SoS Steering Committee Minutes
Dec 5, 2014

Voting members: Dean Simon Rhodes; Michelle Salyers/Psychology/President of the Steering Committee; Randall Roper/Biology; Barry Muhoberac/Chemistry and Chemical Biology; Snehasis Mukhopadhyay /Computer and Information Science; Andy Barth/Earth Sciences; Vitaly Tarasov /Mathematical Sciences; Horia Petrache/Physics; Dennis Devine/Psychology

Non-voting members: Associate Dean Doug Lees; Associate Dean Dave Skalnik; Associate Dean Kathy Marrs; Lin Li/Earth Sciences/Secretary of the Steering Committee; Beth Neal-Beliveau/Psychology/Past President

Guest(s): Rajeev Raje/Computer and Information Science; Mihran Tuceryan/ Computer and Information Science; Charles Goodlett/Psychology

1. Approval of agenda- President Michelle Salyers mentioned a change to the agenda. We do not have the minutes from the last meeting ready for approval. We just received them today, so Lin and then Michelle will review them and distribute them for approval by email. No other changes were noted. She called for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion, a second, and it was approved.

2. Comments by Dean Rhodes

Dean Rhodes provided an update from Mitch Daniels’ (President of Purdue) visit to IUPUI last week. The good part was that although Purdue administration has ignored us for so long, it actually now has enabled us to have a direct line of communication to those two people who were on the stage. So now we can talk directly to the president or the provost. And I’ve been doing that with the provost, especially over the last few days. So that’s good.

The disappointing parts were that really not much was said. There was a lot of “we’ll wait and see.” Although they had done a lot of homework before the visit, there were some surprises about what they did not know about the relationships between the campuses, like not understanding that there is not a financial connection between us and them. We did tell them our goal was site-approved PhD degrees in Indianapolis and that there are two IU versions of the PU PhD degrees already in line in the IU system.

Search and screens committees are going well. There’s our usual cultural difference across departments in the sense that in some disciplines this is the hiring season and in other disciplines it’s a little later. I’m seeing a lot of psychologists lately. One change is that Computer and Information Science is searching again because a hire from last year decided not to come.

Someone asked who organized the visit from President Daniels. Dean Rhodes (DR) replied that he did not know what the catalytic event was. Jeff Watt is one of the IUPUI reps on the Purdue senate and every time he’s been there, he has said that we would love President Daniels to visit the Indianapolis campus. So Jeff deserves some credit for that, and the McRobbie speech about engineering probably helped initiate a visit. We did not have an agenda from them for the meeting. Purdue called the Dean of Engineering and said they would like to come for a town hall meeting with
the Dean and faculty of Science. We also had them meet with Chancellor Bantz and Exec Vice Chancellor Paydar. We met in SELB to show that we built that building together.

Rajeev Raje (RR) asked how Engineering is approaching this. DR responded that we are more involved in terms of the graduate program status. So any headway we make seems good for them. I have recommended that they take an opportunity to stand next to us and make the big step. Engineering is a bit more married to the Purdue brand than we are. And so that’s a difference. But there is a mixed reception in Engineering. When IUPUI changed the marketing logo, Engineering had more complaints than the School of Science but not many overall.

President Michelle Salyers (MS) asked what do you see as the main next steps that will happen? DR responded that he thought Daniels will talk to his Trustees and they will decide do they want a presence in Science and in Engineering in Indianapolis? I think the Trustees will tell him they do. I’m not sure he does. It’s very clear that McRobbie and the IU Trustees want us, want both Science and Engineering. The IU lawyers have drawn up the documents. I believe they did that two years ago.

Snehasis Mukhopadhyay (SM) asked, Doesn’t that require a legislative approval? DR responded that it would if they were to do whole campus; but for Science, no. It requires the two sets of Trustees to agree.

SM asked if there was any potential that our school will become the battleground of two universities fighting? DR replied that if we handle it the right way, that may not be so bad. I am glad we’ve had some conversations and decided where we want to be. I don’t want this to hurt our momentum or our mission. But I’d rather have good conversations about who wants us and how we serve the state than the worse than benign neglect we’ve had in the past few years. There has been stunning silence about Ft. Wayne lately. IU sent a team to Ft. Wayne and it is clear Purdue does not want Ft. Wayne. Ft. Wayne faculty has mixed views.

