School of Science Steering Committee Minutes
February 9, 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), Jyoti Sarkar (Past President), John Watson (Secretary)

1. President Mihran Tuceryan called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.
2. The agenda was adopted unanimously (see page 3).
3. President Tuceryan asked for comments on the minutes of the January 21, 2010 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. President Tuceryan turned the floor over to Dean Bart Ng for his comments.
   • Ng introduced the new Associate Dean for Research, Dr. David Skalnik. Skalnik explained his plans for his office. Having just submitted grant proposals through the SOS himself, Skalnik noted that there were areas for improvement in the process. In the future, once a faculty member identifies a potential funding source, that faculty member would receive reminders of deadlines and checklists. He wants the SOS faculty to have confidence that routing a proposal will proceed properly. Skalnik stressed that his office should provide a service that makes submitting proposals easier for the faculty by having appropriate expertise available on a daily basis. He intends to hire a staff member with academic experience to assist with running the office.
   • Ng stated his intention to build research infrastructure within the school and to provide incentives for increased research productivity. He announced the creation of research incentive bonus plan that was recently approved by the Chair’s Council. The plan would come into play if a faculty member has multiple grants or if he/she can cover more than 32.5% of their salary from grant funds. The bonus would be 20% of every salary dollar covered by grants. Department chairs might provide additional release time.
   • Ng then presented a detailed analysis of the SOS budget. He provided a document containing 6 pages of budget information and 2 pages of future considerations. He noted that considerable time and effort went into developing the detailed reporting of income and expenditures that were contained in the document, which reflects the SOS’s accomplishments in faculty hiring and startup. Ng pointed out that student fee income is up and will explain its impact. Funds were set aside for the new building, renovation, and start up packages. Among the high lights of Ng’s summary were as follows:
     – The total income for the SOS for the last year was just over $50M. Of that, only 8.8% is state appropriations, and another 3% is from Commitment to Excellence funds. Therefore the total amount of support from the state is less than 12% of our total income. Student tuition/fees account for approx. 85% of SOS income, whereas indirect costs represent 2.8% of our income.
– Approx. 30% of our budget is returned to campus as assessments. There was $28M in expenditures of various types, with graduate student support being 3.2% of the SOS budget (this does not include graduate student support from grants).
– Faculty recruitment. In the last two years, the SOS spent $5.6M on startup packages for about 28 new faculty hires. Ng noted that this rate of faculty hiring may not be needed in the future, and he anticipates perhaps 5 new hires per year from now on. There is presently approx. $2M for future positions.
– Student fee income (exclusive of lab fees) increased ~$16M since the 2005-06 fiscal year. Ng noted that this is in part because of the willingness of the IU Board of Trustees to approve tuition increases in the face of declining state allocations. He stated that the Trustees affect our lives in direct ways, and that the faculty should be cognizant of the Trustees’ actions and should be willing to communicate with them.
– Funds for facilities were described, including the new building, establishing core research facilities, and certain renovations. He still has hopes that a basement will be included in the new building. The building site for SELB I is apparently an old landfill, and therefore pilings will be required for the building (as opposed to simply building on a slab).
– Ng encouraged departments to develop career-oriented graduate programs in which the students would pay their own way as a source of additional income for the School. He mentioned that proposed changes to the current assessment system might significantly affect how much money the SOS returns to the campus.
– Ng closed with a list of “must-do’s” for the future: (1) maintain enrollment levels; (2) increase student success rate; (3) increase the School’s external funding; (4) set student lab fees at a level that recovers the true cost of the instructional labs; (5) control costs of utilities and upkeep on SELB I and II since the SOS will be billed directly for those costs; and (5) develop philanthropic and alumni support base.

5. Old business. Watson asked if there were any developments on the Dean search. Ng noted that EVC Sukhatme and Chancellor Bantz discussed the search and a decision is pending, perhaps involving President McRobbie.
6. New business. None
7. President Tuceryan adjourned the meeting at 12:35 p.m.
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1. Adoption of the Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes of January 12, 2011 meeting
3. Dean’s remarks on the budget
4. Old business
5. New business