

## Natural Sciences and Mathematics Council

Meeting Minutes for November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Student Union 3016 3:30 – 4:30 PM

### Call to Order

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

### 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*

-----  
John P: Assessment reports will be made available for HLC for their visit.

Edith: Final grades – exam scores are no longer acceptable, need to look at individual exam questions for assessments.

John P: It would be helpful.

Edith: Can we get assistance for that? Statisticians to work with? Who does that fall under?

John P: It will fall on you guys I'm afraid.

Edith: It used to be that we could look at just final grades, and use exams and exam scores for assessment, now they want us to pull individual questions and say that these questions are about objective X or objective Y.

John P: This is true for the core assessment.

For the program assessment – people still using entire exams and not just particular questions.

Right now I have left this alone, however I've left comments for the committee – which would be helpful within the whole group. Core assessment is not in this round. Will be addressed in the spring.

David K: The idea is to get a group of questions that are related to one specific learning objective and use that. I'm dealing with ~1,500 students per semester and it isn't that bad...really.

Jim: Could we use a C for course and P for program on the assessment form?

John P: Core assessment = course learning objective.

David K: Direct link to program. General education courses not part of degree program.

John P: Referring to chair council – under enrolled and high dif. W courses.

Edith: Back to an issue with HLC – do not need to use the template for syllabus, make sure to follow the required components.

John P: You can use your own syllabus.

David K: Suggestion: Create a master syllabus for the entire course and have it posted. Then create a working syllabus for the students in simple form that doesn't have a link to everything.

John P: We all need to have a syllabus for study courses. For graduate research, it can be a general template with general outcomes expected.

Bruce: It sounds like we could have a syllabus or remove a course from catalog/listing – Question is...how do you actually remove it? It is online and where to we need to make our request?

John P: Request goes through Registrar's Office. Process is simple. Probably go through the college.

David K: There is a mechanism where you can put the course in hibernation. You really do not want to get rid of course completely or will have to go through entire process of creating a new course. Marcia King Blandford or Registrar's Office. Not entirely positive.

Bruce: I'd like to welcome Bill Taylor – who is here with us as John P's replacement. NSM website updated. Please make sure the info is correct. Please let me know of any changes/updates and I will fix them. There are however somethings missing. Meetings missing. Some links are draft notes – I (Bruce) would like approved notes to update the links.

Edith: You have some "draft" minutes. We should know if they're "draft" or "final" minute meetings.

Bruce: Did not find ratified constitution. Bruce has highlighted changes version. Bruce needs finalized copy.

John P: New constitution not ratified. Did our copy have the Scarborough clause in place (?) in the recent copy?

## **Update to Promotion and Tenure Elaborations:**

Bruce: Status of tenure and promotion operations – 5 people got together last Friday and hashed out a common version. Sent to Dean on Friday. Dean was pretty happy with it – only a few small changes. Will be sent out to everyone. Minor changes from Dean Karen were made such as: (a) clarifying which particular sections of a CBA and adding/removing a date; (b) Substantial change discussed: statement of expectations that a new faculty person receives deals with the assistant to associate professor position. Should we have a template for a statement of expectations for associate to full professor? This goes beyond the scope of the document. Seems like things are pretty individualized at that time. I (Bruce) could draft a template (Associate to Full), however, it would be fairly general and then it should be up to each department. OR let the Dean come up with the document and see what everyone has to say.

Gerard T: Writing a draft template for each and every department would be impossible as the draft would need to be general. This is something that could be handled at the department level and might be useful.

Edith: Could you not draft a template with outlined specifics and then departments would modify?

Bruce: It's supposed to be a single college wide document that would suite each department.

Bruce: Not everyone will make full professor so a letter of expectations may not be needed. Document right now establishes how to show leadership in teaching and in service and in professional research.

Hans: A statement of expectations for associate to full might be useful if someone asks how it is decided that someone should be promoted and even if it's general it would be useful to have some guidelines in place. "Road-map".

Tim M: A letter of expectations should be up to each department.

John P: The Dean, the Chair and the candidate sign off on the letter of expectations...for Assistant to Associate. The question is: Do we really need a letter of expectations for Associate to Full?

Bruce: Based on the Council's discussion, we feel as a group that it is not necessary to have a letter of expectations from Associate to Full. Next steps for the T&P document will be to get Karen's version, with "Track Changes" sent out so that everyone can see what she changed. The college units will then have to review and give feedback before the end of the semester. Every faculty person needs to vote on it. College wide vote is needed to approve the document.

