

TCNJ GOVERNANCE MEMORANDUM

To: Committee on Strategic Planning and Priorities (CSPP)
From: Steering Committee
Date: October 1, 2025
Re: **Review of Academic Calendar**

Background: In Fall 2025, the Steering Committee received several requests for a review of the [Principles for Developing an Academic Calendar](#). Specifically, the Steering Committee received the following requests:

- Linda Mayger, Dean of Graduate, Global, and Online Education, requested a review of the Academic Calendar and policy on Principles for Developing an Academic Calendar to include updated language on non-standard academic calendars. Currently, TCNJ does not provide any guidance on non-standard academic calendars for programs that may need to run outside of a traditional academic calendar, such as accelerated programs designed for non-traditional students.
- Sean Stallings, Vice President of Student Affairs, requested a more general review to update and align the Principles Policy and accompanying documents (for example, to note that classes are not held to commemorate MLK Day).
- Faculty-Student Collaboration Directors (Joanna Herres and Anthony Lau) requested a review of the COSA selected dates for this year, and future years, due to a conflict with Nursing clinicals which does not allow for many students to participate in the COSA experience.

Charge: In keeping with the timeline outlined below, Steering asks CSPP to review the existing policy on Principles for Developing an Academic Calendar and revise the policy to include guidance on developing non-standard academic calendars for accelerated programs and to make any other needed updates. If the guidance is best served by a separate policy, CSPP should draft a new policy for Developing a Non-Standard Academic Calendar. CSPP should consult this memo for [recommended language](#) and additional context as they revise the policy.

CSPP should also review the [Principles for Developing an Academic Calendar](#) to update and reflect current existing practice and language for the academic calendar.

Testimony Tier: Tier II.

- The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community.
- The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant stakeholder individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation.

The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

Based on the preliminary recommendations, if CSPP determines a substantive change should be made Principles for Developing an Academic Calendar, Tier III Testimony.

For Tier III Testimony, Steering should consult the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, academic leaders, and other relevant stakeholders.

Testimony Tier: Tier III

- The issue requires a high degree of testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation. The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups. Testimony should be solicited in the form of both written and oral feedback, as well as approval by the appropriate representative bodies.

Written feedback should take the form of a survey and/or email feedback. Oral feedback should take the form of public testimony at a meeting of the appropriate representative body or bodies (as identified by Steering). These meetings should be open to the general public, and publicized so that individuals not represented by that group but interested in the issue may attend. Following that meeting, the representative body may, at its discretion, issue a formal response to the preliminary recommendation, which should be sent to the relevant council or committee as well as Steering. On the completion of a final recommendation, this response should accompany the final recommendation to Steering, and it should be considered as part of Steering's final review.

Timeline: CSPP should begin work immediately on the charge, and it should provide a Final Recommendation to Steering by **November 15, 2025**.

TCNJ Governance Processes

Step 1–Steering issues a charge

Step 2–Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

Step 3–The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see below) assigned to the issue by Steering.

For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body.

Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

Step 4–Governance prepares a Final Recommendation

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must re-submit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

Step 5–Steering considers the Final Recommendation

Step 6–The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation

Step 7–Steering notifies the Campus Community Testimony For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see [Governance Structures and Processes, 2019 Revision](#), pages 23–27.