vote rather than postpone and vote down the two amendments.

The Senate President asked if anyone else want to talk about the postponement vote?   
  
Another member stated that his sense is that the proposal was really meant to address deep concerns about the middle state visit. He feels that if we eliminate the modes of inquiry, we'll be raising other deep concerns that Middle States could equally race. He is in favor that we vote now and then assuming that it doesn't pass, we are able to recommit ourselves to coming up with a solution that has broader support.   
  
The GECAP presenter replied to have the vote take place.  
  
Another member asked the presenter, if the proposal amendments pass, when would it be implemented?

His response was that they would be implemented in 2021  
  
The Senate President asked if anyone else has more to say on the postponement vote for discussion? No

**Vote:** To postpone the General Education Program discussion until September.

**The vote to postpone was not approved (20 to 23)**

The Senate President then asked to vote on the first motion and then to debate on the second motion.

**Vote:** **Motion 1 starting in Fall 2021**. We require that students hit each of the six learning outcomes, at least twice in a general education programs phasing out the voluntary inquiry requirement with a launch the poll  
  
 **The vote passes 23 to 18**  
  
The Senate President then asked to vote on the second motion.  
  
 **Vote:** **Motion 2** Because over half a first time first year students are receiving some form of nine credit exemption substitution in the General Education program, we're calling for reduction of the program at the tier one level by three credits and a tier two level by six credits.

**Discussion**

A member asked for clarification. The implication is that the nine-credit exemption would no longer exist because the program itself is being reduced, is that correct?

The presenter said that was correct.

The vote passes 23 to 13

**VIII. Honors Program**

**Motion:** The University Senate of New Jersey City University agrees that the document Honors Program Senate Proposal – Spring 2020 shall be reviewed in the following order:

(1) The Senate’s Planning, Budget, Development Committee;

(2) The Senate’s Curriculum and Instruction Committee;

(3) The Senate body for a vote.

Speaking:

Scott O’Connor

He stated that after a period of inactivity, the Honors Program was reactivated in 2013 in the College of Arts and Sciences shortly later in the School of Business. They've now been merged into one program. The program has about 150 students with a goal of enrolling 60 students per year. The program is growing and it's a highly successful program. We have a four-year graduation rate for our first three cohorts of 75% which is significant, and it's a testament to our students and faculty who are teaching it. Since 2013, when this program was reactivated there was an intense commitment to developing a program which conformed with national best practices. NJCU joined the National Collegiate Honors Council which is the National professional body which sets best standards and reviews programs. Faculty have attended the national conferences and learning how to develop honors programs and we've had representatives from NCHC to campus to help us in as we push forward. An important feature is that the place of honors is well defined in the administrative and academic structures of the relevant institution. Right now at NJCU, The Honors Program is not well defined in the administrative and academic structures. So the honors program while it is an established program, they're permanently approved courses, its relationship to the Senate, the overview that the Senate has, have not really been something that's been in place, and we think it's time to remedy that and bring the honors program under the review of the Senate. However, there isn't a clear process by which we can put the honors program to the initial first step of being looked at by the Senate Committees. So following guidelines, like the new approval procedures for academic degree programs, is not relevant. We are asking that the Senate review the Honors Program, and we've outlined the committee's that we think should take a look. If you vote yes, in this motion, we will submit the documentation and the committees will scrutinize the Honors Program and they will ask questions and maybe require changes. Eventually, it will come to the full body of the Senate for review, scrutiny and vote. What this motion is asking is to start the process.

The Senate President asked if anyone else want to speak on this? He reminded everyone that we are not voting on the program, just a procedure for approval.

A member said it’s a very good idea but wanted to know the proposed process is going to take into account any requirements, grade requirements, course requirements, that students who are already in the program have to maintain because I think when I saw your proposal, the process was going to include going to the planning and budget committee, going to see C&I going to the Senate. I didn’t see anything in regard to the issue of who establishes grade requirements in order to get into the program to stay in the program or similar things.  
  
A member responded saying that he has been the director since January, and we've been using for admissions that only students who have been admitted to NJCU already on a presidential scholarship are invited to apply for our Honors Program. We have not established a separate admissions relationship for getting into NJCU. The Academic Standards committee would have the oversight for what happens with NJCU admissions and we come in after that. We have maintained a committee membership that includes people from all of the colleges, and everything that is required of the students to stay in the Honors Program, for example, the GPA requirement, and then the courses that they're required to take. These are things that had been handled by what we call the Honors Program Committee. We also have details in the proposal itself, that would go to these committees as proposed by the motion  
  
The Senate President asked if anyone else have anything to say about the process to approve the honors program?  
  
A member asked the way it’s structured, does that mean that the C & I would be making some of those decisions, or would this have to go subsequently, to Academic Standards? I'm just not sure where in the document that I saw that somehow the Academic Standards committee becomes part of this process, and therefore the Senate would be voting on some of these things.  
  
The presenter clarified saying about the Senate’s Academic Standards Committee, is that any oversight or changes or policies that are implemented regarding NJCU admissions would automatically be relevant to all honors students. The premise being that no student is ever admitted to the honors program without already having been admitted to NJCU. So that was my explanation of how academic standards has a role to play already in the process flow. The proposal that I have now if this motion passes would be sent over to the Senate office and then to the committee's outlined in the resolution. This document would then be reviewed by the Senate Planning Budget, and then by the C&I. Possible changes within that document would also come from the committee's themselves.  
  
The Senate President asked again, would anyone else want to speak on this?

**Motion:** The University Senate of New Jersey City University agrees that the document Honors Program Senate Proposal – Spring 2020 shall be reviewed in the following order:

(1) The Senate’s Planning, Budget, Development Committee;

(2) The Senate’s Curriculum and Instruction Committee;

(3) The Senate body for a vote.

**The motion passes 41 to 2**

**IX.  Senate Committee Reports**

**a)      Elections Committee**

Prof. Gita Sharma, Chairperson

Nominations have been submitted for the open slots for faculty Senators at Large vacancies and 10 nominations were submitted. Voting for these positions will be conducted electronically by a Gothic Net. Detailed instructions will be sent via email this week. The Gothic Net portal will be open continuously from Tuesday, April 23rd 9am until Friday, April 24 at 5pm. There is information in these instructions for the names and contact information for all of us on the election committee to help with any issues relating to technical difficulties, from the hours of nine to five. I do want to note that there will not be any voting for professional staff senators at large, since for the two vacancies there were only two nominations submitted, so voting is not needed. Lastly, as the Senate President stated at the start of the meeting, call for nominations for Senate Executive Committee, standing committees, and general election committees will be going out this week April 23 and those will run until May 1.

**b)     Planning, Development & Budget (Attachment #2)**

Dr. Joyce Wright

To approve the Business Administration with Specialization in Supply Chain and Maritime Port Management.

The presenter stated that the Committee met via zoom and we did have a quorum. We reviewed the proposal for the Master of Business Administration, with a specialization in supply chain and Maritime Port Management. This was approved. We felt it was a timely Masters of Business Administration and our approval was entered in the CIM system on April 9th.  
  
The Senate President asked if anyone wanted a discussion. This is an action item to approve the MBA with a specialization in Supply Chain and Maritime Port Management

The vote passes 98% Yes 3% No

**X.                New Business**

The Senate President stated that the NJCU President starting on Friday will do a bi-weekly update on ZOOM.

The Senate President for a motion to adjourn.

Motion seconded

Meeting adjourned at 3:45PM

Respectfully submitted by,

Ms. Cynthia Vazquez

Secretary of the University Senate
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