To:
FCSM Electorate
FCSM Department Chairs
FCSM Secretaries – Please post one copy
Member-at-Large of the University Senate: Alex Storrs, Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences

Members of the FCSM College Council

Dean: David Vanko; **Associate Dean**: Gail Gasparich; **Biological Sciences**: Sarah Haines, Vanessa Beauchamp; **Chemistry**: Clare Muhoro, Alan Pribula; **Computer and Information Sciences**: Nadim Alkharouf, Siddharth Kaza; **Mathematics**: Honi Bamberger, Leonid Stern; **Physics, Astronomy, & Geosciences**: Rajeswari Kolagani, Phuoc Ha; **At Large**: Brian Fath (Biological Sciences), James Saunders (MB3); **Students**: Kal Srour (Graduate Student), Joshua Giltinan (Undergraduate Student)

MINUTES OF THE FCSM COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

The FCSM College Council met on February 25, 2011 in Smith Hall, Room 306 at 1:30 pm with Honi Bamberger, Chairperson presiding.

Attendance: Clare Muhoro, Nadim Alkharouf, Leonid Stern, Phuoc Ha, Brian Fath, Joshua Giltinan, Vanessa Beauchamp, David Vanko, Siddharth Kaza, James Saunders, Honi Bamberger, Alan Pribula, Sarah Haines, Gail Gasparich (guest), Howard Kaplon (guest)

Absent: Rajeswari Kolagani (notified in advance), Kal Srour (notified in advance)

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Honi Bamberger, Chairperson.
2. The council discussed the draft of the FCSM strategic plan 2010-2016
   - 2.1. A spelling mistake in 1.1.1. of the plan was pointed out.
   - 2.2. There was a discussion on combining sections 2.1.1. and 2.1.2. of the plan. There was also a discussion on whether GPA is a correct performance measure to use. It was then pointed out that GPA is just one measure (out of many) to be used in the analysis and does not mean that the college looks at GPA as a sole indicator of performance.
   - 2.3. There was a suggestion to define the meaning of a performance measure at the onset of the plan, but that was later rejected by the council.
   - 2.4. There was a suggestion to add professional workshops to section 3.2. (quality of research and scholarship) of the draft plan. It was pointed out that the professional measures should match the list in the AR document\form.
   - 2.5. There was a discussion on the appropriate method to collect the performance measures of section 3.2. (quality of research and scholarship) of the draft plan. Some suggested the use of the AR documents submitted by faculty as the source of these measures. It was then pointed out that a software package exists (which FCSM might consider purchasing) that can be used to collect such information at the end of each academic year and generates an AR document automatically (and at the same time updates a faculty members CV!). It was concluded that the college should aim to have such a system in place for that by 2013. There was also a discussion on the quality of collaborations and how one would go about measuring that as a performance measure as well.
   - 2.6. In section 3.3. of the draft plan it was decided that we need to find out what the baseline is with regard to faculty mentoring of students. It was also decided to change part time faculty to adjunct faculty wherever the former appears in the plan.
   - 2.7. In section 4.1 of the draft plan there was a discussion on how to increase faculty involvement with students and that the faculty need some kind of reward to achieve that goal. There was a suggestion to collect input from faculty on how much time is spent on research with students. A lengthy discussion then took place on whether time spent with students in the lab (research) should be counted as contact hours or not. This is something the college council will continue to look at and examine.

2.8. Again for section 4.1. it was mentioned that a full academic year will be needed to collect data to establish a baseline. After that suitable targets will be set.

2.9. In section 5.1. of the draft plan it was decided that the existing programs mentioned in the plan is an excellent baseline. A suggestion for 2013 is to maintain these very good programs. A discussion then followed on the definition of Metropolitan University and whether USM institutions, or other private universities in the area, fall under the umbrella of Metropolitan. There was also a suggestion to integrate the existing programs listed in section 5.1. of the draft plan with the academic programs of the college.

2.10. In section 5.2 of the draft plan, it was decided to remove a and b from the 2010 Baseline subheading. There was a suggestion to start a blog that would increase exposure of TU and a discussion followed on how to best spread the word about the accomplishments of the college to the media (the insider and Baltimore sun were mentioned).

2.11. In discussing the strategic priority section of the plan, it was suggested to make the first performance measure (increase quantity and quality of state of the art equipment…etc.) a separate heading all by itself (i.e. 6.2. instead of falling within 6.1.).

2.12. In section 6.2. (work with academic affairs to improve critical resources) of the draft plan, there was a comment on computer power and the need to take the requests for such computational power into account when hiring new faculty or to meet current faculty needs. There is also a need to have people know what is available in the college. Therefore there was a suggestion to do an inventory of all the research capabilities and equipment of the college with regards to scientific computing.

2.13. In section 6.2.2. of the draft plan it was decided to change “Graduate Assistant” to “Teaching Assistant and\or Research Assistant”.

2.14. There was talk about order in the draft plan and whether resources was too far down in the list. It was decided to switch section 5 (Metropolitan) and 6 (Resources) around.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.
Respectfully Submitted,
Nadim Alkharouf