

**University Senate**

**Professional Studies Building, 203A rm. 3**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**November 19, 2018**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Presiding:** Dr. Christopher Shamburg, University Senate President

**DEPARTMENTS PRESENT**: A. Harry Moore, Harriet Phillip; Art, Brian Gustafson; Biology, Ethan Prosen; Chemistry, Yufeng Wei; Computer Science, Mort Aabdollah; Counseling Education, Dennis Lin; Criminal Justice, Bill Calathes; Early Childhood Ed., Basanti Chakraborty; Educational Leadership, John Melendez; Educational Technology, Chris Carnahan; Elementary/Secondary, Vanashri Nargund; Dept. of Earth & Environmental Science, Hun Bok Jung; English, Joshua Fausty; ESL, Anne Mabry; Finance, Zhimin Wang; Health Sciences, Lilliam Rosado; History, Jason Martinek; Latin American Studies, David Blackmore; Library, Min Chou; Management, Wanda Rutledge; Marketing, Rick Lee; Mathematics, Gunhan Caglayan; Media Arts, Marcin Ramocki; Modern Languages, Aixa Said-Mohand; Dept. of Multicultural Ed., Donna Farina; Music, Dance & Theatre, Desamparados Fabra Crespo; Nursing, Gloria Boseman; Philosophy/Religion, Scott O’Connor; Political Science, Joseph Moskowitz; Professional Security Studies, Laszlo Molnar; Sociology/Anthropology, Max Herman; Special Education, Patricia Yacobacci; Women’s & Gender Studies, Jennifer Musial.

**DEPARTMENTS ABSENT:** Accounting, Michael Bell; African/Afro American Studies, Jermaine McCalpin; Alumni, Jane McClellan; Economics, Ivan Steinberg; Fire Science, Patrick Boyle; Fitness, Exercise and Sports, Manuela Caciula; Literacy Education, Mary McGriff; Physics, Chris Herbert; Psychology, Frank Nascimento;

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Cindy Arrigo, Deborah Bennett, Barbara Blozen, Lorraine Chewey, Christopher Cunningham, Marilyn Ettinger, Venessa Garcia, Robert Prowse, Michelle Rosen, Christopher Shamburg, Rubina Vohra.

**SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** None.

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

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** Mince John.

**STUDENT SENATORS PRESENT:** Nermeen Girgis, Sophomore Class VP.

**STUDENT SENATORS ABSENT:**

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE PRESENT:** Kiara Espinosa; Kyle Izyayev, Keion Jackson, Rania Noubani.

**STUDENT SENATORS-AT-LARGE ABSENT:** None.

**Meeting #3**

**University Senate Meeting**

**November 19, 2018**

**GSUB Room 129**

**Agenda**

Meeting called to order by President Shamburg at 2:08 p.m.

**I.          Audience Response System Test**

 Successfully completed.

**II.        University Senate Meeting Agenda**

 Motion (made and seconded) to approve.

 Motion: passed.

  **III.      University Senate Meeting Minutes of October 15,** **2018**

 Motion (made and seconded) to approve.

 Motion to amend (made and seconded): 1) to correct in Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Committee report the date of the Senate reorganization meeting to “May 7, 2018” and 2) to insert in C&I report above the names of the committee members “members as of May, 2018.”

 Motion to amend: passed.

 Motion to approve minutes as amended: passed.

**IV.       Announcements**

Full announcements are on the handout which has been distributed already.

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

1. Temporary Course Proposals

 The list was distributed with the agenda.

 2. Committees

a. Congratulations and thank you to Michael Rotenberg-Schwartz on his election as the C&I committee chair for the 2018/2019 academic year.

b. Vacancies on Senate Standing Committees**:**

* 2 people are needed on C&I and SOB needs to be represented.

This is urgent, especially given the 30 day resolutions.

* 1 person is needed on the Academic Support & Services Committee (AS&S).
* 1 person is needed on the Committee on Instructional Technology (CIT).
* 1 person is needed on the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC) from the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS).

c. Provost Search Committee

 The provost search committee members (and how they were selected) are:

 Jodi Bailey (appointed administrator)

Gloria Boseman (elected faculty member)

Tamara Cunningham (appointed administrator)

Allan DeFina (elected faculty member)

Desamparados Fabra Crespo (appointed faculty member)

Joshua Fausty (elected faculty member)

Barbara Hildner (AFT Local 1839 president)

J.D Jayaraman (appointed faculty member)

Michael Krantz (appointed faculty member)

