Minutes of the Special 2012 School of Science Faculty Assembly  
Friday, February 10, 2012  
Science Building, Room LD 010

Faculty Present

Biology: Atkinson, Simon; Blazer-Yost, Bonnie; Kusmierczyk, Andrew; Marrs, Jim; Marrs, Kathleen (Associate Dean); Meyer, Jason; Randall, Steve; Rhodes, Simon (Dean); Skalnik, David (Associate Dean); Watson, John C. (President of the Faculty);

Chemistry & Chemical Biology: Muhoberac, Barry;

Computer & Information Science: Liang, Yao; Mukhopadhyay, Snehasis (Secretary of the Faculty); Raje, Rajeev; Tuceryan, Mihran (Past-President of the Faculty); Zou, Xukai;

Earth Sciences: Barth, Andrew;

Mathematical Sciences: Arciero, Julia; Cowen, Carl; Cross, Bill; Geller, William; Its, Alexander; Misiurewicz, Michal; Sarkar, Jyotirmoy; Shen, Zhongmin; Tarasov, Vitaly;

Physics: Gavrin, Andrew; Petrache, Horia; Wassall, Steve;

Psychology: Ashburn-Nardo, Leslie; Goodlett, Charles; Hazer, John; McGrew, John; Poposki, Elizabeth;

1. President John Watson called the assembly to order at 9:05 a.m. He reminded everyone that the objective of the assembly was to discuss changes to School of Science (SOS) Promotion and Tenure (P&T) guidelines. He started off with a brief history about the process of current change. Some of these changes are mandated by campus to come to compliance with the campus P &T guidelines. In the Fall 2011 semester, then Acting Dean Bart Ng and the SOS Steering Committee in conjunction the SOS Unit Committee initiated this revision process. Mary Fisher, from the IUPUI Academic Affairs, also provided several suggestions. President Watson thanked Ben Boukai (the Chair) and the rest of that Unit Committee for their hard work on this document. In the Fall 2012 semester, in compliance with the SOS by-laws, Dean Rhodes and the Steering Committee appointed an ad-hoc committee, chaired by Andy Barth, to finalize all such changes. Two weeks ago, Barth sent two versions of the new draft document, one with substantive comments and the other also including purely editorial changes. Some of the changes were with terminologies; while the SOS used terminologies such as “distinguished”, “substantial”, and “satisfactory”, the campus used terminologies such as “excellent”, “highly satisfactory”, and “satisfactory”. The SOS is now required to use campus terminologies. Hence, these word changes were accepted as changes. President Watson sent a version to all SOS faculty with these so-called “word-smithing” changes. He also sent another version with numerous other changes, and also a clean version. At that stage, there were 9 categories of change. The plan was to set up an electronic vote by all faculty (yes/no/abstain) for each of these categories. An additional item to be discussed was proposed by the Computer & Information Science (CIS) department concerning peer-reviewed conference paper; copies of this proposal were handed out at the faculty assembly.

