Meeting Minutes of August 22, 2016 Meeting Minutes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Absent | Excused |
| **Faculty** |  |  |  |
| Black, Cheryl | x |  |  |
| Coman, Marius | x |  |  |
| Donaldson, Kurt | x |  |  |
| Fay, Erik | x |  |  |
| Furler, Robert | x |  |  |
| Gaidos, Gabriel | x |  |  |
| Hepner, Roy | x |  |  |
| Hermann, Henry | x |  |  |
| Hooks, Ed | x |  |  |
| Israsena Na Ayudhya, Thep | x |  |  |
| Jester, Roz | x |  |  |
| Koepke, Jay | x |  |  |
| Liu, Qin | x |  |  |
| Manacheril, George | x |  |  |
| McDevit, Dan | x |  |  |
| McGarity, Lisa | x |  |  |
| McKenzie, Jonathan | x |  |  |
| O’Neal, Lyman | x |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Absent | Excused |
| Ottman, Tina | x |  |  |
| Page, Rebecca | x |  |  |
| Paudel, Yadab | x |  |  |
| Porter, Emily | x |  |  |
| Romeo, Peggy | x |  |  |
| Shaw, Mary | x |  |  |
| Trevino, Marcela | x |  |  |
| Ulrich, Melanie |  |  | x |
| Vala, Teju | x |  |  |
| Verga, Vera | x |  |  |
| Wilcox, Bill | x |  |  |
| Witty, Mike | x |  |  |
| Wolfson, Jed | x |  |  |
| Xue, Di | x |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Adjunct Faculty** |  |  |  |
| Carol Kennedy | x |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Introduction:

The meeting started at 2:30 PM by faculty introducing themselves to the group.

1. Minutes of April meeting

The minutes of the April meeting was adopted.

1. Courses, text books and course supervisor updates:

The faculty subject groups document was reviewed with the following changes:

1. Tina Ottman volunteered to be course supervisor for BSC 1011L
2. Emily Porter agreed to supervise BSC 1050C and BSC 1051C
3. General Education Lab requirement and C courses:

In order to align the general education lab requirement to the State recommendation, it was suggested that we change the two-lab course requirement to one. To that end, Tina moved the following motion:

“To satisfy science general education requirement, student should complete two courses from lists A (core courses) and B, choosing at least one from A. One of these must have an accompanying lab component, either a C or an L course. “

The motion was voted on and was adopted with 23 for and 3 against.

A change of program proposal will be made to the curriculum committee to effect this change.

It was also agreed that the 3 credit 3 contact hour C courses will be changed to reflect the Carnegie definition of a C course. This will be done on a case by case basis.

1. Assessment Discussion:

Dr. Joe Van Gaalan made a presentation on how best the course assessment report can be used to gauge student performance and improve the assessment instrument. He said that the assessment outcomes are intended to provide a baseline achievement moving forward as well as investigate the strength and performance of items in the exam. It also provides comparisons between dual Enrollment and non-dual enrollment students, online versus traditional students, and by site, where possible. He explained the relevance of some of the features of the assessment report such as item difficulty level, item discrimination index and the Point Biserial Index. Dr. Roy Hepner expressed dissatisfaction with the format of the assessment report saying that it does not provide any meaningful information about student performance or feedback for course improvement.

1. Item IV of syllabus template:

Course supervisors who have not submitted amended section IV to Allison Studer were asked to do so before the end of September.

1. School reorganization:

Dr. Stuart had asked for faculty input in the proposed merger of SoAHSS and SoPAS into a single school. The faculty had more questions than suggestions. The following discussion summery was forwarded to the Provost and his reply are given in red against each item.

1. The earlier model with a Dean and two Associate Deans worked well before the two-school system was instituted. I understand that a suitable dean to oversee 1 school was not found in the search process so the Provost decided to split the schools in the current model that we have now.

(ii) Why was the system that worked well abandoned in favor of the present model? See answer above.

1. The present model works well and why do we need to change it? We don’t “need” to change it, this is an opportunity brought to me by faculty suggesting to move back to 1 school of Arts and Sciences which would provide cohesive leadership for our largest program at FSW, the Associate of Arts.
2. A Dean from the Arts and Humanities area may not be suitable for leadership in the Science and Mathematics areas. That is possible and of course we would always look at the leadership of all schools from the faculty perspective and determine our next steps.  This model would allow for Associate Deans to be focused on the Sciences & Mathematics and a long with Arts & Humanities so no area will without discipline specific leadership and faculty leadership at the departmental level will be critical to the success no matter the model that is adopted.

(v) How will the restructuring affect the present leadership? If we moved to 1 school of Arts and Sciences and the current dean is interested in being the dean and based on his positive evaluations, Dr. McClinton would be given the opportunity to lead the school. Again, faculty at the departmental level would be critical to the success and faculty would still have input on the selection of the Associate Deans and the departmental leadership.

(v) I will continue collecting feedback from faculty on this and update you as we move forward. The tempo of discussions indicated that science faculty are overwhelmingly in favor of a Dean and two Associate Deans leading the new school if the final decision is to merge the two schools.  Thank you.  I appreciate the dialog and if there are additional question, I would be pleased to address them.

1. Breakout sessions

The meeting broke into subject groups to discuss specific issues and come up with course improvement plans based on the course assessment report.

 The meeting closed at 5:00 PM.