

Natural Sciences and Mathematics Council

Meeting Minutes for October 20, 2015

Student Union 3016 3:30 – 4:30 PM

Call to Order

- Roll Call – Peter Andreana
- Presiding – Bruce Bamber
- **Present:** Jim Anderson, Jonathan Bossenbroek, Mike Cushing, Edith Kippenhan, David Krantz, Kathy Shan, Don Stierman, Sibylle Weck-Schwarz, Denis White, Hans Gottgens, Tim Mueser, Gerard Thompson, Doug Lieman, Katharine Fisher, Kevin Gibbs
- **Others Present:** Dean Karen Bjorkman, John Plenefisch (ex-officio)
- **Absent:** Anthony Quinn, Yanfa Yan, William Taylor

Last Meeting:

Corrections to the minutes:

Cola grant = Kohler Grant
Pluralize (Member(s) of research council)

Use two different Headers for the 2 approval minutes

Spelling of Rebecca Schneider

Vote to accept minutes, after noting corrections, was unanimous

Update to Promotion and Tenure Elaborations:

Discussions lead by Dean Karen:

1. Revise, rethink or even consider
2. Left over from Arts & Sciences Elaborations
3. Think carefully our current situation (institution, current climate)
4. Think carefully about tenure and promotion to full
5. Currently there is some confusion about promotion to full because things are vague
6. What are the expectations? Faculty clearly need to express their ideas

7. Strategy - Council will come up with revised elaborations representing NSM College
 - a. Vote of the full faculty
 - b. Each department will then revisit their own elaborations to ensure they are in-line
8. Where are the college elaborations?
 - a. They are not online but a hard-copy was made available to Bruce Bamber with a section missing – They refer to the old Arts & Sciences Elaborations – Dean Karen worked on this earlier version for Arts & Sciences
 - b. The institute is in a different place than what it was ~10 years ago and the Arts & Sciences College does not exist anymore – this is the charge for revisiting the elaborations
9. Bruce sent the old Arts & Sciences version to the committee via email
10. John Planefish was welcomed as new Associate Dean
11. Dean Karen's ideas for new elaborations (up for debate as some people will agree and some will disagree): **[The Charge]**
 - a. There is an understanding that the research mission is very important to the NSM College
 - b. Teaching and Student engagement mission is also very important to College and University
 - c. There is an understanding that people contribute to these in many different ways
 - i. We essentially operate like an ecosystem but we should not expect everyone to contribute in equal ways in any one area
 - ii. We need to put people in the correct place so that they can make excellent contributions (recognizing the strength(s) of our members for success) – this means we cannot just tell our junior assistant professors that research is the only thing that matters. There are other areas of importance too and just publications and grants (although these are very important, they're not the only thing)
 - iii. Teaching, community engagement, other forms of service are very important to our institute because we in fact do have a niche in and amongst other institutes – there are other things that contribute to the whole of the institute, college and department – need to promote all facets of professional development (research, teaching, service)
12. Hans - Teaching should not replace research but needs to be considered seriously and not just as lip-service
13. Dean Karen – we need to meet students where they are at and not where we want them to be and therefore need people who are willing to contribute in that manner
 - a. Research is engaging for graduate students and undergraduate students
 - b. We need to continue to think along these as we make hiring decisions
14. Gerard T. – Due to the fact that tenure/tenure track people have been depleted, the increased work-load of teaching and service falls on the young faculty more and more – these things should be acknowledge in writing

