

Program Viability Meeting 11/6/17

Three Department Proposals related to ESES

1. How are students not being served in the current configuration?

Environmental Sciences merging with Biology – *Students needs are always met – always pick up the slack. The program will continue to grow even in the current structure, but with the Biodiversity and field studies work coordinate easier with Biology than current structure. If all the programs want separate, then Envir can't be solo and needs to combine with somewhere – put with Geology & Geography – want the interdisciplinary approach/flair.*

Geology/Geography/Astronomy – *There is only 1 chair for 5 disciplines – it has made it difficult for students to contact discipline faculty and with pre-requisite challenges. Slower with going through the extra layer. Programs not visible to the students; not easy for the discipline faculty to make a quick response since the current chair isn't of the same discipline.*

Astronomy and Physical Sciences – *the biggest issue with ESES is the size of the department – geology, geography and astronomy has grown 68% in sections and the others two (geos) are comparable. It is difficult for one person to manage all that growth.*

2. How would students be served better?

Environmental Sciences merging with Biology – *Students needs are better met with workloads moving smoothly. Currently 1 chair deals with 5 different disciplines and doesn't do it effectively. Merging with Biology when there is already shared space, lab tech, and equipment will allow for better meeting of the students needs. Currently offering 5 classes/semester. The idea is grow with TMC approved courses – short-term – no need for additional resources; but could with lab tech support upon growth of the department. Lab tech at CCC is split between Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences, the job description was altered by Omar a couple of years ago to make sure Environmental Sciences was included in the lab tech support at CCC.*

Geology/Geography/Astronomy – *streamline the interactions/communications with students. Smaller more manageable units will have a focused leader and who will be able to strengthen the program; independence will help with collaboration; current structure – people are territorial and collaboration was difficult. It worked better when it was smaller – the growth has be 60-70%, with the exception of Physical Sciences, which has remained flat, since merging; faster than they expected. Interconnectedness of the programs forces collaboration. Less reassign time means more FT faculty in the classroom.*

Astronomy and Physical Sciences – *there is a lot of cross-over and sharing of staff and equipment. It would be more difficult to schedule these separate. The large majority of students in Astro & physical sciences are **GE**/ there is a small number of physics majors who take astro because they want astrophysics.*

3. Were all FT faculty consulted on the creation of the proposals?

Environmental Sciences merging with Biology – *A meeting with all FT faculty did occur; Jeannie wanted to be with another department and not a single person department.*

Geology/Geography/Astronomy – *no, well – all 6 yes - absolutely yes – there were 6 who decided what to do, but once the proposals were written- one wrote a proposal without the input of the astronomy faculty. Their proposal was discussed among all 6 – this was the proposal that was agreed upon in May. They met again this semester – this was the focus of those meetings. The other proposal was not consulted with them altogether (the one with astronomy and physical sciences) – this one never included conversation with the FT faculty who was hired in that discipline. David has the only job description that includes astronomy. He was hired for dual disciplines – physics and astronomy. David is willing to be chair of astronomy. Jeannie was included in the discussion and supportive. Teresa –wrote a separate proposal that was not in collaboration with the 4 of them.*

Astronomy and Physical Sciences – *they were informed – via email – no response from them; she was not consulted; they were invited to collaborate with her, though.*

When was the decision made to go with this proposal? After agreeing to share reassign time last spring, Teresa set a deadline of Sept 15 to decide what to do going forward. All 6 FT faculty met and agreed to split the departments based on growth – there was discussion of Envir to be separate. It was a surprise that Envir decided to merge with Biology. Teresa worked on her own proposal. The faculty wrote that other proposal in secret. There was discussion about splitting but no specifics about what that would look like. Teresa said she was very clear about what her proposal would look like.

4. What has changed since last program review?

Environmental Sciences merging with Biology – *the need for the program to grow; originally Enviro was with Biology – so merged with ESES – but has become clear that Enviro could grow more. They have been talking about why this isn't in PR, but Miriam, Omar & Jeannie have been talking about it for the past year. The discipline wants to grow most effectively. All the programs are growing in ESES and it is difficult with only 1 person in charge of it.*

Omar – Enviro TMC is emerging and appears Enviro with Biology – the TMC has only been developed in last few months.

Geology/Geography/Astronomy – *Geography would have 3 with pending position; geology would have 2; astronomy would have 2 (with Teresa); physical sciences would be only Teresa.*

Astronomy and Physical Sciences – *Teresa did further research – that there are a handful of departments that would have similar size of this proposal – such as engineering and physics; architecture, etc.*