Last spring the Academic Senate reviewed a proposal to reconstitute the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science. The Academic Senate responded with a list of concerns. The department has provided response to all of the concerns and the new College of Engineering Dean has provided a letter of support. Committees are asked to review the new information provided and respond providing advice as to whether the Academic Senate should support the reconstitution proposal.
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the additional materials submitted in connection with the reconstitution of the Department Chemical Engineering and Materials Science (CHMS) into two separate units. CAP has the following comments concerning how the proposed split may influence faculty merit and promotion actions.

(1) CAP feels that the submitted materials do not articulate convincing pedagogical or programmatic motivations for the proposed separation. Although many other institutions have separate Materials Science departments, they are generally of modest size and do not achieve desirable economies of scale and disciplinary breadth.

(2) CAP finds that smaller homogeneous faculty voting groups often do not provide candidates with adequate diversity of perspective in evaluating teaching, research, and service, especially in the context of major (tenure, promotion, Step 6, and Above Scale) actions. For this reason, CAP feels that the split may disadvantage junior CHMS faculty in adequately preparing them for the major performance evaluations that they will face.

(3) With the implementation of the Step Plus system, each category of performance (teaching, research, and service) is receiving systematic scrutiny. For faculty in programs with low undergraduate enrollments, it may be more difficult to make the argument for exceeding teaching expectations. CAP recognizes that it is much easier to achieve excellent course evaluations in low-enrollment specialist courses than in large-enrollment required courses.
FEC: School of Medicine

January 20, 2016 1:39 PM

No response at this time.
Graduate Council

January 19, 2016 9:30 AM

Response continued on next 2 pages.
To: Academic Chair Knoesen  
Re: Reconstitution – Department of Chemical Engineering & Material Sciences

The Graduate Council, partially based on the deliberations of its subcommittee on Academic Planning and Development is responding to your request for comment to the Reconstitution – Department of Chemical & Material Sciences proposal.

The proposal to reconstitute the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science (CHMS) into two separate departments was not approved by the Academic Senate last year. Relevant Senate committees provided comments that, together, supported the decision to not approve the proposal. The responses of CHMS (dated May 26, 2015) appear to address the questions and concerns raised by that Academic Senate review. With respect to Graduate Education, all of the points were satisfactorily addressed: 1) graduate program membership, and member voting on matters of reconstitution, was clarified; 2) separate bylaws have been made for each reconstituted graduate program; and 3) concerns of potential loss of TA positions for graduate students were alleviated. Furthermore, the new Dean of the College of Engineering has had the opportunity to consider the reconstitution proposal; the Dean’s support for the proposal is documented.

Now that separate bylaws have been drafted they should formally be sent through the Graduate Council bylaws committee for recommendation of approval. Separate degree requirements should go through the Educational Policy Committee. These two committees will report back to Graduate Council with their findings for subsequent Graduate Council consideration.

Sincerely,

Kyaw Tha Paw U, Chair  
Graduate Council
CPB reviewed the Reconstitution proposal from the Department of Chemical Engineering & Materials Science. Overall CPB endorses the proposal. However CPB is concerned about the very small student credit count in Materials Science and notes that there is no clear indication that the department will be able to grow in the future.
January 25, 2016

Dear Andre:

At its meeting of January 22, 2016, the Undergraduate Council discussed the departmental reconstitution proposal submitted to the Division Academic Senate by the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science.

The UGC found that the proposal satisfactorily addressed potential problem issues that had been noted in prior Senate review, and UGC has concluded that the reconstituted program will successfully continue to deliver high quality undergraduate degree programs and instruction.

Accordingly, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to support the proposal for reconstitution of the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science.

Submitted on behalf of the UGC.

Sincerely,

E. P. Caswell-Chen

Chair, UGC