I. **Convening of the Meeting – Ellen Thomas, President**
The meeting started at 11:32AM

II. **Roll Call**

The following non-voting members were present: J. Shafik (Stud. Senate), J. Yuan (GSA), K. Beifield, R. Lazer, O. Tukel, F. Deek, L. Hamilton, J. Daniels (sub for M. Kam), M. Stanko, and K. Riismandel.

The following guests were present: E. Katz, S. Ziavras, P. Deess, L. Simon, P. Ibrahim (Stud. Senate), W. Fox, and A. Zarzycki.

III. **Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on October, 3, 2019**
Minutes were approved unanimously with two abstentions.

IV. **Report of the Faculty Senate President (10 Minutes)**
   a. **Update on meetings**
      - IFM attendance was one shy of quorum. Senators have to do a better job of promoting it to faculty
      - The FS President and VP met with Chuck Brooks and Mary Kierst who are chairing the Faculty Senate Committee on Assessment. They are populating that committee now and will begin preparations for Middle States 2020
      - Next week the FS President and VP are meeting to discuss the scheduling simulation evaluation criteria. If you have any concerns, comments, or suggestions please forward them before Wednesday morning.

V. **Report from GER subcommittee and motion for STS courses (Eric Katz, 30 minutes)**
   a. **Motion from meeting on 5.9.19: Four 200 level STS courses (STS 201, STS 205, STS 210, and STS 221) may satisfy either the Liberal Arts GER Literacy or the Social Science GER literacy, as long as one course is not counted as both GER literacies for a student**
   b. **Motion: If an academic unit wants to design a GER course in a specialty of another academic unit (e.g. math GER, Humanities GER), the course should be designed by both units and have the approval of both**

E. Katz stated that the GER committee has not yet met this year due to scheduling conflicts and CUE not forwarding business to discuss. The motion for STS courses was discussed over a long period starting in Feb 2019. Motion was tabled in Feb for the March meeting and again in March for the April meeting. During the April meeting it was voted on and passed. S. Pemberton took issue with the process during the March meeting.
Discussion: S. Pemberton stated that the issue was postponed to create rubrics for the GER. During Feb 4th meeting, there was a motion to have courses reviewed for the Social Science Literacy category. Motion was tabled until March 11th meeting. During March 11th meeting, S. Pemberton raised objections about the rubrics being disregarded and asked the committee to create a motion ensuring that the correct process would be followed. S. Pemberton stated that his comments were ignored and the committee passed the motion without looking at course syllabi.

D. Blackmore motion to approve Four 200 level STS courses (STS 201, STS 205, STS 210, and STS 221) may satisfy either the Liberal Arts GER Literacy or the Social Science GER literacy, as long as one course is not counted as both GER literacies for a student. E. Bilgili seconded.

Further discussion: E. Katz stated that the syllabi were there and reviewed. E. Katz also stated that the committee looks at new courses/changes to courses and not courses grandfathered in, so there was no need to examine if the 4 courses are under Liberal Arts (as approved in March 2017). Offers more flexibility to students looking to take other Lib. Arts courses. E. Katz final comment that in terms of process and content he sees no issue with the GER committee approval.

Q&A: D. Horntrop commented that it is GER's responsibility to review changes in these courses. D. Bunker asked if these 4 courses actually satisfy GER requirements. E. Katz replied that an argument could be made that the Psychology and Sociology courses (STS 210 and 221) could be removed from Liberal. Arts; however, they were grandfathered in, and STS 201 and 205 are clearly multi-disciplinary and should be in both Liberal Arts and Social Science. D. Bunker stated that GER should go back and reevaluate 4 courses placed in the wrong area and correct the issue. E. Katz stated this can be a two-step process: 1. FS passes the motion 2. He promised that the GER will look at STS 210/221 courses to see if it can be removed from Lib. Arts GER. D. Sollohub asked to make the two step process a friendly amendment to the motion. G. Thomas seconded. Friendly amendment was approved (21 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention).

Further Discussion: D. Bunker made a motion to send issue back to GER committee to evaluate 4 courses (including STS) according to Lib. Arts and Social Sciences GER literacy by following rubric/procedure. A. Gerbessiotis seconded. Motion was not approved (9 yes, 10 no, 4 abstentions) G. Thomas called the question. Motion was approved (16 yes, 4 no, 3 abstentions).

VI. NJIT 2025 (Fadi Deek and Perry Dees, 30 minutes)
Presentation. Dees asked that FS members send comments on KPI's (if any were missed) in writing to him. Each priority has objectives that are not in order of importance. Discussion w/ Q&A. D. Bunker question regarding the retention slide: what happens after 6 years? P. Deess answered that this shall be addressed by the Center for Student Success. A. Gerbessiotis: does the graduation rate apply to transfer students? P Deess: will try to find the metric for transfer students with Associates Degrees. J. Shakif asked why isn't a 4 year metric included? P. Deess: they are not used for ranking/reporting the University, but still tracked. P. Deess stressed the need for a summary metric about IT and asked for suggestions. R. Lazer suggested asking the candidates for the new CIO position during interviews. P. Deess also stressed the need for objective metrics for facilities. M. Stanko commented that she would like to see teaching in the plan. All other comments/questions will be sent directly to Perry/Fadi.

VII. Research committee presentation on TAC (Jay Meegoda, 15 minutes)
Discussion. Faculty handbook (FH) is implicitly a part of the PSA contract. H. Grebel stated that he was in favor of removing TAC language from FH because these matters are best left to the departments. It was clarified that TACs are developed independently at the departmental level. Several senators suggested checking the level of approvals of the current TACS.

VIII. CUE report and motions – see attachment (David Horntrop, 10 minutes)

1. CME
   (a) B.S. in Materials Engineering
   D. Blackmore motion to approve. G. Thomas seconded. Motion was approved (20 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention)

2. Double majors
   (a) Biology/Mathematics double major
   (b) CS/Mathematics (Applied Mathematics concentration) double major
   (c) CS/Mathematics (Computational Mathematics concentration) double major
   (d) Physics/Mathematics double major
   G. Thomas motion to approve. Y. Perl seconded. Motion was approved (20 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention)

3. MIE
   (a) B.S. in Industrial Engineering
   G. Thomas motion to approve. E. Bilgili seconded. Discussion: Changes approved will be effective during the Fall ’20 semester. D. Bunker asked how many students are in BIO 200. D. Horntrop estimates 5 (transfer credits satisfy). Motion was approved (20 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention).

IX. CGE report and motions (Sotirios Ziavras, 10 minutes)

a. PSM in Biotechnology (MS in Pharmaceutical Chemistry): New PSM title and curriculum changes
   P. Armenante motion to approve. G. Thomas seconded. Motion was approved (20 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

b. MS in Chemistry: curriculum change (core courses)
   P. Armenante motion to approve. G. Thomas seconded. Motion was approved (21 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

X. The meeting ended at 1:23PM