

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
September 28, 2021

The meeting was held via Zoom.

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

Meeting called to order at 9:15am.

1. Approval of the agenda. as amended. **Msc**
2. Approval of the minutes from September 14, 2021, as amended. **Msc**
3. Announcements:

Lisa Hammersley

- Census was yesterday. Enrollment is down slightly from last fall.
- Spring planning is ongoing. More in-person classes planned.
- Budget notifications went out to departments last week.
- Students, faculty and staff who have attested that they are unvaccinated may be on campus but they must be tested twice a week. The campus is working to identify students who attested they are not accessing campus or have not yet attested and are enrolled in a face to face course. Last week Chairs were provided with those names with the goal of trying to find which students came to an agreement with the faculty member to accommodate virtual. Drops for all other students who have not yet attested will begin today. No policy on booster shots yet.
- Lisa is going to be out of the office the first 2 weeks of October.
- An email went out last week announcing the course redesign grants from the Chancellor's Office. The grants are up to \$40K to redesign courses or sequence of courses with a focus on those with large opportunity gaps or high DFW rates.

Yinfa Ma

- The Research Symposium planning committee is working with the ITC's to lay out the details and timing of the virtual event. A call for submissions has been sent out to students. Faculty should encourage students to present. The event is on Oct. 21, 3-7pm with 2 sessions that run simultaneously of 5 minutes Power Point presentations. Projects do not need to be completed to present.

Ron Coleman

- The university research fall research event is on Nov. 5 and it is an in-person poster event. Workshops are open in the Student Research Center where students can get help. Projects do not need to be completed to present.

4. Safety Committee Clerical Staff Rep Selection
 - Amie Bright, ASCII in Geology self-nominated. **msc**
5. Safety Committee Charge Language Revision Regarding Staff Reps

- The Technical Staff rep classifications will be identified in parenthesis to include Instructional Support Staff, Information Technology Consultants, and Equipment Techs (IST/ITC/ET)
- The term “Clerical” will be changed to “Non-technical/Administrative” with the classifications in parenthesis to include Administrative Support Assistants, Administrative Support Coordinators, Administrative Analyst Support, and Student Services Professionals (ASA/ASC/AAS/SSP)

msc

6. Review of Secondary Committee Working Group Changes to RTP Policy

- The initial issue that started this review was questions about timing of election and eligibility to serve.
- The other issue the working group was formed to address was ways to modify the structure of the committee to relieve the workload and allow more faculty to be eligible to serve. The workgroup reviewed the CBA, campus UARTP, and other colleges Secondary committee RTP documents. They also looked at schedules of upcoming year review cycles to compare to the sizes of other colleges and discovered NSM is the largest college that is still operating with one Secondary committee. All other comparable sized colleges have a model that includes multiple Secondary review committees. A benefit of having multiple Secondary committees would allow tenured Associate Professors to review junior faculty. If eligibility expanded to Associate Professors could increase the pool by about 25. Changes proposed by the working group that were approved by Academic Council were brought to Adam Rechs, UARTP Chair, for review who provided comments which were brought back to Academic Council.
 - Section 1 changes included modifications to the composition of the Secondary committee to include two types of subgroups: Retention and Retention/Tenure/Promotion. Any tenured full or tenured Associate Professor can serve on Retention with at least one full professor on each Retention subgroup. Only full professors may serve on the Retention/Tenure/Promotion subgroups.
 - Section 2 is in regard to election and terms of subgroup members. No more than 2 faculty from one department may serve on the same subgroup. At the organizational meeting in spring the subgroups will be staffed starting with who got the most votes, unless there are already 2 reps from the same department, then the person with the next highest votes from another department will be chosen. The Secondary committee as a whole will elect the Chair and each subgroup will elect a Chair.
 - a. Tom S. expressed concern that faculty going up for review do not have the opportunity to vote for who will be reviewing their file since the college votes on the Secondary committee but not on the subgroups. Ron mentioned that in the MOU there is a provision that says any faculty member can ask a committee member(s) be recused from reviewing their file by submitting a letter of justification.
 - Section 3 talks about the duties of the subgroups. Each subgroup will divide the files to be reviewed into subsets. The amount and categories of each subgroup can flex year to year depending on the number of files to be reviewed at each level. Currently the college has more retention reviews but, in the future, there will be more T/P reviews as well as more faculty eligible to review them.
 - a. 3.1 – Ron proposed changing language that says the subgroups shall establish a schedule of deadlines to the Dean shall establish the timeline.

- b. 3.3 – The candidate has 10 days to submit a response. Ron proposed adding “calendar” days for clarity since working days are defined in other parts of the policy.
 - c. 3.12 – Each candidate will be given a copy of the subgroups letter. Ron would like to add that the letter comes from the Dean for clarity on who is responsible for doing this.
 - d. 3.13 – Upon request, the faculty must be given the opportunity to appear before the committee. Ron asked about the timing and outcome of such meetings since the letter would have already been written. In such cases UARTP 9.02 will be followed but it is unclear in UARTP 9.02 the timing and purpose of these meetings. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.
- Section 4 outlines procedures for the review.
 - Tom S. expressed concern about consistency in reviews among the subgroups. Lisa pointed out that at each level of review, the previous level’s review is analyzed to ensure the policy was followed. Also, while the previous review level is considered by the next, it is not always in agreement with the outcome so maintaining consistency and fairness is part of how the levels of review are set up.
 - Review of section 4 will continue at the next meeting.
- The issues raised by Tom S. regarding subgroup population will be revisited after section 4 review has been completed. The working group will craft language for an alternative to the current proposal of how these subgroups will be populated to bring to a meeting in one month.

10:20am adjourn