

**Agenda of the Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**March 14, 2019**  
**Albert Dorman Honors College Conference Room (211), 11:30 AM–1:30 PM**

- I. Convening of the Meeting – Eliza Michalopoulou, President
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on February 28, 2019.
- III. Report of the Faculty Senate President (10 minutes).
  - IT advisory board.
  - Next IFM (April 24, combined with R1 reception).
  - Teaching evaluations – students with a D or F.
  - Teaching evaluations: report and motion to follow.
  - Teaching evaluations: report from LEC to follow.
  - Elections of VP and EC members – April 2019.
  - Elections of academic unit senators.
  - TAC/load justification status.
- IV. Presentation on academic integrity (L. Nurse, 20 minutes).
- V. Correction in the Handbook. The phrases indicated by arrows in the 2015 Handbook on the selection of the Provost and the Deans (page attached) are missing from the 2017 Handbook (10 minutes).
- VI. TLT: Motion to adopt Canvas (M. Koskinen, 25 minutes).
- VII. Discussion of the CFRR motion on the evaluation of upper administrators (30 minutes).

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**March 14, 2019**  
**Albert Dorman Honors College Conference Room (211), 11:30 AM–1:30 PM**

- I. Convening of the Meeting – Eliza Michalopoulou, President  
The faculty meeting started at 11:33AM
- II. Roll Call- The following voting members were present: A. Anandarajan, T. Arinzeh, D. Blackmore, D. Bunker, M. Ehrlich (for E. Thomas), E. Farinas, H. Grebel, D. Horntrop, B. Khusid, N. Steffen-Fluhr, E. Michalopoulou, S. Pemberton, L. Potts, R. Rojas-Cessa, A. Rosato, M. Saadeghvaziri, M. Schwartz, R. Sodhi, D. Sollohub, G. Thomas, Y. Perl, and A. Gerbessiotis.
- III. The following non-voting members were present: B. Shokralla, K. Belfield, R. Lazer, R. Caudill A. Hoang, M. Stanko, K. Riismandel, and B. Baltzis.  
  
The following guests were present: M. Koskinen, B. Haggerty, A. Akansu, L. Nurse, J. Carpinelli, L. Simon, A. Borgeonkar, J. Sodhi, P. Natarajan, and E. Petrick.
- IV. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on February 28, 2019.  
The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on February 28, 2019 were approved unanimously, with 1 abstention.
- V. Report of the Faculty Senate President.
  - IT advisory board.  
Low attendance by faculty at the IT forums reflects low interest.
  - Next IFM (April 24, combined with R1 reception).  
The FS President and Vice-President will speak with the Provost about teaching evaluations. Provost Deek is open to comments from faculty regarding removing evaluations of students with a D or F.
  - Teaching evaluations: more information to be provided at a later time regarding modifications of the current evaluation surveys. A report from LEC will follow.
  - Elections of VP and EC members – April 2019.
  - Elections of academic unit senators.
  - TAC/load justification status: NCE information is expected soon.
- VI. Presentation on academic integrity (L. Nurse).  
New forms for various student violations (academic integrity/general issues) are now available on the Dean of Students website using the Maxient platform. Dean Nurse stated that the main goal of the new forms is student retention. A. Gerbessiotis commented on discrepancies between policy language and procedures. Y. Perl commented that the DOS is too lenient with cheating on campus. L. Nurse stated that inconsistencies within policies will be addressed over the summer. Additional comments were expressed regarding faculty complaints with reports going unheard and the DOS office not being responsive. L. Nurse stated that the current system would be replaced with a new standard of feedback from the DOS within 5-7 business days. Questions were raised about the number of cheating incidents that are reported to DOS. L. Nurse will confirm and provide the number to the Faculty Senate. The final decision for student issues will be made in conjunction with DOS and the reporting faculty member. Workshops can

be available for Faculty to review and complete student violations forms; faculty should reach out to L. Nurse directly.

- VII. Correction in the Handbook. The phrases indicated by arrows in the 2015 Handbook on the selection of the Provost and the Deans (page attached) are missing from the 2017 Handbook.  
D. Bunker will review past motions to confirm “typo” for the next meeting.
- VIII. TLT: Motion to adopt Canvas (M. Koskinen).  
Q&A and testimonials with professors: E. Petrick, P. Natarajan, J. Sodhi, A. Borgaonkor, and M. Ehrlich, who have piloted canvas. All positive testimonies for in-person and fully online classes. Additional comments from professors: video links and customization are much better than with Moodle, uploading files and personalizing quizzes is very easy, Canvas is organized and simple to navigate. A few shortcomings of Canvas: the quiz features, moving content from Moodle to Canvas. Senators asked that detailed instructions and training are made available to students and professors. B. Shokralla provided positive feedback from students; they prefer the look and feel of Canvas to Moodle, as it is easier to navigate. Additional positive feedback from students to professors: unanimous preference for Canvas, customization of notifications, mobile app available, intuitive and preferable interface. Q&A with M. Koskinen. What is the difference between Canvas and Google classroom? M. Koskinen: Google is missing features such as gradebook and a quiz system and is similar to Moodle platform. What is the cost of both platforms? Canvas: 150K and Moodle: 85k (will increase incrementally per the contract terms). G. Thomas made a motion to approve. S. Pemberton seconded. Motion was approved (13 yes, 1 no, 4 abstentions).
- IX. Discussion of the CFRR motion on the evaluation of upper administrators.  
Discussion. Evaluation of President is not included in the language for the Faculty Handbook. G. Thomas commented that the purpose of the review of administration is to help improve NJIT. Y. Perl stated that the Faculty Senate should continue fighting to include this statement in the handbook, as it is preserving the essence of shared governance. S. Pemberton suggested informally asking the Board if they will endorse a Faculty Senate performance review of the President. D. Bunker suggested 360 reviews and cross-referencing other university evaluation processes. T. Rosato asked what prevents the Faculty Senate from creating their own evaluation of administration and suggested sending out a survey. A. Akansu stated the labor issues with sharing the evaluations with a third party. B. Lazer commented that there is a difference between performance appraisals vs. evaluation of the individual. Evaluation of the individual is developmental while appraisals include moving forward with feedback and the individuals’ approval or disapproval of the appraisal. K. Riismandel made additional comments regarding what the difference between student and professor evaluations are, as professors are also not aware how evaluations affect their future.