Minutes of the Faculty Meeting of the New Jersey Institute of Technology
February 8, 2017

I. Convening of the meeting Dr. Daniel Bunker, Faculty Senate President
At 2:46 PM the Institutional Meeting of the NJIT faculty was convened.

II. Approval of Minutes
As quorum was not reached among attending faculty, the faculty president declined to move the minutes of the October 19, 2016 for approval.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President Dr. Daniel Bunker
A. Dr. Bunker began his report at 2:50 with a brief comment on the significant progress the university has made in developing and implementing new instructional technologies. He encouraged faculty to take advantage in particular of the new Writing Center resources now available in CKB. This building also features new “scale-up” classrooms, allowing faculty and instructors to build alternative pedagogies beyond the more typical lecture formats. The president then announced, complementary to these additions, CTLT’s recent provision of Quality Assurance guidelines for online curricula.

B. Moving directly to the general topic of university Curriculum Review, Dr. Bunker introduced the current study now underway in the Senate as a two part process, emphasizing that issues in CR involve at one level the institution as a whole, as well as, at another level, individual programs. While many program related issues were originally place with CUE as part of their jurisdiction, the contemporary review is raising broader questions to be looked at by an additional ad hoc committee. The President announced that the Senate’s goal is to ultimately set in place a more systemic procedure to enable departments to review curricula annually.

C. Dr. Bunker reminded Faculty that standard by-laws for all departments are now in effect. A procedure for departments to modify and revise these by-laws is also in place, managed by a committee currently chaired by Dr. Darius Sollohub of the School of Architecture and Design. To date this committee has received modified bylaws for review and assessment from two departments.

D. Dr. Bunker noted that Spring 2017 marks the first term where course scheduling has been done as a collaboration between departments and the office of the Registrar, without relying solely on the software tool InfoSilem. Dr. Bunker praised the success of this method, while noting that a search for a new Registrar as well as different software to aid the current method is underway.

E. Dr. Bunker provided an overview of several Faculty Handbook revisions currently being conducted by CFRR. According Dr. Bunker, Section 3.5 “Restructuring of Academic Units” is the last major section in need of revision. Section 4 “Promotion and Tenure” needs to incorporate more fluently and clearly the present two methods currently being used to guide new faculty in the tenure process: namely, the “one
shot method” applying to hires from Fall 2016 onward, and the original method still applicable to all hires before this date. The committee is also in the process of creating better departmental guidelines for Faculty Tenure, while developing a standard policy for the hiring and promotion of University Lecturers.

IV. **Report of the Provost – Dr. Fadi Deek.**

The Provost formally opened his report to NJIT faculty with a list of its agenda, beginning with a presentation appraising the university’s progress in the 2020 Vision plan to be followed by a prepared list of several additional topics under the heading “evolving issues”.

A. The Provost proceeded to report on the current status, as of 2017, of the 2020 Vision plan, organising his comments according to each of its five formal Priorities (Students, Learning, Scholarly Research, Community and Investments) and their respective Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

i. On Priority One, Students, the Provost announced we were doing extremely well, being on target for nearly every KPI, including stated objectives for admissions, as well as retention and graduation rates. He mentioned that the application process has been greatly improved, resulting in higher SAT scores.

ii. On Priority, Two, Learning, the Provost announced we were doing well, although more effort was needed to increase activity in online and converged courses being offered. He noted that the Masters student enrollment numbers will show a substantial increase now that PSM certificate programs are online.

iii. On Priority Three, Scholarly Research, the Provost announced we were doing well except in two areas, noting that we need better leadership among faculty to be more successful in procuring externally funded educational and service grants and also to improve the number of pending patents.

iv. On Priority Four, Community, the Provost stated we were doing well, while we continue to be underrepresented among university employment in minorities. He is certain this trend will reverse thanks to the specific efforts of the chairs and deans, whom he thanked.

v. On Priority Five, Investments, the Provost confirmed improvement was needed regarding several KPIs, noting specifically that current levels of faculty and student satisfaction with the university’s infrastructure should be addressed. He mentioned that a concerted effort was underway in response to the university’s disappointing ranking in student satisfaction as published last year by the *Princeton Review*. The publication’s editor had been since invited to view the campus, and agreed that student life, as witnessed in 2016-17, revealed a different image of general student contentment. He also noted that more 1,200 students had completed responses to this year’s *Princeton Review*
survey, a number substantially larger than last year’s, making him hopeful that any subsequent ranking will also be higher.