Jason Kroll (appointed administrator; appointed committee chair)

Anne Mabry (elected faculty member)

Jason Martinek (elected faculty member)

Benjamin Rohdin (appointed administrator)

Wanda Rutledge (elected faculty member)

Christopher Shamburg (University Senate president)

Yufeng Wei (appointed faculty member)

The Search Committee met on October 19th and developed the job advertisement [https://academic-search.com/sites/default/files/NJCUAd.pdf](https://webmail.exchange.njcu.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=QbAHoX1fRm8U9nKjPhYx_uTTqLhDr63h9XZM58Z78LzLyJ9ghk3WCA..&URL=https%3a%2f%2facademic-search.com%2fsites%2fdefault%2ffiles%2fNJCUAd.pdf).

The committee also solicited feedback via a survey on October 25th and November 5th. The search prospectus is available at:

<https://academic-search.com/sites/default/files/ASI.NJCU_.Profile.pdf>

d. Associate Provost Search

The associate provost search committee members are:

Phyllis Szani (administrator)

Mary McGriff (faculty)

Deb Woo (administrator)

Haouari Hanae (faculty)

Marilyn Ettinger (faculty)

Denise Serpico (professional staff; chair)

Cynthia Vasquez (professional staff)

Tracy Nelson (student)

Ivan Steinberg (faculty)

Joao Sedycias (administrator)

Lilliam Rosado (faculty)

Erin O’Neil (faculty)

Christopher Shamburg (University Senate president)

Zhixiong Chen (faculty)

The committee reviewed 96 applications, interviewed 7 candidates via Skype, and forwarded the top 3 finalists to the provost.

**e**. Additional Members of the Provost Search Committee

 Statement from the Senate Executive Committee:

“At the October 15th senate meeting, the Senate strongly recommended the inclusion of professional staff elected by the Senate and students from the Student Government Organization in the provost search committee. Nevertheless, the search committee has been constituted without these members. Professional Staff are vital to the academic life of the University. The education of Students is the sole purpose of a university and the purview of the Provost.

The SEC is expressing its disappointment that the voices of these important constituents are not included on this search committee. This decision runs counter to shared governance, student-centered practices, and sound organizational principles. Moreover, exclusionary practices such as these can be detrimental to the sense of community and climate at NJCU. Their input would be crucial to the selection of a successful candidate.

We urge President Henderson to reconsider the inclusion of these elected constituent representatives in the Provost Search Committee.”

I discussed this with President Henderson, and she replied the committee (with 16 members already) would be too unwieldy, but that professional staff and students will definitely participate at a later stage.  I would also like to acknowledge, again, that we have an unprecedented number of senate-elected faculty members on the committee.

3. Course Cancelations

Motion: (made and seconded): In response to the Senate’s resolution inviting the Dean of Arts & Sciences to explain his course cancellation policy and procedures, the provost, on the dean’s behalf, declined the invitation.   Consequently, the University Senate calls upon the administration to forward its course cancellation policies and procedures in writing to the Senate.  The Senate would have preferred, as a means promoting better communications with the dean, an open dialogue at a Senate meeting.

Discussion: If passed and if needed, this motion would be taken up at the next Senate-Administration Coordinating Committee (SACC) meeting.

Motion: passed.

4. Midterm Grades History

In February 2017 the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) gave a report on midterm grades. Also, in February 2017 SACC created the Academic Success Evaluation Task Force that subsequently made recommendations on many items, including midterm grades. In May 2017 the Academic Success Evaluation Task Force presented a report, but no action was taken.

In June 2017, the SEC charged the ASC to review the Task Force’s report. In November 2017 ASC provided feedback to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the SEC requested more details. Now, the charge to the ASC will be reiterated and follow-up sought: to review the Academic Success Evaluation Task Force’s report and to provide feedback to the Senate.

**VI. Early Childhood Education: Infant Toddler Option Proposal** (see attachment #1)

This is the first program to move to the Senate floor based on the 30-day rule.

 Motion (made and seconded): to approve program.

Discussion: Where is the assessment plan in the program? As the first program arising under the 30-day, the Senate should not discuss the details of this program and should just vote on it without further discussion. Numerous committees have already reviewed the proposal. C&I has not reviewed the proposal so where do we review the details of this proposal? The document included contradictory sentences about budget impact. The curriculum maps in the document include total credits that do not add up correctly. There are six new courses noted but descriptions are not provided. How can the Senate approve this document? Why did the deans and provost approval this document? C&I should have corrected these errors. The proposal is more than three years old. The proposers are very willing to make the corrections. Some of the new courses have been approved so the document may be an old version. The budget in the document may also be an earlier version than was approved by Planning, Development and Budget (PD&B).