15. Edith – need a better evaluation structure for teaching because the current model is not working correctly (numbers of replies to evaluation)
 - a. Dean Karen – agreed to Edith’s suggestion and also noted we need more than just one evaluating system – outcome based evidence (need data)
 - b. Edith – mid-semester evaluation as well as end of semester evaluation – argues that students give mid-semester feed-back and get change during the class and not just at the end of the semester when class is finished
 - c. Dean Karen – we need to listen to students and hear what they are saying
16. Gerard T. – How do we do it then? One way is to have a better letter of expectation for our new incumbent faculty
 - a. Dean Karen – How that would work is that the Chair, DPC chair and faculty member sit down in a meeting to openly discuss letter of expectations – it’s agreed upon and signed off on including the Dean
 - b. This has been done before with letters for new faculty that come to UT as a faculty member and a member of a school for example
17. Bruce – How have departments been dealing with these letters of expectations – Are they equal?
 - a. Dean Karen – They vary throughout depending on the situation – depends on who’s on the committee – However, overall it’s pretty consistent at very high levels but the details are different – We need to work on the same level
18. Tim M. – Therefore these elaborations should allow for greater consistency across the board? Tenure and Promotion to full?
 - a. Dean Karen – Yes
19. Bruce B. – The current elaboration document does, to some extent, incorporate the ideas being discussed so it might just be a matter of culture?
 - a. Dean Karen – The college should provide the foundation for everyone to agree on
20. Gerard T. – What about Open Access Journals as a contributing factor to tenure or promotion?
 - a. Dean Karen – Open Access is the way all agencies are going – we have to evaluate them properly – there needs to be weight given to publications in Open Access journals
 - b. Dean Karen – Related to Open Access journals, Funding is horrendous at the moment (8% acceptance rate in Astronomy) – we can’t be penalizing people because they are not getting funding – we will decimate our junior faculty if we do not encourage them – funding is coming from different places and in different ways (money is money when it comes to running research groups)
21. Michael - How can the evaluation process be made easier?
 - a. Dean Karen – Something called Faculty 180 where CVs, Publications...etc. – like a dossier online – E-Dossier...we have to move in that direction.
 - b. As part of the elaborations we should have certain things built in for the Dossier and not leave it entirely wide open so that everything ends up in there

22. Bruce B – Department of Biology’s elaborations seem to be well constructed but wasn’t certain if new faculty were getting the document of if established faculty even had that document
23. Michael – One good thing about an e-dossier is having built in links and not having to print everything out
 - a. Dean Karen - Thought in this direction is happening just not very fast because there are a lot of other things to deal with as well
24. David K – Multi-PI grants and how to deal with it?
 - a. Dean Karen (i) Multi-PI grants – it’s a real issue however if the faculty member spells out contributions things are made a lot easier – clearly Multi-PI projects are how science is getting done in today’s world
 - b. Dean Karen (ii) Another thing to consider is Multi-Disciplinary research projects consisting of more than one area of expertise – we cannot discourage those venues of research by not counting them – weighted appropriately – people will need to articulate their contributions properly – discuss in narrative! – culture change?
25. Hans – Reviewing external Promotion cases?
 - a. Dean Karen – mostly research based for external evaluations.
26. David – We only send out packages for comment on research not teaching or service
27. Edith – To strengthen the evaluations for teaching, there might be more peer-to-peer evaluation processes
 - a. Dean Karen – Peer-to-peer evaluation – Master Teachers (Award) – bring it back? Develop a list of expectations.
28. David K. – Master Teachers were advisories to the Dean and college at one point – now we’re faced with retention and degree completion and therefore bringing Master Teachers back would be beneficial
 - a. David K. – recognizes the importance of Master Teachers mentoring young people because teaching does matter
29. Tim M – Tim sits on CCAP and recognizes that department committees value research quite highly but then will nit-pick on teaching. How do we streamline it so that doesn’t happen? Argues that when teaching is being nit-picked, a negative spin ensues and this is not necessarily fair because there is a large amount of data supporting a positive evaluation and one or two negative comments does not justify a negative discussion when there are far more positive comments in the teaching component of an individual’s dossier. Personal choice to find negative comments rather than a professional responsibility to parse out the weight of positive versus negative comments. Elaborations should allow for a streamlined approach.
 - a. Dean Karen - The thing that we need to be cognizant of is the CBA and ensuring that we are in line with those guidelines.
 - b. Tim M. – Argues that the current evaluation process at the department level is not fair in that if they look for positives in research then they’ll look for positives in teaching; if there are negatives in research then they’ll look for negatives in teaching...there is not a good balance.
 - c. Edith – Would a rubric be helpful?

