**General Principles of the Proposed NJIT Faculty Senate**

 **23 September 2011**

The Shared Governance Steering Committee has agreed on a proposed model of shared governance, with a Faculty Senate specifically devoted to academic and faculty affairs and a University Senate covering other, more general, university affairs. The Faculty Senate would supersede the current Faculty Council and Committee on Academic Affairs and would also assume many of the duties and responsibilities that are currently reserved for the full Faculty. What follows is an attempt by the faculty members of SGSC to summarize the principles that have been agreed to so far in regard to the Faculty Senate.

* 1. **Composition**
		1. The voting membership of the Faculty Senate would consist of Senators selected by and from the Faculty. Faculty Senators would serve 3-year, renewable terms, with provisions for replacements in case of sabbaticals or other leaves. Initial terms would be staggered in order to maintain continuity.
		2. A total of 15 Faculty Senators would be selected in the following manner:

A. Nine Faculty Senators chosen from the colleges/schools

1. Each college or school would select between one and three senators according to the number of its Faculty in relation to the NJIT Faculty as a whole. Thus, using 2011 numbers, NCE and CSLA would each select 3 Faculty Senators from among the Faculty in their colleges, and CCS, CAD, and SOM would each select 1 Faculty Senator from among the Faculty in their respective colleges or schools.
2. In colleges or schools with multiple departments and more than one college/school Faculty Senator, each department would nominate one candidate according to methods of its own choosing, and the Faculty Senators would be elected from among the candidates by vote of all eligible Faculty in the college or school. No more than one Faculty Senator chosen in this manner could be from any one department.
3. In colleges or schools with only one college/school Faculty Senator, the Faculty Senator would be elected by vote of all eligible Faculty in the college or school, from among those who have been nominated by any eligible Faculty members in the college or school.

B. Six At-Large Faculty Senators

1. After the Faculty Senators chosen by the colleges and schools have been selected, six At Large Faculty Senators would be elected by vote of all eligible NJIT Faculty, from among all eligible Faculty candidates who have been nominated by any eligible Faculty member in the university
	* 1. All tenured and tenure-track Faculty (except full-time administrators at or above the rank of Dean) would be eligible to serve as Faculty Senators in the college or school in which they hold their primary appointment.
		2. No more than two Faculty Senators with primary appointments in a particular department would be permitted to serve as Faculty Senators at the same time.
		3. Regular attendance and active participation would be expected of all Faculty Senators.
		4. The non-voting membership of the Faculty Senate would consist of designated individuals from the administration and other constituencies, including the President or his/her designee, the Provost (as Chair of the University Senate), two academic Deans, the Vice-President for Academic/Student Services, the Senior Vice-President for Research, a representative from Student Government, a representative from GSA, a representative from Staff Council, and a University Lecturer. Non-voting members would not serve on the Executive Committee (see no. 3 below).
	1. **Meetings**
2. Meetings would be open to all members of the university community.
3. Meetings would normally be held biweekly, although adjustments in the meeting schedule could be made by the Executive Committee as necessary.
4. Meetings would be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
5. Minutes would be kept and posted on the Faculty Senate’s website.
6. Robert’s Rules, etc.
	1. **Chair, Vice-Chair, and Executive Committee**
7. The agenda for Faculty Senate meetings would be set by a five-person Executive Committee composed of the Faculty Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, and three other Faculty Senators elected by the Faculty Senate for twoyear, non-renewable terms.
8. The Executive Committee would have frequent and regular meetings with the Provost and President and would consult with them in preparing the agenda and on other matters.
9. The five members of the Executive Committee would be members (with their counterparts in the University Senate) of the Joint Coordinating Committee.
10. The Chair, Vice-Chair, and one other member of the Executive Committee chosen by the Chair would sit as voting members of the University Senate (see no. 6 below).
	1. **Charge**
11. **Academic**  **Affairs**

Recognizing that some matters described herein have financial implications and require consideration by the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Senate would have authority to conduct business over the full range of academic affairs, including (but not limited to) the topics listed in the AAUP “Standards of Shared Governance” document ([www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/ND/Feat/veitsb](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/ND/Feat/veitsb)): (1) graduation requirements; (2) the undergraduate curriculum; (3) the establishment, merger, or discontinuation of departments, schools, and colleges; (4) the establishment of new degree programs (including online programs); (5) the establishment of or substantive changes to majors; (6) the elimination or consolidation of degree programs; (7) the establishment of individual new courses; (8) admissions policies; (9) attendance and grading policies; (10) grade-appeal procedures; (11) drop-add policies; (12) course-repeat policies; (13) policies for honors programs; (14) honor-code policies. However, deliberations and actions taken on some of these matters could also involve the University Senate and/or the Faculty as a whole, as stated below (see nos. 6 and 7).