Motion (made and seconded): to table the motion [to approve the program].

Point of Order: Can the Senate send proposal back to C&I? Yes.

Discussion: Should the proposers be penalized because the Senate probably has the wrong document? Enrollment is being hampered and this will be the first program of its kind in New Jersey. How about sending to the proposers a list of missing items and corrections? The Senate is holding up proposals to the detriment of students and to motivated faculty proposers. This proposal reached C&I in May 2018 not before. The University needs a method of identifying and correcting errors before proposals reach the entire Senate. We need a way to expedite approval and have the document corrected; therefore, let’s vote down the motion to table and have a different motion for the Senate to conditionally approve the program subject to an improved document being sent to and approved by the SEC.

 Motion to table: not passed.

 Motion (made and seconded): to conditionally approve the program subject to the approval of the Senate Executive Committee.

 Discussion: The Senate still has the option of approving the program today as presented.

 Motion to conditionally approve: passed (yes: 44; no: 6).

**VII.     University Senate Committee Reports**

**a)    Faculty & Professional Staff Affairs (FPSA)** - Donna Farina, Chair

 Donna Farina (chair)

Jason Martinek (secretary)

Joe Moskowitz

Denise Nash

Jeanette Ramos-Alexander (vice chair)

Failen Rosa De Los Santos (student)

November 19, 2018

This report covers the FPSA Committee meetings of October 12 and October 22, 2018.

1. Mini-Grants Program (see attachments #2 & #3)

As was already reported at the 9/24/2018 Senate meeting, several times during the previous academic year, the FPSA Committee requested information about the Mini-Grants program and received none. Following the motion for the reinstatement of the program that passed in the Senate on 9/24, the Office of Academic Affairs contacted the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with a request for information about the program. The FPSA Committee provided Academic Affairs with an overview of the history of the Mini-Grants program as well as a copy of the old application.

The Office of Academic Affairs expressed interest in moving forward with the Mini-Grants program. In the interest of expediency, the FPSA Committee has approved (attached to this report):

• A revision of the Mini-Grants application and guidelines, for use immediately in this academic year, 2018-2019.

• An informational overview of the program, which includes a timeline for carrying out the program.

Rationale for Immediate Reinstatement, AY 2018–2019

Mini-grant funds have never been more important at NJCU as greater pressure has been put on junior faculty to publish and on senior faculty to enhance their scholarly profiles. Mini-grants augment the very limited conference funding deans provide, helping junior faculty in particular to attend international conferences without undue pressure on their personal finances. Mini-grant funds also offer ways for faculty to maintain memberships in professional organizations that have high annual dues. In addition, they provide modest publication subventions for indexing forthcoming books as academic publishers move away from providing that service for free. They can also help faculty acquire materials that departments, colleges/schools, or the library cannot afford to enhance the educational experience for students. The benefits far outweigh the costs, and thus the program should be reinstated as soon as possible.

Process for Future Academic Years

For the next academic year 2019–2020 and beyond, the FPSA Committee would welcome working with the Office of Academic Affairs—should that Office consider it necessary to revise the Mini-Grant process. However, given the four-year lapse in this program, the committee considers it extremely important for the university community to avoid further delay and move forward with the process now.

The FPSA presents the following motion (action item):

Motion (made and seconded):

The University Senate, on the recommendation of the Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs (FPSA) Committee, calls upon the Office of Academic Affairs:

 To re-implement, immediately, the University’s mini-grant program in accordance with the attached guidelines and materials.

Due to the absence of this program for the past four years, the University Senate calls upon both the administration and the Senate Executive Committee to publicize the availability of mini-grant applications for the current academic year (2018-2019) to all full-time faculty, staff and librarians and to do so within 10 business days of the passage of this Senate resolution.

Discussion: The SEC could only move forward based on the administration agreeing to the mini-grant program. The union will present a demand-to negotiate on the basis of the FPSA’s report since the union views this program as proving compensation. The union will accept the procedures as proposed by the FPSA and approved by the Senate and will be proposed to the administration within a week. For decades, this mini grant program was not a union matter. If this is a union matter, why is the Senate discussing this? This is an overlapping union and Senate matter. The previous mini-grant program is in the 2009 Faculty Handbook.

Motion: passed.

