COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
October 26, 2021

The meeting was held via Zoom.

Present: Lisa Hammersley, Tom Krabacher, Chris Taylor, Ron Coleman, Matt Schmidtlein, Shannon Datwyler, Craig Timmons, Tom Savage, Yinfa Ma, Richard Aguirre, Kacey Sozzi, Michael Wright, Julie Griffin, Matt Block, Katie Ardill

Meeting called to order at 9:15am.

1. Approval of the agenda. **Msc**

2. Approval of the minutes from October 12, 2021. **Msc**

3. Announcements:

   Lisa Hammersley
   - Four faculty searches ongoing in NSM (Chem, Bio, Geog, Math). This is the first year the Division of Inclusive Excellence has provided faculty diversity hiring fellows to work with committees to embed inclusion and equity into the hiring process.
   - The departments are working on spring 22 scheduling, keeping an eye on where online, hybrid or in-person instruction would benefit students most. Shannon will be working with departments to ensure the CMS coding is correct so it is clear to students what modality their classes will be. The goal is 70% in-person; most NSM departments will be close to 100% in-person.

   Shannon Datwyler
   - Planning to have a scavenger hunt event for NSM students returning in spring. Planning committee to be formed soon.

   Yinfa Ma
   - This Friday 11am-1pm the UEI leadership team will hold a post-award financial management workshop and it will be recorded. This is crucial for anyone with or potentially getting outside funding. Pre-award funding goes through OREID but once the it comes in it moves to UEI. UEI has recently switched to a new Payroll system and plans to hold more workshops to help support faculty funding. Yinfa will be the college contact for any funding questions.

   Ron Coleman
   - The university student research poster event is coming up on Nov. 5 at 9am-3pm in the Ballroom. Students can still register to present up until tomorrow. There were 38 student presenters at the NSM event, there currently 14 NSM students registered for the campus event.
   - AITC Updates:
     - There are still issues with items going to junk email that shouldn't be and it is still known what is causing it.
     - Shared files in One Drive have an expiration date for security purposes so check to make sure the files you need are still there.

Casey Sozzi
- Women in STEM is hosting an upcoming panel event called the Stepping Stones event. It is geared towards getting students to ask questions and get advice on what post grad will look like as a woman in STEM. Faculty should encourage their students to register, especially juniors and seniors. The flyer and email contact will be sent out after the meeting.

4. Review of Secondary Committee Working Group Changes to RTP Policy (cont'd)
- Section 4.3.5 current language: ""Associate Professors without tenure are not eligible for promotion to full. However, if it is anticipated that tenure will be granted effective Sept. 1 of the next AY, as a result of primary review, such faculty will become eligible for promotion to full". New proposed language: "Associate Professors without tenure are not eligible for promotion to full. However, an Associate Professor without tenure may also submit a request for promotion to full at the time they apply for tenure. In this case, the subgroup will make separate recommendations for tenure and promotion".
  o Nothing in UARTP that conflicts with this policy.
  o Any faculty who wish to follow this process would put in a request in writing prior to submitting their file which is the same process for going up early.
  o Motion to approve new language for 4.3.5. **msc**
- Section 3.13 proposed new language: "As per UARTP 9.02, upon request, the faculty member must be given an opportunity to appear before retention or R/T/P subgroup to discuss their file so long as the request is made before the file advances to the next stage of review". UARTP 9.02 says: "The faculty unit employee may be permitted by the review committee to appear before it and may be accompanied by a representative at the time of periodic evaluation or performance review."
  o "Next stage of review" refers to moving from the subgroup to the Dean.
  o The language in UARTP is vague so we need to be careful not to add interpretation language in our policy that conflicts. Matt S. pointed out that our policy is adding timeline language and that the meeting could inform the faculty member on what to write in their rebuttal letter. It needs to be clear this conversation does not in itself add or change anything in the file.
  o Will update "As per UARTP policy 9.02" to "In accordance with UARTP policy 9.02, upon request, the faculty member must be given an opportunity to appear before retention or R/T/P subgroup to discuss their file so long as the request is made before the file advances to the next stage of review."
  o Motion to approve new language for 3.13. **msc**
- Section 2 alternate language for direct election of members to subgroups in response to concerns about faculty not being able to vote for who will be reviewing their file.
  o The original language had the college elect the pool for the subgroups but it wasn't clear who would be on which subgroup since the assignment of which would take place at the spring meeting.
  o Section 2.3 states how the election ballots will be prepared. The working group proposes adding that a ballot will be prepared for each subgroup and that each ballot shall also list the categories of files the subgroup will be assigned to review in the coming year.
  o This simplifies the process as well as provides faculty more of a voice in who they want to review their file.
  o It isn't likely that subgroups will be reassigned to different categories in subsequent years until there is a switch in how many retention and R/T/P subgroups are needed. Right now, there is a need for 3 retention subgroups and 1 R/T/P and the minimum for each subgroup is 3 members.
  o Motion to approve section 2 revisions **msc**

- The next step is to send out to the college for a vote on the revisions of the working group. First, the working group will send the finalized revised document to Academic Council for one last review before sending to the college. Once approved by the college election, it will go to UARTP and ultimately to the President for approval before being adopted for the 22/23 review cycle. Elections can happen in the fall if needed to staff the subgroups. The working group has crafted some talking points to highlight the decrease in workload and advertise service opportunities at the college level.
- At the end of the last meeting there was a question about if Academic Council would like to request that the working group take up the topic of clarifying the role of the Secondary Committee. Tom S. brought up the issue because there has been confusion in some discussions about whether the Secondary committee is strictly checking that the Primary committee followed policy or if they do their own separate review.
  - The roles of the Secondary Committee are stated in the college RTP document which says that if there are any areas that the Secondary committee does not agree with the Primary it must be for compelling reasons and justification is required. This is especially important in cases where the Secondary Committee disagrees with the recommendation. It is more common to have different outcomes in certain areas and whether they meet or exceed expectations. Ron pointed out that the Secondary Committee does document any areas that don't exactly match the conclusions of the Primary Committee since interpretation can vary among individual perspectives. If there is a major discrepancy between the two then it's up to the Dean to make the determination.
  - It will be made clearer to Department Chairs and at the RTP workshops what the role of the Secondary Committee review is so faculty understand how and why there could be differing opinions among the levels of review and how it affects their review.

10:30am adjourn