**College of Engineering and Computing**

**Faculty Council Meeting**

**April 27 2015**

**Committee in attendance**: Dr. Arvind Agarwal (MME), Dr. Ronald Baier (OHLSC), Dr. Peter Clarke (SCIS), Dr. Mohammed Hadi (CCE), Dr. Chenzong Li (BME), Dr. Anthony McGoron (BME), Dr. Nezin Pala (ECE), Dr. Nagarajan Prabakar (SCIS) and Dr. Walter Tang (CEE).

**Absent:** Dr. Jiuhua Chen (MME), Ali Mostafavi (OHLSC – out of town), Dr. Gong Quan (ECE).

**Guest:** Dr. Amir Mirmiran (Dean College of Engineering and Computing)

**In attendance:** Dr. Malek Adjouadi (ECE), Dr. Armando Barreto (ECE), Dr. Gene Farmer (OHLSC), and Jorge Rivera (BME).

* Dr. McGoron called the meeting to order at 1:10pm
* Dr. Mirmiran presented the following Dean’s report:
* The Dean stated that the college had not yet heard anything from the ABET reviewers.
* It was also recommended that if the units under ABET review have any additional data or information that could impact the results of the review they should send the materials to Dr. Munroe. The ABET reviewers are in the process of conducting two rounds of reviews.
* All the merit raises from the various units in the college went through without any problems and are currently being processed. There were two raises 1.5% across the board and 1.5% merit raise.
* The CEC Commencement exercises will be held on Tuesday May 5th. All the faculty members are encouraged to attend the exercises.
* Faculty awards will be given at the Fall 2015 CEC picnic. The one-time bonuses for the awards should go into a paycheck sometime in the fall. The delay in the faculty council awards was due to issues related to the staff nominations.
* The council was again requested to address the tenure and promotion (T&P) polices and guidelines for the college. The Dean reiterated his concerns with respect to privacy issues related to candidate files. It was recommended that at this stage the torch for the T&P polices and guidelines be passed on the incoming CEC Interim Dean.
* The Dean thanked the faculty council for the work they have done during his tenure as Dean of CEC.
* At this point in the meeting Dean Mirmiran opened the floor for questions.
	+ Dr. Clarke wished the Dean all the best on behalf the School of Computing and Information Sciences. Dr. Baier wished the Dean all the best in his new position as provost and vice president for academic affairs at University of Texas at Tyler.
* At this point in the meeting Dean Mirmiran left.
* The agenda was approved (Motion by Dr. Clarke – Second: Dr. Prabakar). Vote was unanimous in favor
* The minutes of the meeting held on March 23rd was approved (Motion: Dr. Prabakar - Second: Dr. Clarke) Vote was unanimous in favor.
* No official report from the Curriculum Committee was presented.
	+ Dr. Adjouadi stated that Dr. Pan did a good job chairing the committee during the 2014-2015 academic year. Dr. Prabakar said that all the requests made this year were successfully passed.
	+ It was stated that there was a big change made this year that would impact all CEC undergraduate programs since students were now required to be “Cal I ready” before they can declare their major.
* Dr. McGoron gave the report on the CEC T&P committee:
	+ He stated that there were 6 candidates going through the T&P process in CEC during 2014-15 academic year, promotion – 5 and tenure at the rank of Associate Professor – 1.
	+ The committee met pretty late for the T&P meeting since there was some mix-up on who should call the first meeting of the committee. It was expected that the Dean would call the first meeting and the executive for the committee would be decide at that meeting.
* Dr. Prabakar gave a report on the CEC Awards committee:
	+ The faculty awards still needed to be finalized. The staff nominations still needed to be completed. There was some confusion on whether staff could nominate themselves or not.
	+ The committee still needs to finalize the guidelines on how staff members can be nominated. It was recommended that where possible self-nominations should be avoided. It was suggested that the committee contact Ms. Elizabeth Naranjo who had several suggestion on how the nomination process should be done for staff.
* The next item discussed was the T&P polices and guidelines for the college led by the ad hoc faculty council sub-committee T&P polices and guidelines.
	+ The Chair of the faculty council stated that by the end of the meeting the council should be in a position to send the T&P document to the units for review so that the document can be finalized in the future.
	+ The T&P minutes for the sub-committee minute were reviewed.
	+ Dr. Clarke stated that during the fall the SCIS faculty met with Tonja Moore, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs and Isis Carbajal De-Garcia, Senior University Counsel to discuss updates to the SCIS T&P procedures. With respect to the issue of who can and cannot attend the T&P committee meetings, Mrs. Moore stated that it is at the discretion of the college/school/department. With respect to who may view the T&P candidate application materials is also left to the college/school/department to decide approved by the President of the university. Note that Mrs. Carbajal De-Garcia confirms that although the previous statement is true, i.e. who can view the candidate files, legally faculty evaluations are private and confidential as our student records, for example.

*Note that parts of the above text were taken from the SCIS meeting minutes on August 27, 2014, 2:00PM, ECS 349*

* + Dr. Farmer questioned if it was appropriate for all faculty to review the T&P candidate application materials, even the chairs evaluation letters.
	+ There was extended discussion regarding the specifications in the University’s T&P T & P Manual (approved by Faculty Senate 6-10-14; approved by the Provost 6-30-14), that states “*Every college/unit must have tenure and promotion guidelines that clearly and unambiguously articulate the standards and expectations for tenure and promotion*.”
	+ A question was raised regarding if the CEC T&P policies should also state which “standards and expectations for tenure and promotion” should be use when individuals go through the tenure and promotion process. It was suggested that for tenure and promotion it should be the standards and expectations in place during the 3rd year review. The council then agreed that the subcommittee should consult the UFF agreement.
	+ A motion was put to the committee by Dr. Agarwal and seconded by Dr. Clarke. The motion reads as follows:

It should be left to each CEC unit to decide who should participate in the T&P meetings and who should be able to review the T&P candidate applications. This wording should be included into the document title “College of Engineering and Computing Tenure and Promotion Manual”.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote by the council.

* + The council agreed that the CEC T&P Manual Draft currently being considered should be modified to remove the details for all instructor and lecturer positions. The details for these positions should be addressed sometime in the future.
	+ A motion was put to the committee by Dr. Agarwal and seconded by Dr. Prabakar. The motion reads as follows:

Approve the current document title “College of Engineering and Computing Tenure and Promotion Manual” with aforementioned changes and send to the units for input. The input should be provided to the council by the end of October 2015.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote by the council.

* Meeting ended at 2:30pm.

Prepared by:

Peter Clarke and Anthony McGoron