

**CSS Program Meeting**  
**May 7, 2021**  
**2:30-4:00pm**  
**Zoom meeting**

**In attendance:** Menaka Abraham, Mohamed Ali, Eyhab Al-Masri, Paulo Barreto, Charles Bryan, Tom Capaul, Wei Cheng, Donald Chinn (chair), Alan Fowler, Ingrid Horakova, Juhua Hu, Wes Lloyd, Chris Marriott, Anderson Nascimento, Raghavi Sakpal, David Schuessler, Josh Tenenberg, Ankur Teredesai

**Absent:** Kivanc Dincer, Athirai Irissappane, Monika Sobolewska

**Student Representative:** Firn Tieanklin

**Non voting faculty & staff:** Bryan Goda, Beth Jeffrey, Raj Katti, Marife Llavore, Megan Reardon, David Ross

**Approval of minutes from April 9, 2021**

Menaka Abraham motioned to approve the minutes, Raghavi Sakpal seconded. 11 approved, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

**Announcements**

- Donald announced that if you have any honors program students this quarter, let him know so that he can help set up the presentation and announce it.
- Menaka and Raghavi reminded everyone about the upcoming CTC meeting next Friday, May 14, 2021, 9:00 am-12:00 pm.
- Raj shared that Dr. Mark Pagano sent out an email earlier today that Dr. Jill Purdy will be stepping down from her role as Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs effective Sept. 16, 2021.

**Advisors update**

David reminded everyone that fall registration opened up this morning. Please send students to Beth and David for any registration requests.

**Student update**

Firn shared that the graduating students are submitting their photos in preparation for the 2021 virtual commencement.

**Faculty Council update**

- Josh's term on the faculty council is ending this year and a tenured faculty needs to replace him.
- Expect to see a proposal for a small change to the bylaws. This change is to get representation from faculty from the new programs on to the faculty council.
- Josh shared that the faculty council will be addressing next year, the departmentalization of the school. The question of how we are going to do this and what subdivisions makes sense will be the main focus of discussion.

- Raj mentioned that most faculty are finding that voting on other program's issues can be difficult, example CS faculty may not fully understand what CE or ME faculty need, etc. That is the main motivation for the departmentalization.
- Athirai and Josh brought back (Teaching professor promotion) comments from the last CSS program meeting and the other programs gave their input as well with the council. What the council decided, largely in the interest of time, and simplifying, is that the only changes that would be brought to the full faculty meeting would be the name change from "lecturer" rank to the "teaching professor" rank. Any other changes to that document will be tabled whether temporarily or for the long term is to be determined.
- There were small/brief discussions about a new iteration of the Tenure and Promotion document for the tenure track at the Faculty Council meeting. Many of the comments that were placed in the Teaching promotion document applied similarly to the Tenure line promotion document but haven't been replicated. The assumption was that they applied there as well.

[old business:]

### **Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- Josh opened the floor for discussion on the Tenure and Promotion criteria. Faculty can go directly on the shared Google doc & he or Athirai will bring the comments back to the next Faculty Council meeting.

This is the new link for tenure and promotion:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/11PDJP17TfRQ9QXSfGUgSzt79LdEbLk4V/view?usp=sharing>

- Donald mentioned that the new version of the criteria (teaching, service, and research) is an improvement from the old document, but some areas are still left unclear; perhaps it needs more general guidance of what is expected in these areas.
- Ankur shared that he likes the document. It leaves opportunities for Assistant and Associate professors to shine the light on areas that they are really excelling at.
- Eyhab expressed his concerns about the proposed T&P guidelines. Specifically, those who have spent most of their years here following the old guidelines will be uncertain as to which guidelines to follow. A change in the guidelines will create a gap and provides an advantage to some over others. For instance, faculty hired closer or after the adoption date of the new policy would have more time adopting to the new policy versus those who have considerably followed the current guidelines for the majority of their years so far here at UWT. While he saw the proposed guidelines as a positive change, he is concerned about inequality and unfairness that it will create without considering his concerns. He was therefore against the proposition.
- There was a suggestion that the newly hired faculty would fall under the new guidelines adopted, but for those who are already hired and currently preparing for a promotion, there should be a choice between using the new or old document.
- Anderson shared that the language is general on both old & new documents; he doesn't think the process will change dramatically when votes for tenure promotion happen. He does support having the current faculty choose between using either the new or old document.

- Donald said that the process will be similar, but will be different in the following way: Eyhab will probably need to write the narrative in a different way to align with the criteria/language being used.
- Chris seconded Eyhab's concerns. This will cause a "rise in bar" as the evaluators will use the previous promoted faculty as the example. He is concerned this will give the evaluators ammunition to deny someone of their promotion.
- Bryan Goda expressed that he served on the APT committee for the past 3 years and reassured the faculty that you're not supposed to compare candidates. Each candidate stands on their own merit(s), each person is an individual & unique. The promotion committee process goes through a rigorous review process. This whole process gives a picture whether this person deserves a promotion or not. The APT committee looks at all of these, and checks was the process followed, is it fair, and writes the statement, it then goes up to the next level.

Our current document is so outdated and CSS centric, that the new, revised document looks 100% better. Using the old document doesn't make us look good, because no one has a document this old compared to the other schools.

- There will be one more faculty council meeting next week on 5/13/21 and SET faculty meeting 5/28/21. Josh asked the faculty for feedback now before this document is finalized & voted on.

[new business:]

### **Graduate update**

Mohamed reported that they received 23 new student applications for PhD, 4 of them have already made their deposits and some are waiting for their funding.

There were 230 applications for the Master's program. 53 were denied because of missing scores, etc. and the rest were admitted. As of today, there were 42 students who made their deposits.

### **142, 143 master syllabus modifications**

Faculty who are involved in 142 & 143 programming got together to reexamine and change the master syllabus and to include the new ABET objectives. There were a couple of minor unresolved items in the 143 syllabus that were discussed.

Proposed updated master syllabus for 142:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1S5qrQqYvIK5JLwa3pVAYmoYKNI3Phj2C9EyKFFskTcs/edit?usp=sharing>

Proposed updated master syllabus for 143:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r8hPol7N8H\\_0fwVNfl5T5VpIPhn2GxngTTi-M4kLE/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r8hPol7N8H_0fwVNfl5T5VpIPhn2GxngTTi-M4kLE/edit?usp=sharing)

142 master syllabus:

**Menaka Abraham motioned to move to make the change to the title, outcomes & course description for 142, Alan Fowler seconded. 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.**

143 master syllabus:

**Menaka Abraham motioned to move to approve 143 master syllabus with the changes, Alan Fowler seconded. 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **Prerequisite for TCSS 141**

The official prerequisite for TCSS 141 is pre-calc, but for enrollment purposes and for accessibility (the course name is "Programming for All"), for the past two years we have waived that math prerequisite.

The academic undergrad advisors for pre-majors often promote this course for students who have never taken any programming before.

The faculty discussed if we should maintain and enforce the official prerequisite vs. removing or changing it.

**Menaka Abraham motioned to remove the prerequisite for 141 & add recommendations, Ingrid Horakova seconded. 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.**

### **TCSS 321 failure rates**

Beth shared there is a higher failure rate overall in TCSS 321 than any other course in the major. The advisors would like to brainstorm to address this issue. This discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

### **CSS Chair**

Anderson gave a presentation and expressed his interest in the CSS Chair position for the next academic year. The CSS faculty and advisors were given the opportunity to ask him questions afterwards.