SM said that one of the words that Daniels used about us, IUPUI, is partnership. I don’t know what that means and how that will evolve. So maybe the viewpoint in West Lafayette is also changing. DR agreed and said that it may be that the Purdue Trustees in the last month have said “Hey wait a minute. You know, we have the best deal ever in Indianapolis. Why you messing with it?” The Chairs asked yesterday whether if we get the PhDs site approved here, is that enough? I’m not sure, because that’s not everything that we want. IU still controls everything else about us. We got moved down the building list in the last state request. I don’t know if the state will build any buildings, and it may not be a relevant point, but nonetheless why should IU put us in a prime place on a building list when we’re delivering degrees for the other university? So it’s not just about PhDs. It is largely about the PhDs, but it’s not just about PhDs. In terms of philanthropy there are certain big agencies that we cannot approach without permission for the IU President. And again, would he rather us approach them or would he rather the Kelley School of Business that delivers bright red degrees approach that person or that organization?

With no further questions, MS moved to our next agenda item.

3. Collaborative Research Discussion with speakers: Rajeev Raje; Charley Goodlett, Mihran Tuceryan
MS reminded us that this came from our prior discussion about collaborative research and how we want to encourage and value that in the school, and whether or not our P & T guidelines accurately reflect or encourage that.

RR said that based on the Steering Committee request, they reviewed the School of Science guidelines, and Charlie reviewed the Campus guidelines to see what they currently say. There were many very brief narrations about collaborating. We sat down and came up with a brief amendment that the Unit Committee has not yet seen (aside from Andy Barth and Michelle Salyers). We tried to highlight in this brief amendment that first we want to indicate that collaborative research is needed and we want to encourage that. We made some degree of enumeration (referring to the draft).

What is the official role of this particular investigator in the collaboration? In the second bullet, we tried to indicate that with respect to your actual contribution to the research effort, what were your roles in that contribution, e.g., unique piece, necessary support function, or something you totally own. And the third bullet was based on some of our past experience. We have seen situations where people who are doing lots of collaborative activities, but the dossier did not reflect the unique aspects of that person’s research contributions were related to a unified theme of the person’s research. So essentially we are saying that the collaborator or the person who is going to participate in such collaborations, needs to indicate in the dossier the need for the collaboration and strong evidence for their expertise. The last paragraph talks about getting supporting letters from your collaborators in the process, which can highlight the role again from their prospective.

This is just a beginning draft. The process that we’re hoping to follow is to get feedback from you, then forward to the Unit Committee. Then if everybody is in favor of the wording, then we can pass on to the entire faculty.

Charley Goodlett (CG) added that when he looked at the campus guidelines, they had it several places. One thing we’ve avoided here, in one of their paragraphs, there’s a statement about the importance of collaboration in team science. But also the caveat is the candidates still should show evidence of independent research. And I felt that was going too far in the modern era. In the right context, a strong collaborator can show important expertise and independence, even in the context of collaborations. An Investigator could fit their work in collaborations such that the work is still necessary for those other projects to succeed, recognizing that there could be debate about that. Barry Muhoberac (BM) said that they covered that in a good way in the draft. CG replied that the Campus level might potentially raise some concerns there. DR added that the old litmus test was if someone is collaborating with 5 other people, and those people all get hit by a bus at the same time, is that person’s career still viable? So is that still a litmus test? Mihran Tuceryan (MT) did not remember this question arising in recent cases. CG added that the other facet of that litmus test is if you pull the person out of that collaboration, does the research collapse.

RR said that they decided to eliminate that in the guidelines. Also, the campus guidelines indicate some specific artifacts that we decided were best not to enumerate because any collaboration is going to be a little bit different. CG added that Mihran had strong opinions about not over specifying or micro managing this process. The important part of this is the first paragraph, where we describe the value of collaborative research from the perspective of the School of Science, that this is the modern practice of scientific research. It is also important to describe the expectations of the candidate and the protection of the candidate.
SM asked if we are going to be this precise about collaborative efforts, do we need to have criteria about if we have a person whose collaboration does not pass the litmus test. Are we going to discount that completely? Or is it going to count a little bit but not as a full? Collaborations by nature are somewhat amorphous, may be subjective and not clear cut. We can probably just say it has, that person has to play a significant role, rather than being too specific about what the significance means. We are promoting an individual, not a project. We take all evidence into account, including the letters. I wonder if this specification is necessary.