David K: What is the timeline and how necessary is it to be done by the end of semester? Clearly it's a very busy time of year.

Bruce: Dean - necessity by end of semester? Provost wants it to be done by end of semester as well. This is only for tenure track bargaining units (CBA Tenured/Tenured Track).

Sibylle – need a period of two weeks to vote on it. One week feedback, then the ballot could be done over thanksgiving and everything would be done by end of semester. Vote needed in between that to approve the document is approved as it to vote on. Document will go into the Tenure and Promotion elaborations of the college. Need elaborations to go back to the document. Email vote acceptable to go ahead with vote. Bruce: The idea would be to give everyone Dean Bjorkman's T&P version for feedback and then to request a vote on the elaborations.

Bruce: I will send out an email requesting that the T&P document be reviewed by all faculty and then make note of an ensuing college wide vote on the elaborations document.

Jim: Electronic voting? University is looking into for the faculty senate and once it is in place then all faculty will be able to use.

Edith: We could use Blackboard to run the vote.

David K: Faculty senate looking into electronic voting that could then be used University wide.

Sibylle: Electronic voting is definitely being looked into.

David K: Anonymous and secure are the two issues surrounding electronic voting.

Gerard T: Thank you to Bruce for putting so much work into the document. He in fact did about 99% of it.

### **Course Modification:**

Mike: nothing to bring to vote. A proposal pending before the committee on Math 1770. Concerns arose that are on the faculty meeting agenda for tomorrow.

Tim M: Biology has two required courses for Math 1770. Is Biology ok with moving it to 1?

John P: The issue – moving to 1 requires the college to change their requirement for curriculum. Biology two semesters required will be moved to one. College needs to change curriculum. Agreed to 2 semesters of calculus.

Mike: Physics department went through reassessment of undergraduate program and a lot of changes made. Goal is to have it done by next year. Working hard to get it through college and the chair.

Bruce: Just as a reminder, the next meeting is in another room.

Hans: Simple changes might just affect an entire program.

Mike: None of the recommended Math changes will lead to big program changes.

Sibylle: Pharmacy really wants the changes. Changes to math courses for the pharmacy program.

Hans: Course requirements will change for every program that have calculus requirements.

Mike: 1760 should still run through the fall for people who are more than halfway through program in order to fulfill those calculus requirements. No changes will be made until everything is approved by everyone.

Tim M: Will the college requirements have to change.

Bruce: Will this affect graduate school requirements if they are asking for 2 semester of calculus?

Sibylle: 1770 will be OTM – general education

Hans/David K: 2 semesters of 3 credits each will solve a lot of issues this is bringing up but doesn't solve the issue for the pharmacy department. Maybe they will have enough students to support a course for their department.

David K: Let's get all the relevant information (course offerings, what exactly they are, all college BS requirements and individual department requirements) together and discuss at the January meeting because there are many layers of details.

Kathy S: I have kept track of these math classes and looking at the College of Education requirements because we were thinking of changing some courses required through them so we ended not changing anything. College of Education has students taking the 1750/1760 courses as well.

Gerard: Couldn't we just let pharmacy do 1750 and keep the rest as is?

Kathy F: Discussion on 1770 being proposed for pharmacy and leave 1750/1760 in place for the other (life science) students. Math department needs to discuss whether they want to do this. The intention is to add on 1770 and eventually get rid of 1750/1760. Perhaps this needs to be changed within the justification statement.

Kathy F: The irony is that the extra 2 credit hours that are not pharmacy material are all aimed at preparing the students for the PCAT. Pharmacy is no longer interested in training their students for the PCAT it appears because they were quite happy to get rid of those components.

Kathy F: The vast majority of other schools do not have a Life Science calculus. They might have an applied calculus and then a regular calculus.

Bruce: Curriculum committee can maybe do some research and get the parties together and clarified statement as to where everyone stands.

## **Reports:**

Bruce: Written reports from senate grad council and chairs council to me (Bruce) and I'll disseminate them.

John P: No NSM rep on curriculum committee at the graduate level - volunteer needed. Contact Becky Schneider or Connie Crenshaw to volunteer. The next grad council meeting will be discussing international students. If you have anything you want brought about international student issues let Becky know.

Motion to adjourn @ 5:03 pm

Motion approved