1. **Faculty Affairs**
2. The Faculty Senate would have authority to conduct business concerning Faculty affairs, other than matters under the jurisdiction of the Professional Staff Association.
3. In this capacity, the Faculty Senate would manage the Faculty Handbook (as revised to reflect the new governance structure), including policies concerning promotion & tenure, sabbatical leaves, and other matters contained in section 2 (or 2x) of the Faculty Handbook. However, deliberations and actions taken on some of these matters could also involve the Faculty as a whole, as stated below (see no. 7).
	1. **Standing Committees and Ad Hoc Committees**
4. The Faculty Senate would maintain standing committees that deal with academic matters and faculty issues (e.g., Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee, Graduate Council, Research Committee, Library Committee, Health/Medical Education Committee, Academic Budget Priorities Committee, Teaching Excellence Committee, Faculty Handbook Committee).
5. The members and chairs of such standing committees would be drawn from the entire university community, as appropriate (e.g., the Library Committee could be chaired by the Director of the library and could include both faculty and staff members).
6. New standing committees would be created, and old ones dissolved, by majority vote of the Faculty Senate.
7. The Faculty Senate could also create ad hoc committees to deal with short-term issues.
	1. **Interaction of the Faculty Senate with the University Senate**
8. The Faculty Senate and the University Senate would maintain a close working relationship and frequent exchange of information. The Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the University Senate would maintain regular and frequent communication, as would the Executive Committees of the two senates, meeting together as the Joint Coordinating Committee.
9. The minutes of the most recent meeting of the Faculty Senate would be distributed to members of University Senate as soon as they have been approved by Faculty Senate, and vice versa.
10. Whenever the Executive Committee or a majority of the Faculty Senate deems an issue to require deliberation and approval by the University Senate in addition to the Faculty Senate, the matter would accordingly be sent to the University Senate (and vice versa). Examples of issues that might require consideration by both senates include admissions policies, drop-add policies, honor-code policies, and course scheduling procedures.
	1. **Interaction of the Faculty Senate with the Faculty as a whole**
11. Most academic business formerly requiring the approval of the Faculty as a whole and/or the Committee on Academic Affairs would now require only the approval of Faculty Senate. Examples include approval of new degree programs, approval of changes to the General University Requirements (both general principles and specific courses that fulfill the GUR), and approval of name changes of academic departments.
12. Certain “extraordinary” issues—such as the addition or dissolution of an academic department or college/school, or changes to the Faculty Handbook involving policies on promotion & tenure, procedures for selecting Department Chairpersons, etc.—would require approval by the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting, as would any other issues that a majority of the Faculty Senators vote to take to the Faculty as a whole.
13. Faculty Meetings
	* 1. All Faculty Meetings would be called and chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
		2. In the absence of extraordinary business, Faculty Meetings would normally be held once each semester.
		3. If there is extraordinary business to conduct, Faculty Meetings would be convened more frequently, as determined by the Faculty Senate.
14. Faculty Input and Exchange

Faculty Senate would regularly seek input and exchange information with the Faculty at large (as well as the university community as a whole) by means of (1) communication carried out at the departmental level, between each Faculty Senator and the Faculty/Staff in his/her Department; (2) Faculty Meetings (see no. 7c above), where the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate would inform the Faculty at large of its deliberations and seek input; (3) the Faculty Senate website, where information would be posted and opinions may sometimes be solicited; and (4) interactive Information Sessions that the Faculty Senate may sometimes convene in order to discuss pending issues with the Faculty at large and/or the entire university community.

* 1. **Interaction of the Faculty Senate with the Board of Trustees**
1. The SGSC recognizes that the authority for governance of NJIT ultimately resides with the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Senate model described in this document assumes delegation of authority by the Board of Trustees, in accordance with the powers bestowed upon the Board by the State of New Jersey, on matters as described herein.
2. The Board of Trustees would be asked to delegate the authority for final approval of certain kinds of business, such as changes to the Faculty Handbook, to the Faculty (i.e., either the Faculty Senate or, for matters of grave importance, the Faculty as a whole), with the approval of the President.
3. In order to facilitate two-way communication and fruitful information exchange between the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate would meet with the Board members at least once each semester on the days of regularly scheduled Board meetings.
	1. **Resources and Support**
4. The Faculty Senate would be provided with appropriate resources in order to ensure effective governance, including (1) an adequate budget, (2) adequate office space, and (3) adequate support personnel.
5. The Chair of Faculty Senate would receive one course release time each semester during his/her term of office. Other Faculty serving on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate would receive one course release time for each year of service. Other Faculty Senators would receive the same amount of time for reassignment of effort that has traditionally been granted to members of Faculty Council (i.e., one course for every three years of service).