BM asked whether it would be useful to have some notation of growing involvement or growing commitment in terms of the developmental role of the collaboration. It could be one thing for someone to send you a sample and you run it and the data’s exchanged. I’m not saying it needs to be in there, but, would it help the committee to have some evidence of a growing role of collaboration instead of a role that’s sort of stagnant. CG added that you see between tenure and promotion to associate versus a full. BM added that it’s not explicit. If we reword this, I could see some explicit language. MS asked whether these guidelines have to apply to both (Associate and Full). CG replied that most of the current school guidelines are written for tenure and promotion to associate with less on the Full. We agree in spirit about not over specifying, but I think there is a point at which the best interest of the candidate comes from having some clarity as to what the school says is sufficient. Because when a case goes to even higher levels, those committees have to come back to the school criteria and abide by those, so we need clear, explicit criteria. DR responded that SM said, “we don’t promote projects, we promote people” and we could put that at the beginning of the second section to set up why that second section is important.

CG added that one of the things that we talked about as a group was that if we start saying what constitutes meritorious collaborations, e.g., looking publication-by-publication, grant-by-grant, that’s not what we want. The candidate’s expertise is more than that, and they should describe why it’s meritorious. RR said that there has to be some sort of a middle ground, where some area of specificity is necessary. We have suggested guidelines so that people can think about them if they are participating in collaborative ventures and to make that case as strong as possible.

Vitaly Tarasov (VT) distinguishes between two kinds of collaborations. One is going within a narrow subject, with same expertise where it is very difficult to distinguish the contribution. In Mathematics, list authors alphabetically to reflect equal contribution. In different subject collaborations, when people are coming from different areas it is easier to specify what each person brings.

CG added that the culture of the departments is different and it will be important to accommodate them. He had a similar comment from a faculty member who noted that sometimes when you do team science it’s not so much the individual contributions, but the synergy among all the people working together and how do you capture that? And it’s not unlike mathematics. And so there needs to be a way to acknowledge and encourage that. VT noted that the letters of collaborators especially for interdisciplinary research might be very important. CG added that letters are not required from collaborators, but may be used. The concern is that when there is a junior faculty member with a senior faculty member working on the same project. And that’s when people start to get concerned about who’s doing what. VT agreed that for this kind of collaboration, we could ask the senior person to write more specifically about the role. And that person who is doing the dossier
and seeking promotion should explain his role specifically in collaboration. RR agreed that’s exactly what I tried to do in this section of the draft and added that even if you don’t have collaboration, your dossier is what you are to the committee.

BM noted that the junior, senior collaboration problem goes back to his original statement about the growth of the involvement of the junior collaborator. But it’s also the time dependence. If we don’t show that growth, then the senior person can always claim credit for everything.

SM asked whether with different possible ways collaborations could happen, are we going to be collaboration killers in some way? RR said he did not think so. A person has to address, could you be easily replaceable? Is your role unique and critical to the project? Lin Li (LL) added that this is like the discussion of impact and how to quantify. RR replied that this is like other areas that you have to justify in the dossier.

SM asked where this topic came from. MS replied that it came from our discussions and IU school of Medicine recently revised their P&T documents to have two pages worth of collaborative research, where they clarify how to document it. DR added that as we went through strategic planning, a lot of those conversations talked about how we could work better together (illustrates that we now have psychologists with grants with people in math). SM’s center he co-directs could be a catalyst for these sorts of things. CG added that he’s had faculty say they have this opportunity to engage in collaboration, but were not sure if it was really valued at the promotion and tenure level. Of course, if it’s important and has value. We have to find a way to communicate that as a school. This is the way people work now. DR added that in a similar conversation he also said don’t tie your success to some else’s control.

Horia Petrace (HP) brought up the language about the letters and that we should clarify if they are required? And for each collaboration? Is there a limit? Would not want a dossier turned down for a technicality.

RR said that would not happen in his experience. With respect to the limit, the candidate has 5 pages for the statement, 2 pages for the accomplishment. They could be merged together in the overall statement. Apart from that the whole thing is 50 pages. CG added that the guidelines are very specific about these kinds of letters. A collaborator giving their perspective is part of the area of excellence. There’s another section called reference letters, which cannot be solicited by the candidate and that are typically solicited by the Chair.

MS asked if there is a concern that the current wording will be misinterpreted because it says whenever possible? This led to a discussion about the wording of that paragraph. RR said that their group would edit the document again and send it back to the Steering Committee for our review before sending it to the Unit Committee. MS added that then we’ll present it to the spring faculty assembly for a vote at that point.

