

Minutes of NJIT Faculty Meeting of April 24, 2019

Presiding: Eliza Michalopoulou, Faculty Senate President

I. Convening of meeting

The meeting was convened at 2:40 pm by the Faculty Senate President, Eliza Michalopoulou and a quorum was confirmed.

II. Approval of minutes

As a quorum was present, the minutes of the February 13, 2019 Faculty Meeting after amendment including the name of the scribe, Anthony Rosato, were moved, seconded and approved.

III. Faculty Senate (FS) report

FS President Michalopoulou reported as follows:

- A. A new ad hoc committee on teaching evaluations has been formed to propose changes in the current system.
- B. The question of how to handle honor code violations is being discussed with a focus on the roles that should be played by the faculty concerned and the Dean of Students.
- C. Scheduling is being revisited: A new centralized version of Infosilem has been recommended, and trial simulations are to be run for the purpose of evaluation.
- D. Procedures for evaluating administrators have been and are being developed.
- E. New proposals for selecting distinguished professors are being considered.
- F. A new system for using webpages (Digital Measures) to automatically add information to profile pages has been developed.
- G. Concerns have been raised about the teaching load distribution and information is being collected across the university to evaluate the current implementation of the TAC.
- H. Discussions with GT on IT concerning cloud usage are underway.
- I. Presidential search procedures are still in the development stage, which is important inasmuch as President Bloom's contract is to expire on June 30, 2022.
- J. A new Faculty Senate President, Ellen Thomas, and Vice-president, Denis Blackmore, have been elected for the coming academic year.

IV. Voting on proposals

Two proposals (for additions/edits of the Handbook) were put forward for a vote (see below):

- A. A motion (M1) was made and seconded for a new procedure for evaluating upper administrators (that was unanimously approved by the faculty Senate) was made and seconded. After the addition of some amendments (to add School Directors and Associate Deans) and an unsuccessful motion to table, the amended motion was passed overwhelmingly (see attached).
- B. A motion (M2) was made and seconded for a new procedure for periodic review of the University President. After some discussion, including a question of how this would be done, which elicited the reply that we would use past practice, the motion was passed overwhelmingly (see attached).

V. Provost's report

Provost Fadi Deek reported on some positive developments and important current activities such as:

- A. He was asked to convey the best wishes of President Bloom, who was unable to attend.
- B. Strategic Planning/Faculty Hiring: Efforts for the next strategic plan, as mentioned before, are well underway and proceeding apace. Most of the 2020 Vision goals have been achieved; for example, we expect to have increased our faculty to 345 by 2020. On the other hand, we have fallen short in the area of diversity.
- C. Students: Our total enrollment in 2019 is 11,985 students, and we have managed to this number with an average SAT score of about 1300.
- D. Ranking: Kudos to us for achieving the Carnegie R1 classification. This puts in good and rather exclusive company (131 of 4500 universities considered). The R1 ranking coupled with our jump from 150 to 106 in the U.S. News & World Report ranks is reason to take pride in our achievements. However, we should be wary of becoming complacent, since as we advance, the competition to maintain and possibly improve rankings becomes keener, to say the least. We have to keep improving to firmly anchor ourselves and possibly advance in R1 territory.

VI. Provost's response to questions

After concluding his report, the Provost opened the floor to questions and responded as follows:

- A. Question 1: How much is in our budget and how much is for renewal? Provost's response: The exact amounts have been provided in previous reports and can be found on the web, but the amount set aside for renewal is about \$17 million.
- B. Question 2: What about changing from Moodle to Canvas? Provost's response: This is under consideration, but it has not yet been approved because of the budgetary impact.
- C. Question 3: Twenty years ago, we were ranked 112 by U.S. News & World Report, so how do explain the fluctuations and recent improvement? Provost's response: It is difficult to completely explain the variations other than a possible inconsistencies in purpose and effort, but the recent improvements are largely due to our success in adding excellent new faculty. We need to keep this and the other good things up, which should help in improving our standing in the eyes of our peers.
- D. Question 4: In our efforts to improve our standing as a research university are we in danger of devaluing teaching? Provost's response: Teaching is important and we need to maintain a healthy balance between research and teaching and naturally treat our students well.
- E. Question 5: It appears that we have a problem with increasing student to faculty ratio. Provost's response: Yes, we are in the high end; hiring more faculty needs to be a priority.

VII. Meeting adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Motions:

M1

7.2 Reviews of Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans and Chairpersons

The purpose of all reviews of administrators by the faculty is to improve the climate and operation of NJIT and the reviews will emphasize, but not be confined to, positive aspects of the efforts of the

administrators to maintain and improve NJIT. With the knowledge and cooperation of the President, the Faculty Senate will conduct periodic performance reviews (at least every three years) by the faculty of the Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans, and Department Chairpersons. The Senate, after consultation with the President, may also review the performance of other administrative officers whose work impacts academic affairs. A person whose work is reviewed will have the opportunity to see the review and comment on it before the review and the comments are sent on by the President of the Faculty Senate, who is responsible for transmitting the reviews to the President in the case of the Provost and to the Provost for all others administrative evaluations

M2

7.x Review of President

The Faculty Senate will conduct periodic performance reviews of the President by the faculty. These reviews will occur at least every three years. The President will have an opportunity to see the report and comment on it. The President of the Faculty Senate is responsible for transmitting the results of these evaluations to the Board of Trustees.