2. Category (Item) 1 of Proposed Changes: These are required to be in alignment with the campus guidelines. For example, the current SOS guidelines say that our document takes precedence over the campus document. On the other hand, campus guidelines say that the latter takes precedence. Hence, this must be changed. Gavrin thought that the language used was slightly ambiguous. Goodlett commented that there were two issues regarding such compliance. While the format and the style of a candidate’s dossier must match campus guidelines, the criteria used can be different for different departments and schools. Gavrin suggested a slight modification of the language which was accepted by unanimous voice vote. The paragraph on page 7 about the Chair and the P&T process was also necessary to comply with campus guidelines. Randall and Tuceryan both commented that the chair may not participate in the primary committee, but may provide clarifications. Watson noted a similar situation exists in the Unit committee with the dean. The proposed language was approved by unanimous voice vote. The changes proposed on page 13 was about work done in rank previously at places other than IUPUI. Goodlett observed that what
counts and what does not count when somebody joins IUPUI as an Associate Professor should be clear. He stated that this was a difficult issue even at the campus level, such as a candidate moving from “Assistant Research Professor” to “Assistant Professor”. The proposed changes related to external letters bring us in alignment with the campus. Solicitation of external letters should be a collaboration between the primary committee and the chair; the candidates should not be aware of the reviewers being solicited. The external letter writers should be at “arm’s length”. Gavrin objected to the language stating that external letters not satisfying “arm’s length” should go to the Appendix, because the Appendix material does not go to and is not seen by the campus committee. Goodlett proposed to put these additional letters in section 4 or the section on excellence. A proposal was made to change “to the Appendix” to “in the dossier”; this proposal was accepted by voice vote unanimously. Considerable discussion followed concerning a sentence defining arm’s length and “overlapping” colleagues. Atkinson observed that this may exclude people with appropriate expertise. He thought that this should not be dictated by guidelines, but should be left to the judgment of the Chair and Primary Committee. Goodlett observed that allowing such letters as external letters may raise a red flag at the campus P&T committee. A proposal was made to strike the relevant sentence and was passed unanimously by voice vote. The last change in item 1 was regarding change in the format of the dossier to comply with campus guidelines.

3. Category (Item) 2 of Proposed Changes: This is an optional change concerning the composition of the primary and unit committees originally that was suggested by Acting Dean Ng and modified by Dr. Fisher. Specifically, “In general, faculty members holding administrative appointments outside of the School in which they have to act at the behest of the administration on Tenure and Promotion should not serve on their departmental Primary Committee or the School’s Unit Committee”. Gavrin commented that such policies should not be based on individual cases. Dean Rhodes thought that the level of involvement is an important point.

4. Category (Item) 3 of Proposed Changes: Language concerning the chair providing feedback to a candidate. A proposal to add “within seven days of the primary committee meeting” was accepted unanimously by voice vote.

5. Category (Item) 4 of Proposed Changes: This was concerning the operations of the Unit committee. An option was added to elect a “Vice Chair”. It also requires a reader (and scribe) not from the candidate’s department. The departmental representative still presents the case. The report has to be approved by the entire Unit Committee.

6. Category (Item) 5 of Proposed Changes: This stated that the departmental representatives on the Unit committee cannot vote on their departmental candidates. Goodlett observed that members from many other schools abstain from earlier levels to vote at a later level and still satisfy the “one person, one vote” campus requirement. This would not allowed under the proposed change in our school’s document.

7. Category (Item) 6 of Proposed Changes: This concerns feedback from the dean to the candidates. A proposal to change wording to “a copy of Unit Committee’s report and Dean’s letter” was accepted by unanimous voice vote.

8. Category (Item) 7 of Proposed Changes: This was concerning the importance of grants.

9. Category (Item) 8 of Proposed Changes: This was a paragraph on interpretation of criteria.

10. Category (Item) 9 of Proposed Changes: This stated that the relative weights on different criteria varied between departments. This same language change was made for all three of Teaching, Research, and Service criteria.

11. President Watson stated that he would set an electronic vote by the entire faculty on the proposed changes, as decided in the assembly.

12. Miesurewicz suggested changing the external solicitation letter to include the phrase “Tenure and Promotion” instead of “Promotion and Tenure”.

13. Tuceryan made a Powerpoint presentation on role of peer-reviewed conference papers in the Computer and Information Science discipline. He proposed a new change to reflect accepting
peer-reviewed conference papers as evidence of scholarship in addition to journal papers. Miesurewicz also raised the issue of peer-reviewed books. Prof. Its proposed to change the language to just say “peer-reviewed publications” and not on the type of publications. Shen wondered how peer-reviewed book chapters will be handled. Gavrin noted that peer-review may take different forms. Prof. Its proposed a change in the language on conferences in the presentation section of the guidelines. Both were accepted by unanimous voice vote to be presented as additional voting items to all SOS faculty during the electronic vote.

14. Motion to adjourn was approved at 10:45 a.m.