2. Sabbatical Application Guidelines and Procedures.

As was previously reported (9/24/2018), the committee is working to revise the process for sabbatical applications. Following the action item that passed at the last Senate meeting (9/24), the committee sought and received feedback from the NJCU community regarding the sabbatical process. The committee thanks those people who contacted us.

The provost, assistant provost, and the three deans were invited to the FPSA meeting of 12 October 2018 to clarify procedures and expectations. The committee would like to thank Dr. Julius, Dr. Aydin, and Deans McSherry, Sedycias, and Woo for their attendance and discussion. Among the issues discussed: how to better account for logistical, operational, and resource limitations in the application process; the possibility of sabbaticals being split between two academic years.

The committee plans to seek feedback on its revised documents (guidelines/application, scoring instrument with weighted categories, checklist, etc.) from the deans, provost, and assistant provost prior to presenting these documents in the Senate. The goal of this collaboration is to have a process that includes evaluation tools that all parties (FPSA Committee, deans, Academic Affairs) will use— to the exclusion of any additional or separate evaluation tools that are not available to the sabbatical applicants and to all others who participate in the review process.

The committee wishes to have a sabbatical application and review process that is transparent for the applicants. In light of this goal, apart from the discussion with the administration, the committee is considering what feedback it will be providing to the applicants after its recommendations have been sent.

3. Tenure/Promotion Guidelines. The FPSA Committee began a discussion of tenure/promotion guidelines and procedures across campus and seeks information in order to continue its discussion and review.

The FPSA presents the following resolution (action item):

Motion (made and seconded):

The University Senate, on the recommendation of the Faculty and Professional Staff Affairs (FPSA) Committee, calls upon the provost:

1) To immediately provide all full-time/part-time faculty members with copies of all/any rubric(s) and/or other scoring instrument(s) used by the administration (i.e., all deans, vice presidents and other administrators) for reappointment and promotion evaluation(s), and

2) To provide within 30 days of the passage of the resolution to each individual faculty member who was evaluated using a rubric(s) and/or other scoring instrument, his/her own rubric(s) as completed by the faculty member’s dean(s) and/or other administrator(s) and used (in any way) as part of the 2016-2017 and the 2017-2018 reappointment and/or promotion process(es).

Discussion: Tenure and reappointment procedures are negotiable; the union accepts this motion and will move it to negotiations if approved by the Senate. Shouldn’t we also be asking the University Promotion Committee (UPC) for information? Should we also be seeking information from the range adjustment committee? On the University’s website are the 2016-2017 Goals for the College of Arts & Sciences. They include the development of rubrics and their actual use for tenure and promotion evaluations by the administration (see attachment #4) The dean of CAS was asked for copies and responded with questions about the purpose of the request rather than providing the rubrics and the dean never provided the document(s). Subsequently an Open Public Records Act (OPRA) request was submitted by the union. The document the union received was simply a retyped version of a portion of the long-standing promotion procedure. How can a retyped copy of an existing document constitute a CAS goal? How can the goal of developing the rubric(s) be described, on the University’s website, as adopted by the administration for all the colleges/schools? What happened to transparency? This motion simply says give us the papers. If we don’t ask for information from the UPC, we should not ask for the administration’s rubrics. The UPC doesn’t claim to have rubrics; the administration does. The FPSA anticipates proposing evaluation instruments for sabbaticals evaluations which the committee will suggest be distributed to everyone. In the COE faculty commonly distribute rubrics to students as part of assignments. The CAS rubrics could help faculty prepare their reappointment and tenure applications.

Motion: passed (yes - 45; no - 5).

**b) Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) -** Lorraine Chewey, Carrie Robinson, Co-Chairs

Lorraine Chewey

Helen Friedland

J.D. Jayaraman

Freda Robbins

Carrie Robinson

Christopher Shamburg

November 8, 2018

New Program Proposals

At the meeting on Monday, 5 November 2018, the GS reviewed and approved, pending minor revisions, the two program proposals are summarized below.

The B.A./M.A. program is not submitted for a vote today. GS has reviewed its part of the proposal but C&I has not reviewed the undergraduate portion.

I. Multidisciplinary Program (B.A./M.A.) in Teacher Education with Triple Certification

The Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education, Multicultural Education, and Special Education in the College of Education collaborated to develop a five-year educator preparation program leading to B.A. and M.A. degrees. The unique feature of the proposed program is that candidates who complete the full five-year program will earn three certifications in high need specializations (Elementary Education, K – 6; Teacher of Students with Disabilities [Special Education]; and Teaching English as a Second Language [TESL - Multicultural Education]) in addition to two degrees. Once approved, this multidisciplinary program will be the first in New Jersey to prepare, in five years, highly specialized teachers for special education English language learners at the elementary school level.