B. The Provost introduced a list of four key evolving issues that currently dominate his concern, namely: academic research, enrollment, budget and faculty renewal.
   i. The Provost announced that we set a new record for external funding awards in the past two quarters, increasing funding from $25.6 million to $36.3 million—a 42% increase over the previous year.
   ii. The Provost considers enrollment numbers to be an evolving concern and understands some of the drops in actual numbers to be part of a disturbing trend. He noted that NJIT’s dependence on student tuition is a simple fact. The actual total enrollment numbers for FY17 show a decline, prompting him to ask chairs and deans to accept reduced budgets.
   iii. Speaking further on the operating budget and its obligatory reduction by 1.3% of the original or $4.4 million, the Provost stressed the need for a collective response among faculty and administration. At the same time, he noted that at this point the administration has successfully shouldered most of the burden.
   iv. On the final evolving issue of Faculty Renewal, the provost announced that this topic continues to constitute the largest single resource commitment of the 2020 Vision Plan, and that, on target with its corresponding KPI, NJIT will have 20 new faculty join us in September 2017. Our projected faculty population will be roughly 320 next year.

C. The Provost concluded his report with a review of the university’s ongoing efforts to improve facilities, detailing project updates for the new Central King Building, the Life Science and Engineering Building and the construction of the Wellness and Event Center, set to be completed in September 2017. While the CKB is almost complete, it remains the only facility project on budget at $99,138,279. The Life Science and Engineering Building expects a cost overrun of $750,000. The Provost reminded faculty that budgets for these building were supported by State Bonds, meaning that university costs have been minimal. The Wellness and Event Center is the only current project that is fully funded by the University with a projected construction cost of $106,500,000. The Provost believes this project is also on track and expects convocation to be held there this Fall.

V. Further Business and Questions
Following the Provost’s Report additional time was allocated for an informal question period from faculty members.

A. Faculty applauded the President’s efforts to keep faculty and students informed and aware of the University’s ongoing commitment towards principles of freedom and tolerance in education. At the same time, Faculty asked if the President was pursuing
other alternatives in response to some of the federal government’s recent attempts to bar certain immigrants from entering the country. Faculty further encourage the President to respond actively to these events if he is not currently doing so.

Speaking for the President of the University, the Provost confirmed that he appreciated these concerns among faculty and assured members of the President’s open mind and willingness to respond to these events.

B. Faculty brought up several budget and funding related questions regarding the ongoing improvements to facilities, asking the Provost to elaborate on potential shared concerns over project cost overruns and how they might affect faculty resources. The Provost was reminded that the University is now accountable to its financial institutions for several significant debts.

The Provost responded by calling these questions fair enquiries and subsequently encouraged Faculty to pose them to the University’s Senior VP of Finance, Ed Bishof. Faculty requested a full presentation to be made by the Senior VP of Finance at a later date.

C. Faculty asked for more information concerning one of the metrics presented by the Provost regarding Priority 2 KPIs and Professional Success. The Student FE passing rate, currently listed at 71 per cent, seemed confusing and did not match rates previously presented to Faculty in other meetings. The Provost invited associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Dr. Basil Baltzis to respond. Dr. Baltzis explained that the listed rate of 71 per cent for 2016 corresponds to NJIT’s current comparative standing with the national average student passing rate. NJIT students show an FE passing rate that is .71 of the overall national rate.

D. Faculty asked for an update on the current Dean search the University is conducting for the Honors College. The Provost responded by noting that the Dean search for the Honors College is almost concluded, having been narrowed down to two external candidates.

VI. Adjournment
Dr. Bunker reminded faculty that, as quorum was not reached, the minutes of the October 19th Institutional Faculty Meeting would not be approved today.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45.