

Agenda

NJIT Institute Faculty Meeting

December 4, 2019

Jim Wise Theater, 2:30 – 4:00 pm

Presiding: Ellen Thomas, Faculty Senate President

1. Approval of minutes of the April 24, 2019 Institute Faculty Meeting minutes.
2. Approval of minutes of the October 16, 2019 Institute Faculty Meeting minutes.
 - a. Minutes are posted at: <https://www5.njit.edu/facultysenate/>
3. Faculty Senate Report
4. Proposed Handbook Change: Sections 2.3.1.4, 2.4.1.4, 4.4.4, Selection of Distinguished Professors
5. Proposed Handbook Change: Section 7
 - a. Proposed changes are posted at: <https://www5.njit.edu/facultysenate/>
6. Report of the Provost
7. Other business

Institute Faculty Meeting – Minutes

December 4, 2019: 2:30 – 4:00 PM

Location: J. Wise Theater

Opening of the Meeting: 2:47 pm (no quorum)

Report of the President of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Ellen Thomas

Senate leadership is reviewing NJIT 2025 KPI's and meeting with SVP Ed Bishof on budget issues

BoT changes: Robert Cohen will become BoT chair this summer. Many new trustees onboarding now. BoT indicates willingness to work with FS on Presidential search process and subsequent search.

Senate leadership is working with Registrar on scheduling. Reports on simulation being run to assess current hybrid model against a completely-centralized system. Survey of faculty to be conducted. Any changes in protocol will take place no earlier than Spring 2021.

FS is still working on the issue of evaluation of upper administrators since the motion passed at the spring IFM was not accepted by the administration.

Report of Provost F. Deek

Began discussing NJIT 2025 Strategic Plan

Quorum Achieved at 2:55 pm. FS President takes podium to begin voting.

Approval of Minutes of April 24 and Oct. 16, 2019 IFM

Motion to approve with proposal that amendments be attached to the April 24 minutes. – APPROVED.

Motion to approve minutes of Oct. 16. - Approved with 1 abstention

Motion to approve addition to Faculty Handbook that corrects clerical error. Motion seconded. Discussion ensued.

Comment. Claim that wording of addition of Section 7.1.3.5 to Faculty Handbook doesn't make sense. He suggests that "consultation with department to determine faculty rank" doesn't make sense since the motion additionally indicates that appointment must be made at the rank of Distinguished Professor under consideration, and the approval of the Distinguished Professors Committee must be obtained.

Additional discussion on issue

Motion for friendly amendment, to add "potential of the appointee".

Vote on friendly amendment taken → 71% No. Amendment failed.

Vote to call the question, cut off discussion in order to proceed with a vote, seconded. → 89% Yes

Vote on motion to add language to the Faculty Handbook. → 91% Yes. Motion passed.

Motion to approve a modified selection process for Distinguished Professors.

Review of history of issue given by FS President and procedure for final approval.
Presentation of FS-approved “Distinguished Professors Review Subcommittee”

Motion to approve and seconded.

Discussion

- Comment: Believes that approval of motion would be a mistake since the ‘distinguished professor’ is not a rank by an honorary title. Placing DP within the P&T process violates the handbook.
- Comment: Refutes claim indicating that the process comes under the purview of the FS, especially since DP’s receive a pay increase.
- Comment: Cites that evaluation of any rank must be done by those above that rank. Claims that approval of the proposed process would make NJIT a laughing stock among other universities. Suggests that ‘rank’ should be done only by the distinguished professors.
- Comment: More discussion in support of the motion for transparency and to be in sync with current P&T process in departments that includes associate professors
- Comment: This type of evaluation not common in most universities. Requests clarification on process if candidate does not obtain a 2/3 majority from the department. Suggests that if 2/3 majority is not obtained, the process should end.
 - Vote to call the question, seconded → 67% Yes; 29% No; 5% Abstain
 - Vote on the proposed new DP process → 73% Yes; 19% No; 8% Abstain. Motion passed.

Motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded. Meeting adjourned.