This multidisciplinary program in teacher education leading to triple certification is divided into two phases. In the first phase, candidates complete the B.A. degree which includes nine graduate credits (three courses) in special education. The second phase of the proposed program is the completion of M.A. degree and the full completion of all remaining courses for Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) certification. The M.A. phase of the program is designed to allow the candidate to deepen one’s knowledge base in both special education and English as a second language (ESL) education. Candidates earn the Master’s degree in Special Education and ESL after completion of 36 credits (9 credits in year 4 and 27 credits in year 5).

II. Master of Science in Financial Technology

The Department of Finance and Real Estate in the School of Business developed a new program leading to a Master of Science degree in Financial Technology. The curriculum for the M.S. in Financial Technology will require the completion of 30 credits. This program will prepare students with the skills needed to work in the financial technology industry. It is designed to cater to the burgeoning need for financial technology professionals. The proposed M.S. degree program in Financial Technology is fully geared towards practice. Student learning experiences will be grounded in real world contexts. Students will learn analytical skills and use software tools that are currently popular in the industry, to find solutions to financial technology problems that are commonly encountered in practice. Graduates of the program will be thoroughly prepared to hit the ground running in the Financial Technology industry.

GS F18 Meeting Schedule

The remaining F18 GS meetings are scheduled on Mondays, 19 November and 10 December from 11:30PM to 12:30PM. The GSC will review documents on a first come, first serve basis and respectfully requests that materials be sent from the Senate to the Committee at least one week before the scheduled meeting to give the Committee adequate time to review, discuss, and act upon each proposal.

Motion (made and seconded): to approve the Master of Science in Financial Technology program.

Motion: passed.

**c) Planning, Development & Budget (PD&B)**

Marilyn Ettinger, Joyce Wright, Co-Chairs

Marilyn Ettinger (co-chair)

Joyce Wright (co-chair)

Pat Boyle,

Max Herman,

John Melendez,

Ira Thor,

Gabrielle Salcedo (student representative),

Wilton Thomas-Hooke (ex officio)

November 19, 2018

The PD&B committee met on October 11, 2018, with a quorum of voting members present. The committee elected Joyce Wright and Marilyn Ettinger as co-chairs and reviewed the Senate Constitutional directive to the committee. The following actions were taken:

* Approved two program proposals without conditions:
	+ - * Finance Department, *Master of Science in Financial Technology*
			* Language Study Task Force and Modern Languages Department, *World Language Requirement* (addition to All-University Requirement)
* Approved two program proposals with minor recommendations or revisions [subsequently incorporated by the proposers and approved by the committee]:
	+ - * Finance Department, *Minor in Business Analytics and Data Science*;
			* Management Department, Program Modification of *Bachelor of Science in Management*
* Planned future meeting dates as follows (with spring dates pending confirmation of members’ final schedules):
	+ - * November 29
			* January 31
			* March 7
			* April 4

Post-meeting, we welcomed our newly-appointed student member, Ms. Gabrielle Salcedo.

**d) Student Affairs Committee**

Jeanne Ruggiero, Denise Serpico, Co-Chairs

Jeanne Ruggiero, (co-chair)

Denise Serpico, (co-chair)

                        Allan DeFina

                        John Donnellan

                        Rubina Vohra

                        Caroline Wilkinson

                        Nermeen Girgis, (student)

                        Lyn Hamlin, ex-officio

**November 2018**

The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) met on September 14, 2018 and November 1, 2018. The co-chairs met on September 24, 2018.

* 1. Academic Grievance Form: The SAC received a draft form from Dr. Shamburg at our first meeting. The SAC edited the form and examined it in a pdf fillable file. This was not successful as such a form cannot be completed by different individuals at different steps without the Adobe Program (most individuals have Adobe Reader only). The committee is now benchmarking other universities in search of a confidential web-based application form that can be filled at multiple steps.
	2. One student grievance is now at the SAC level and the committee is in the process of examining it to come to a timely decision.
	3. We anticipate the discussion of Reading Day: The Student Government is proposing more than one Reading Day at the end of the Spring and Fall semesters. This is currently under discussion by SGA.
	4. Senate Committee Manual: This was introduced at our September SAC meeting and chairs meeting. The SAC was charged to develop its entry for the manual and this is a goal of the SAC 2018-2019 academic year.

