

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
October 31, 2019
Albert Dorman Honors College Conference Room (211), 11:30 AM–1:30 PM

I. Convening of the Meeting – Ellen Thomas, President

The meeting started at 11:30AM

- II. Roll Call- The following voting members were present: A. Anandarajan, S. Adamovich, Matt Adams (sub for Matt Bandelt), D. Blackmore, D. Bunker, E. Farinas, I. Gatley, H. Grebel, R. Goodman, Q. Jones, B. Khusid, N. Steffen-Fluhr, E. Michalopoulou, S. Pemberton, L. Potts, R. Rojas-Cessa, A. Rosato, U. Roshan, L. Rodriguez-Freire, M. Schwartz, R. Sodhi, D. Sollohub, G. Thomas, E. Thomas, Y. Perl, A. Gerbessiotis, P. Armenante, and A. Lee.

The following non-voting members were present: J. Shafik (Student Senate), K. Belfield, R. Lazer, B. Baltzis, J. Yuan (GSA), L. Hamilton, M. Kam, M. Stanko, and K. Riismandel.

The following guests were present: L. Nurse (Assoc. Dean of Students), W. Fox, I. Chaudhary (Student Senate), W. Sadik, T. Tyson, and A. Hamovich.

III. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on October, 17, 2019

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on October 17, 2019 were approved, with two abstentions.

IV. Report of the Faculty Senate President (10 Minutes)

- a. Reminder now that the spring schedule is out, Senate meetings are moving to Tuesdays
- b. Data Governance Steering Committee
David Bader will be faculty representative on the Committee.
- c. Update on meetings
E. Thomas and T. Rosato met with J. Trombolla, W. Lin-Cook, and B. Baltzis regarding scheduling simulation. Simulation will be run in February. Surveys will be developed by OIE for perusal. It will take 2 months to analyze data. Simulation will run again for Fall 2020 schedule. If any changes are made, it won't be until Spring 2021.

V. Student Services and the Care Team (Marybeth Boger, 20 minutes)

<https://www5.njit.edu/doss/care/>

L. Nurse made a presentation to the FS about the Care Team process, followed by Q&A. The main concerns were about student privacy.

VI. Student Senate Pass/Fail Resolution (Justina Shafik, 15 minutes)

Presentation by J. Shafik and I. Chaudhary (Student Senate) followed by Q&A. Q: Isn't it easier for a student to audit a class? A: The pass/fail will show that a student took the tests and participated in class. Q: Wouldn't that create students that do not give best effort in classes? A: No more than 20% of any pass/fail class could be filled with students taking the course as pass/fail. The idea is that students taking these classes have an actual interest in the class so the Student Senate believes effort will be shown. Q: What happens for the courses that are prerequisites (PRs) for some students? A: Pass/Fail students will not take the seats of any student who needs to take a PR. Comments from faculty about specifying the level of the course

(does this apply to 100/200 level) and creating two standards for students in class. J. Shafik clarified that pass/fail courses are designed for juniors/seniors (not just any student) and they must speak with their advisors to approve access for registering. Students will also need advisor approval from both academic departments. Advisors will not approve students attending a class with large group projects. Several comments from faculty supporting student intellectual curiosity. Q: Would students be able to convert pass/fail to a letter grade? A: Student Senate will look into it with the Registrar. M. Schwartz suggested raising the GPA to at least 3.0 and letting professors know who is a pass/fail especially when trying to assist students. The FS suggested the Student Senate bring this issue to CUE.

- VII. Ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluations Data Request (Maria Stanko, 20 minutes)
Update on Committee by M. Stanko. NCE and HCAD representatives are needed. Currently looking for mechanisms from students/professors so faculty can improve teaching. All input is welcome and should be sent to M. Stanko directly.
- VIII. Selection Process for Distinguished Professors (DPs): Discussion and Vote (45 minutes)
G. Thomas motion to approve. T. Rosato seconded. Discussion. G. Thomas commented that there are two issues: extent of DP's major role in making selection and having a system to expedite process by having a committee decide who does not have a strong background for approval. P. Armenante made a short presentation against motion to approve. Further discussion. E. Michalopoulou stated that this discussion began in 2016 so the FS needs to make a decision today-whether for or against. D. Bunker opined that the concerns raised have been motivated by the faculty not getting a fair hearing and the DP process not being transparent. There are many underrepresented departments on the DP committee so the faculty and DP's need to come to a resolution so they can own the process. The date of March 1, 2020 is far too late-why is one month not enough time? G. Thomas stated that his preference would be to pass the motion, test it, and then use the data to see if the new process works. T. Rosato stated that he is in favor of voting and amending the process if it does not work just to move ahead. P. Armenante commented that the committee needs to make sure there is a rigorous system in place to avoid abuse of the system of requesting letters. A deadline of March 2020 so that committee can move together. D. Bunker suggested bringing the issue to the December 12th meeting and vote during the first meeting in January. G. Thomas stated that the preference of CFRR would be to vote today. D. Blackmore's friendly amendment proposing the following screening process: Reference letters must be solicited for nominees for promotion to DP that are recommended by a 2/3 majority of the senior members of the P&T committee of their department, was moved and then seconded by E. Michalopoulou. In the discussion that followed, it was noted that the senior members of a P&T committee are all those entitled to vote for promotions to full professor. Secret ballot: Friendly amendment was approved (16 yes, 7 no, 1 abstention). D. Bunker stated that full professors are capable of determining and providing input to the DP committee when representatives from certain departments are missing. D. Blackmore commented that only nominations approved by the department according to the amendment require solicitation of reference letters and such solicitations for every other nomination would be determined by the DP committee. P. Armenante commented about rushing the process. D. Bunker stated that the FS could pass the motion today and the committee can amend in the future to provide inspiration for a better proposal. Secret ballot: Motion was approved (17 yes, 5 no, 2 abstentions).
- IX. The meeting ended at 1:30PM