School of Science Steering Committee Minutes  
September 13, 2010

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), Michal Misiurewicz (substituting for Vitaly Tarasov, Mathematical Sciences), Stephen Wassall (Physics), Charles Goodlett (substituting for John McGrew, Psychology)

Non-Voting Members present: James Murphy (Associate Dean for Research), Jyoti Sarkar (Past President), John Watson (Secretary)

1. President Tuceryan called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.
2. The agenda was adopted unanimously (see page 4).
3. President Tuceryan asked for comments on the minutes of the August 20, 2010 meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) meeting. I was noted that Dr. Tarasov’s name had been added to list of Voting Members. One SC member noted he had not been present at the April 30, 2010 SC meeting, and therefore did not vote for approval. This will be noted in the April 30 minutes. The Aug. 20, 2010 minutes of were then approved unanimously with these revisions.
4. President Tuceryan turned the floor over to Dean Ng.
   • The first item for discussion with Dean Ng was the proposed changes to the SOS “Criteria, Standards and Documentation Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment” document. He noted that the last changes to this document were in September 2005. He explained that changes in the P&T procedures at the campus level necessitated modification of the SOS P&T procedures and document to bring the SOS into register with current campus policy. Each spring when the campus level P&T committee finishes handling candidate dossiers, the committee conducts an evaluation of current procedures. With such timing, suggestions for changes at the school level often cannot occur until early in the following fall semester. Early feedback from and discussions with the SOS representative on the campus P&T committee (Dr. Ben Boukai) and the previous year’s Chair of SOS Unit Committee (Dr. Martin Bard) facilitated the proposed changes to the SOS P&T document. The proposed revisions target 3 main facets of the SOS P&T document dealing with (a) the role of the chair in Primary Committee function using wording much like that in the university’s P&T document, (b) ensuring that each person who votes on a candidate’s P&T case can do so once and only once, and (c) establishing that the Unit Committee member who presents a candidate’s case to the entire committee the departmental be from a different department than the candidate. Dean Ng presented the rationale for each of these changes.
   • Dean Ng explained that it is responsibility of the Dean of the Faculty to modify the campus level P&T document. Likewise, it is the responsibility of the SOS Dean to modify our P&T document. He stressed the importance of obtaining substantive faculty input prior to finalizing any changes to the document. As mentioned above, consultation with and recommendations from selected members of the
Unit Committee occurred. Dean Ng said he was now soliciting input from and collaboration with the SC.

- Dean Ng then invited discussion and questions. Dr. Misiurewicz expressed concern about having a candidate’s case presented to the Unit Committee by a member from another department and the changes ensuring one vote per person during the P&T process for a given. He also stressed that emphasis should be placed on insuring that “arm’s length” distance between a candidate and the outside letter writers should be re-examined. He suggested that bringing the School’s arm’s length policy into alignment with the campus level policy would be good.

- Discussion then focused on the provisions in the P&T document relating to the role of the department chair. The main proposed revision was to insert the following into section B.1, paragraph 2 on page 6 of the P&T document: “The Department Chair shall ensure that the departmental P&T committee completes its tasks in a timely manner. The Department Chair may not participate in the deliberations of the case of any candidate, but may seek clarification on issues related to the case for the purpose of writing his or her own evaluation. The Department Chair may not vote and may not influence the outcomes of committee votes.” There was general agreement in the SC on this with following modifications: (a) the second sentence of the insertion be altered to allow the department chair to answer informational questions from the primary committee, and (b) to insert a statement in section B.1 to effect that the Primary Committee will elect a committee chair (other than the department chair) at their first meeting.

- Dean Ng was asked his view of the current SOS policy that the Primary Committee must have a majority of full professors as members. He said he favored retaining this policy. A limited discussion of this discussion followed.

- The subject of a department chair who has not yet reached the rank of full professor was mentioned. Dean Ng pointed out that this scenario is already addressed adequately in the first full paragraph of page 7 of the P&T document.

- The next topic discussed was proposed changes regarding membership on departmental P&T committee members for faculty members who have substantial administrative appointments. The proposed insertion, to follow sentence 1 of section B.1 on page 5, was acceptable to the SC: “In general, administrators at or above the dean’s level (particularly those whose administrative duties lie outside the School of Science) should not be asked to serve on their departmental Primary Committee or the School’s Unit Committee.”

- To address the issue of not voting more than once, regardless of P&T level, Dean Ng proposed inserting the following after item 1) on page 9 of the document: “No member of the Unit Committee will vote for candidates for tenure or for promotions from his or her own department. Any Unit Committee member serving on the Primary Committee of another department will likewise not vote again during the
Unit Committee’s deliberation. This ensures that each voting individual votes only once on the tenure or promotion of any candidate throughout the tenure and promotion process.” There was general agreement on the SC with this item.

- The last major item discussed was the question of who presents a candidate’s case to the unit committee. The proposed change was to replace the wording in item j) on page 9 with: “At the Unit Committee, each case for tenure and for promotion will be presented by a Unit Committee member who is from a different department. Members of the Unit Committee from the candidate’s department may provide additional information or clarifying statements during the deliberations and only after the initial presentation of the candidate’s case.” Dean Ng noted that he was initially resistant to this change but became convinced of its beneficial nature. There was considerable discussion of the pros and cons of this revision. There was general agreement that it is likely that adoption of this change would place a higher priority on the Primary Committee report and on the candidate’s dossier than the current system. Concern was expressed over the process by which the presenting Unit Committee would prepare and consult prior to the committee meeting. Given the shortness of time before this year’s P&T deliberations begin, Dean Ng suggested that this item not be included in this year’s revisions of the P&T document. This will allow additional discussions and formulation of the process by which Unit Committee members would conduct presenting cases of faculty from other departments. Dr. Misiurewicz stated “I think the candidate is more important than his or her dossier.” Dean Ng was in full agreement with this statement.

- Raises. Dean Ng noted that IU has specified that at least 20% of the faculty must receive at least a 4% raise but with an overall average rate of 3%. He presented a table summarizing the % raise available for the remaining faculty as the % of faculty receiving 4% and 6% raises increases. The department chairs favored a situation where 10% and 15% of the faculty would receive 6% and 4% raises, leaving an average of 2.4% available for the remaining faculty. He noted that this will hopefully help retain highly productive faculty.

- SOS budget. Dean Ng said that our budget is very healthy, and all startup packages for the new faculty are paid for. We experienced a small increase in credit hours and number of entering freshmen (unlike many schools). Departments already have been informed of their budgets for this fiscal year. Certain departments received an increase in graduate student support.

- New building. The new building is on schedule.

5. SOS representatives for the IUPUI faculty council. President Tuceryan noted that the 3 slots for the SOS on the IFC were filled. He asked that each SC departmental representative find nominees and forward the names to him. Dean Ng suggested that we stagger the terms of our 3 IFC representatives (2 for the full 2 year term, and 1 for a 1 year term.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.
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AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of August 20, 2010 Meeting
   (http://sos.science.iupui.edu/facultycouncil/SC-Minutes2010-08-20.pdf)

3. Dean Ng
   a. Promotion & Tenure guidelines (please bring your own copy of the proposed alterations to the SOS P&T document distributed by Dean Ng)
   b. Raises
   c. Budget
   d. New building

4. Announcements
   a. SOS representation on IFC

5. Old business
   a. P&T representation for lecturers

6. New business