**VIII.   Amendments to 30-Day Resolution**

The SEC is proposing the following motions in order to clarify the

 meaning and the implementation of the Senate’s 30-day resolution**.**

Motion: (made and seconded):

#1- Clock Reset after Changes: The committee’s 30-day clock resets when a proposal is sent back for changes.  That is, a proposal is reviewed, returned for changes, and then resent to the committee; the clock stopped when the committee returned the item for changes and resets to 30 days when it is returned to the committee with the changes.

Discussion: The original proposer of the 30-day motion supports this amendment. If a proposal is returned (to the proposer) with questions, when the committee received the answers/changes does the clock/calendar reset and start again or does it continue from the point it had reached (which would be less than 30 days)? This motion would clarify that the clock/calendar starts counting 30 days again. A distinction should be made between request for major changes and minor changes which committee chairs could approve. This does not require holding a proposal for 30 days, to the contrary, 30 days is a maximum. The Senate needs a means of dealing with proposals that reach us simply because the 30-day time limit passed at the previous step. A workshop is needed so that proposals reaching the Senate meet all necessary requirements.

Motion: passed.

Motion (made and seconded):

#2- Clock Stops During Breaks:  Clock stops during winter and summer breaks.  Winter break being defined as starting the last day of the fall semester until the first day of classes for the Spring semester.   Summer break being defined as starting the day after graduation until the start of classes in the Fall semester.

Discussion: (see attachment # 5) The handout, “The Senate Committees’ Work Year 2018-2019,” shows the number of working days during the year. Committees should do their work throughout the entire academic year. When members join committees, they ought to be prepared to do the work. Are committee members required to work during summers? Who would join a committee that requires summer work? A court ruling determined that summer break begins after commencement and not June 30th.

Motion to amend motion #2 (made and seconded): to delete “during winter and” in the first sentence; and to delete the second sentence [so that the clock/calendar counting 30 days continues during the Winter break].

Discussion: University’s business does not stop during breaks and we are hurting enrollment and this motion undermines the entire intent of the 30- day rule. We should discuss how to make the 30-day rule work, not undermine it. We have many breaks during the year and we need to help our colleagues complete projects. Omitting the winter break will result in proposals submitted in mid-December reaching the Senate floor in January without C&I or GS review. Faculty and staff members do other work during winter breaks including research and leading student trips. The main motion, without this amendment, doesn’t negate the possibility of meeting; in fact, several meetings are already scheduled during the break. The main motion simply does not require such meetings (because a 30 day meter is running). If it passes, do not join a committee. You will be obligated to do committee work. This amendment hurts the University because it will discourage people from joining committees.

Motion to amend: not passed (yes – 23; no - 24).

Motion #2 as originally proposed: passed (yes - 34; no - 14).

Motion (made and seconded):

#3- Business Days: The 30-day limit refers to “30 business days.” Discussion: “Business days” in contrast to “calendar days.” Business days excludes weekends. Should wording be “university business days?”

Motion (made and seconded) to call the question: passed.

Motion: passed (yes - 23; no - 18).

Dr. Shamburg announced the meeting will be extended by 20 minutes.

**IX. New Business**

 **a)  Proposed Resolution: Election of Department/Program Chairs -** Morteza Aabdollah

Motion (made and seconded):

The University Senate objects to deans rejecting their faculty’s election of their own department/programmatic chairs. The Dean of Arts & Sciences vetoed the results of the faculty’s election twice this semester. Last year he blocked the election of another highly accomplished and respected faculty member. The Deans of Education and Business have also overruled the results of their faculty’s election for departmental chairs. These actions violate the principle of shared Governance which had been valued consistently at NJCU. Blocking the voice of the departmental faculty in their selection of their leader negatively impacts NJCU’s campus climate and it is thus detrimental to the pursuit of the university’s mission. The Senate therefore calls upon the university administration to accept the results of the departmental elections for chairs that took place in Spring 2018 and to discontinue the practice of overturning the results of faculty elections.

Discussion: This issue has a big impact on departments and students. The dean, and the chair he imposed on computer science, decided that 7:00 pm classes would not be offered. Our students need evening classes. Many of the courses he did schedule were cancelled.

**Quorum call: quorum not present.**

Meeting adjourned 4:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Joseph H. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Secretary of the University Senate

Attachment #1: Early Childhood Education: Infant Toddler Option Proposal

Attachment #2: Mini-Grants Program.

Attachment #3: Overview of the NJCU Mini-Grants Program

Attachment #4: CAS Goals

Attachment #5: The Senate Committees’ Work Year 2018-2019