School of Science Steering Committee Minutes  
May 4, 2011

Voting Members present: Mihran Tuceryan (President), Bart Ng (Dean of the School of Science), Teri Belecky-Adams (Biology), Barry Muhoberac (Chemistry and Chemical Biology), Yao Liang (Computer and Information Science), Pierre-Andre Jacinthe (Earth Sciences), Vitaly Tarasov (Mathematical Sciences), Stephen Wassall (Physics), John McGrew (Psychology)

Non-Voting Members present: David Skalnik (Associate Dean), Jeff Watt (Associate Dean), Jyoti Sarkar (Past President), John Watson (Secretary)

Invited Guests: Simon Rhodes (SOS Dean-Designate), Martin Bard (Biology representative from the Unit committee)

1. President Mihran Tuceryan called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.
2. The agenda was adopted unanimously (see page 4).
3. President Tuceryan asked for comments on the minutes of the March 9, 2011 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. President Tuceryan turned the floor over to Dean-Designate Rhodes. Rhodes thanked the committee for the invitation to attend the meeting. He stated that his appointment begins on July 1, 2011. He is meeting regularly with Dean Bart Ng. He also met with two departments that will have searches this coming academic year.
5. President Tuceryan turned the floor over to Dean Ng for comments.
   • Ng summarized the current status of SELB1. He noted that the plans are still in good shape despite recent cuts to the building budget. The design approval will be before the IU Trustees at their July 23, 2011 meeting. If approved, the building will go out for bid. Budget constraints will likely be dealt with by splitting the project into two parts. Current plan do not include a basement.
   • Ng presented summarized appropriations for the state universities that were passed recently by the state legislature. Appropriations were based on the new ICHE system for reallocation of funds based on performance drivers. Using this formula, IUPUI general academic funding will increase by approx. 6.7%. However, funding for the IUPUI health programs will decline by 3.5%, and funding for the IU system is down by 2%.
   • Ng noted that enrollment is slipping for the first time, being down a bit more in credit hours than in head count. His staff is analyzing the situation to determine its cause and effect.
6. President Tuceryan opened the floor for consideration of the proposed changes to the SOS P&T document (see attachment).
   • With regard to process, it was agreed that the revisions would be put to a vote of the Voting Faculty, as occurred with the last revision in September, 2005.
   • The Steering Committee (SC) discussed whether to recommend to the faculty that they approval of the proposed changes to the document. The timing of the vote was also discussed, keeping in mind that summer is upon us but that P&T committees will need to begin their work early in the fall semester.
The SC discussed at length the Unit Committee’s proposed changes to the SOS P&T document. The deliberations are summarized below. The SC requested that the Unit Committee consider a small number of modifications that the SC believes will provide greater clarity in the document. Other parts of the P&T document were discussed as summarized below to provide a complete record of the deliberations.

### Suggested Clarifications

- **Page 8, Section B.1., comment b14.** The point was raised that explaining negative votes in the Primary Committee seemed contradictory to taking the votes by secret ballot. There was general agreement that this sentence should be revised. One possibility is to state that both positive and negative sentiments be explained in the report.

- **Page 15, Section E.1. Publications.** Concern was voiced that the term journals was used without mention of other forms of peer-reviewed publication such as proceedings and books. The 2011-12 version of the Dean of the Faculties guidelines addresses this issue. There was general agreement that this section be revised to reflect the wording used in the current campus guidelines.

- **Page 17, Section E.2.e., comment b33.** There was considerable discussion about the definition of “arm’s length” with regard to the writers of letters of evaluation. There was general agreement that this section of the document was less than practical. The 2011-12 version of the Dean of the Faculties guidelines address this issue. For example, there is clear statement very like NSF’s definition of conflict of interest, plus other updates to the definition of “arm’s length.” The consensus was that this section be revised to be more consistent with the current campus definitions.

- **Editorial changes.** There was general agreement that certain changes would benefit from editing for clarity and grammatical reasons. This is particularly true in the latter portion of the document.

- **Mandated vs. non-mandated changes.** The SC acknowledged campus mandated most of the proposed changes. However, it was suggested that it be clearly indicated whether a particular change was mandated or not before presentation to the entire faculty. One suggestion was that identifying these two categories of changes be achieved with different note colors.

### Other Discussion Points

- **Page 7, Section B.1., comments b1-b5.** One SC member noted that some of his department’s faculty held the view that any faculty member with more than 50% effort outside that department should not be eligible for the Primary Committee, and that there was historical precedence for this. It was noted that the current wording would not preclude a department from adopting a more restrictive definition of eligibility. Another SC member noted that several full Professors from his department would be excluded from the Primary Committee the current criterion in Section B.1 would exclude, and might necessitate a Professor from another department being appointed by the Dean. The pros and cons of both scenarios were discussed, but there was no clear consensus that this section should be changed.
Page 16, Section E.2.b. Two facets of this paragraph about selection of outside letter writers were questioned. The first regarded whether a candidate placing a potential letter writer in the "should be excluded" category meant that letter writer "would be excluded." Another point was how many names were to be solicited from the candidate and whether the final list of letter writers should contain a defined number from the candidates list. After discussion, there was no consensus that this section should be changed.

Page 26, Section I.2. The question was raised as to the reason for mentioning that the dossiers of most SOS candidate are 25 pages or less. The answer was that this statement is to encourage the preparation of concise dossiers.

7. President Tuceryan asked that the SC members send him the names of nominees for the position of Secretary/President-Elect of the SOS Faculty.

8. Old business. None.

9. New business. Dean Ng stated that his next position would be as Dean of the College of Sciences at Benedictine University. He also thanked the SC for its efforts and stressed its importance in faculty governance. The SC expressed its appreciation to Dean Ng with a round of applause.

10. President Tuceryan adjourned the meeting at 12:43 p.m.
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AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda.
2. Approval of Minutes of March 9, 2011 meeting.
3. Welcome to Simon Rhodes.
   a. Q&A
4. Dean Ng’s remarks.
5. Discussion on the changes to the School of Science P&T guidelines.
6. Nominations for the Secretary position for next year.
7. Old business.