I. Housekeeping
   
   A. Approval of Agenda – approved
   
   B. Approval of Minutes from 3/25/14 Meeting. See attachment. – Mark had a comment – include him as present on-line
   
   Notes on page 2 Section III: Mark: indicated that the criterion was difficult to interpret but that the paragraph read well in the section dedicated to professors. – referred to the criteria as being difficult to interpret anyway other than being a promotion from associate to a full professor

II. IARC: Proposed Unit Criteria

   See attachment:
   
   • IARC Unit Criteria
   
   - On page 1 – does it mean the faculty will review after the submission to the Unit Criteria? Yes, it will be taken after our review; that section should be taken out with final submission;
   
   - In the first paragraph; are we looking at a specific department in IARC? Is it a Center or a Department? Need to determine if it is a department or and if so, then need to re-evaluate;
   
   - Should it be Center or Centers on the intro statement? Check and make appropriate alterations if needed
   
   - Is it an entirely new criteria or an update to criteria? IARC changed its structure – merged with other units and now have more faculty with new responsibilities and types of appointments; had new feedback from new faculty and now have the new converged document
   
   - What does a normal bipartite look like in IARC? It varies; 100% self-funded so bring in money in many areas; research faculty tend to have 90% research and 10% service, but it varies; some on monthly contracts and others longer
   
   - Page 4: need to take out content between bullets e and f, and add to the end or within the bullets (AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER MAY ALSO)
- Page 5: C1A – do not change the period to a comma; Change back to a period and then re-write to make it punctually correct (They must occur in a public forum, PROVIDED CONTRACTUAL TERMS AND ETHICS RULES ARE NOT VIOLATED.)
- Page 7: 1f – need to keep in compliance with provosts template; made changes to words compared to the original and need to restore to original language and then re-write your adds to make grammatically correct; (UNRENUMERATED consulting IN THE FACULTY MEMBERS AREA OF EXPERTISE AND DISCIPLINE CONSISTENT WITH THE OBLIGATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.)
- Page 7: 1f and g, and between l and m – need a space between bullets
- Page 9: need an apostrophe before the s in members (IN ADDITION, THE NATURE OF A FACULTY MEMBERS WORKLOAD)
- Page 10: 1 c & b need space between bullets
- Page 11: mentoring of graduate students and teaching, although not mandatory, is encouraged (instead of are) (MENTORING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS AND TEACHING, ALTHOUGH NOT MANDATORY, ARE ENCOURAGED).
- Page 11: need to add IS (EVIDENCE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT FOR PROMOTION TO RESEARCH PROFESSOR INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO:)

Guest from IARC: Dr. Vladimir Alexeev

III. Computer Science: Proposed Unit Criteria
The biggest issue is the justification for using conference proceedings being as prestigious as journal publications; Chris clarified that CEM template is changed a bit just to reflect Computer Science as being a bit different, and though still under the Provost guidelines, can differ from CEM criteria; in past was under the College of Natural Science and Mathematics prior to CEM;
- Page 1: opening paragraph, add s to department’

THE DEPARTMENT’ FACULTY,
- Page 4: 1f – need to go back to the template; there is a semicolon instead of a comma (after review it looks like there is still a semi-colon so should not be a change

f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design, INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISTILLED KNOWLEDGE (BOOKS, SOFTWARE, DOCUMENTATION) FOR STUDENT USE;
- Page 5: why the underline in second paragraph?
- Page 5: why the boldface and between bullet a and b
- Page 6: 2d and 2i – are they changes to the template? It seems you can add wording, but not alter the template so these might be okay
- Page 6: should be k and l instead of l and m to comply with the Provost’s template

l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and
animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

- Page 8: formatting is too far to the right (check as it seems to be fine on Chris Hartman’s version, but not on the Mac version)
- Page 9: 2i – original language is fine, and then added of faculty within the period

i. Mentoring *OF FACULTY*.

See attachment:
- Computer Science Unit Criteria

Guest from Computer Science: Dr. Chris Hartman

IV. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:
- Proposed Bylaws. – moved discussion item to the first topic at the next meeting

Debu moved to adjourn at 12:33pm and Christine seconded