- d. Tim M – What is happening is that the department committees will only look for negative comments from the students to discuss rather than evaluate the comments on a whole. There might be a lot more positive comments than just 2 negatives ones and that's what the discussion should focus on. The issue becomes when those negative comments are written in the department letter and propagate all the way up but at the same time it is just as easy to write positive comments when in fact the positive comments out way the negative ones. Needs to be part of the elaborations.
 - e. Dean Karen – There are many different levels of evaluation for checks and balances.
30. Peter – How important are the external letters?
- a. Dean Karen – Extremely – John P.- agrees
31. Dean Karen – Studies show that external letters will be biased based on gender, scientific area...etc. and that we at UT must be cognizant of them. In fact it would be a good idea for people here to have the proper training regarding “unconscienced biasing” regarding external letters. We need to ensure a very fair process. We need to raise awareness.
32. John P – UCAP experience – grave difficulties with the way the letters were actually being generated. Getting the letters – how much input did the faculty member have in the name selection process? Unfortunately in some cases the faculty member had NO say in where the letters were originated.
- a. Dean Karen – What we should do is standardize that in the college.
 - b. Bruce B – There are clear cut guidelines in Biology elaborations regarding how they solicit external letters. In the Arts and Sciences elaborations, a page and a half inadvertently got deleted.
 - c. Dean Karen – The departments might want to tweak the elaborations a bit but they should follow “Best Practices”. The department chair should solicit other faculty members in the similar area for names of other potential reviewers to try to ensure an overall fair process.
33. Gerard T. – What about the number of external letters? When serving on CCAP, Physics and Astronomy would have 10 letters.
- a. David K. Noted that his department might only get 2 or 3 external letters on occassion.
 - b. Dean Karen – Would like to see 4 to 6 external letters. In any event, if 10 letters are solicited and 10 letters arrive, all 10 letters must be put in the dossier moving forward and not only the good letters or not only the bad letters (ethical).
34. Bruce B – Maybe the Biology departmental elaborations can be used as the template. (Many people agreed with this statement)
35. Dean Karen – If an outlier letter arrives, it might be best for the DPC and Chair to comment on the letter to reflect a potential bias or to point out something that might not necessarily be complementary.
36. Tim M – The candidate should be able to note who not to choose as an external referee.

- a. Dean Karen – Yes. Just like NSF does for example when you submit a proposal.
37. Hans – What's the timeline?
- a. Dean Karen – End of semester.
 - b. David K. – Is there a timeline for the departments?
 - c. Dean Karen – Yes but it will depend on the college elaborations first. Everything to be done by the end of the academic year. NSM College subcommittee should submit their draft by Nov. 20.
38. David K – We do have, in the bylaws, the ability to call an extra meeting to vet something such as these elaborations before the next scheduled meeting.
39. Dean Karen – I want built-in flexibility for these elaborations but I do not want to see standards lowered.

John P. – GEDs – in prep for the HLC visit – we would like to have it explicitly spelled out GED admission standards for the various colleges.

GED in OH – there are 4 subject areas in GED. Students need to reach a score of 150.

100 – 200 range/subject

600 score minimum to pass GED

4 areas:

Reasoning for the language arts

Mathematical reasoning

Science

Social Studies

All based on 12th grade curriculum

*College and Career readiness is considered to be a score of 170 in each subject area (150 means you get your GED only)

Question: Do colleges here at UT have GED standards?

Answer: Only 3 colleges have standards.

1. Business: This innovation requires a 710 total for a Bachelors in Business
2. Engineering: 730 for Engineering plus a math of 190 plus a 22 SAT plus some other requirements for additional years of course work in chemistry and so forth.
3. Pharmacy: will take any applicable GED

Hans – How many GED applicants do we actually get?

John P – Only a handful across the university. For NSM – maybe 1 or 2 the whole year.

Provost is requesting we have a score-line for the GED.

Tim M – Does this replace the SAT for example?

John P – No. It is separate. There is no equation conversion for the GED to a GPA.

Kathy – Might be best for us to be just below Engineering.

Response: A higher level math course would be helpful

John P – Recommendation should come from this group

David K – Concerned that the math requirement be more than just a high school level math preparedness class.

Edith – Advocated that a higher level math, 190 for example, be included in our minimum standard for a scored GED. Edith has noticed some of the difficulties students have with ratios in chemistry for example.

David K – Wants the committee to understand that some of these students might have other insinuating circumstances including personal problems at home or elsewhere. The university has UCollege for boarder line students whereas our college does not and argues that we don't have to necessarily accept GED students but the university can and at some other point in time, those students might want to approach our college when they feel they are ready. In the end, David advocates for having high standards. This minimized the student's risk in taking classes in our college.

Kathy – If Engineering has a 730 and Business has a 710, why don't we have a 720? and keep the math high.

Tim M – Is it fair to treat a student with a 2.5 GPA from High School be subjected to a high GED and therefor a higher standard?

David and Edith – Problem is that we don't have the demographics. We simply don't know if the 2.5 GPA is a result of honors for example or something else? Hard to tell.

Hans – Doesn't the ACT and SAT contain the math components?

Response – Yes. David K – and it's higher than what they're talking about in the GED.

Hans – Maybe not even worry about the GED math. His feeling is that those 2.5 GPA students won't achieve the 190 on the math of the GED.

Kathy – We should be bringing them all up (higher level).

John – That would be for a different discussion – bringing the standards all up.

Chairman Bruce asks for the discussion to be suspended because it is important to vote on the Vice Chair who will be the next NSM Chair (2016/2017).

Tim M – voted in unanimously!

Chairman Bruce noted that Dennis White retired. In order to address this void on Faculty Senate membership, Bruce recommended that the committee vote to confirm Lawrence Anderson takes his place for next year.

Lawrence Anderson – voted in unanimously

Back to GED discussion:

John – The NSM council would not be opposed to setting GED standards at the Engineering level (730 for Engineering plus a math of 190 plus a 22 SAT plus some other requirements for additional years of course work in chemistry and so forth).

Bruce – motion to set NSM College GED standards as those of Engineering.

Hans – Is this independent of ACT/SAT scores or...?

John – It would be for SAT score set at 20. As an alternative to the high school GPA this GED would stand in for that.

Motion passed unanimously

Hans – He would like to find out the protocol for increasing SAT/ACT admission standards for the college. We get a lot of students who are not prepared.

David – We are inching closer to have an “incubation” set-up with Owens and Monroe for potential UT students.

Course Modification:

Mike – Course modification to an undergraduate class Math 4880

Change: Instead of prerequisite being 3850 to 2860. They need to add it to get people to register.

Motion made to accept the change

Motion passed unanimously

Reports:

Faculty Senate:

1. Membership to Senate (volunteered vs appointed/elected)
2. Open Enrollment
 - a. Added healthy you
 - b. Providing personal documentation has been postponed to next year and it might be streamlined to be made a lot easier to enroll.
3. Decrease physical capacity by 10-15%
 - a. Not only to HSC and MC but other 4 campuses
 - b. Not by tearing them down, just by not using unneeded space
4. Ohio Faculty Council – interesting things going on with the state (no details to report) – one interesting point is the efficiency of our teaching (departments) – Ohio Department of Education and Ohio Legislature – Governor's taskforce for efficiency and affordability – There are no faculty or administrative representatives on that committee – The bottom line is that the Ohio Faculty Council is trying to find ways for institutes to collaborate (for example, sociology here at UT and BGSU have notoriously been small)
5. President has announced a national search for the Provost – does not exclude John Barret (Search Committee – Rebecca Schneider, Kristen Keith, Kaye Patten-Wallace, Chris Ingersoll, Karen Bjorkman, Christopher Cooper, Amanda Bryant-Friedrich, Cody Spoon [student government], Jose Rosales, Eric Prichard, Alissa Falcone, Katherine Eisenmann, Llewellyn Gibbons, Edmund Lehman)
6. What is the definition of satisfactory academic progress? Student financial aide.
7. Barret talked about College combinations.

Graduate Council Meeting:

1. Presentation by the President
 - a. \$11 mil in deficit
 - b. \$350 mil endowment
 - c. 60 day hiring freeze...probably going to be extended (for staff replacement and not faculty)
2. State has changed Plateau Pricing – from 12 to 16 credits to 12 to 18 credits – this has caused another \$1.5 mil shortage in our budget.

Chairs Meeting:

1. Big issue was the under enrolled courses
2. Point of Interest – if parent asks you for access to the student's records use proxy and do not give them access
3. If you were paid on a grant during the summer you could potentially pay yourself more. If you have the money, talk to your chair.
4. Dean Karen is serious about expanding our science education footprint – wants one person/department who is in science education (a lot of grant funding available)

Motion to adjourn @ 5.03 pm

Motion approved