Kathy Marrs (KM) asked if outside letter writers would get other parts of the dossier to see letters form collaborators? Will they have background on the collaboration? CG said that this depends on the practice of the department in terms of what is sent to the letter writer. The evaluator should be able to discern from that candidate’s statement what they are in terms of their collaborative strengths.
SM asked if two faculty members in the same department collaborate on a grant, are we saying that only the acceptable credit assignment is 50/50? Otherwise somebody will get hurt. No, we clarified that the person has to document what their role is.

MS thanked the guests and moved to the next agenda item.

4. Old Business

   a. Peer review of teaching

      After our presenters came last time, MS contacted Rajeev as the head of the Unit Committee. We’re going to create a subcommittee of the Unit Committee to discuss and develop recommendations for how to incorporate peer review of teaching. He has emailed the Unit Committee. I will keep you posted on that. The ideal would be that in the spring, the Unit Committee would develop recommendations that we could put forward to the full faculty. The recommendations would come back to this committee first before we did that.

   b. Voting Issue from Math Department

      MS did send this out over email about the voting request that came from Math. The Steering Committee voted 5 against, 3 for, and 1 abstained. So we would not then bring that proposal to full faculty, at least not this year.

   c. Emergency Procedures

      KM described that she met with Bill Abston (Deputy Chief of Police), Ryan Chandler (Assistant Director of Emergency Management) and Erin Roe to talk about some safety concerns that faculty have brought to the Steering Committee. Some of us had attended that presentation at the library, and people wanted a little bit more. They are willing to do another training (50 minutes), perhaps presenting 5 scenarios and having small group discussion. We could invite Engineering if we wanted more people, and it would be for faculty and graduate students.

      We discussed the past Active Shooter training that had multiple sessions, and some of us went, but most of that time was spent on the past incident. There was some discussion of gun laws and in our state it is illegal to have a gun on campus.

      KM said they would also participate in the training for graduate students who get the TA training in the Fall and that they would do a training for our undergraduate student mentors. She has already talked to the Bepko learning center about doing that at the big August orientation trainings, with maybe a smaller January training.

      MS asked, so as a follow-up, do we want to do this in January? KM asked if we would like to do it as the semester’s getting started again or the couple of days before classes start? MS suggested to have a good showing and we might have the training after the semester officially starts. KM agreed and said they could have another training in August, with new graduate students and faculty.

      Beth Neal-Beliveau (BNB) asked what the red phones in the hallway are for. KM replied that they go to the campus police. The reason that they exist is that virtually all the rest of the phones are now internet based. We discussed that a label and instructions would be good, similar to the new locks on doors. New emergency locks are being placed on all the major classroom doors, but nothing about training or procedure has been given, too. KM agreed and said it was similar when desks got
silent alarms. KM also suggested that some doors need to be changed, with windows put in so that students and faculty are not behind closed doors with no window. We had them put in all our academic advisors doors, which is national practice for advisors now. Advisors have mixed responses, including putting paper over the window, while others love it.

BM noted that the response might depend on whether you’ve had a threatening situation and noted that in the past Chemistry did have a situation of concern. He said he likes the windows even though there’s a privacy issue; those windows are important, especially for counselors or advisors.

KM summarized that it sounds like in an upcoming training could build in what we do about the phones, what we do about the door locks in addition to these scenarios. BNB added the difference between “lockdown” and “shelter in place” would be helpful. The past experience we had was not clear what to do. We discussed that the phone system sends multiple alerts to students, staff and faculty.

5. New Business

MS asked if anyone had new business.

VT brought up the concern about the timing of the student evaluations. The last date of student evaluations is Monday, December 15th, but several requests were made for Math classes to end it earlier because of Saturday finals. He was not sure if this was being done this semester. DR said that Mark Federwish needs to know. MS said she thought the email had an exception for Math classes.

KM brought up a related topic, that the response scale for the lab and lecture go in different directions. Several students wrote to faculty that they had completed the survey in the wrong way. MS will contact Mark Federwisch about these issues.

SM brought up that we usually have an update from Doug Lees about budget and finances. Doug Lees (DL) said that departments are submitting information and that the assessment process is complex. He will do a report in the Spring, and we decided the March meeting would be good.

MS reminded the group that the subcommittee for administrative reviews is not meeting today, and we will do that in January or February.

So January or February we’ll meet after that meeting. I’m not sure, still waiting to hear back from people on the last edited version. But we’ll talk about that at the next meeting.

DR added that now Steve Randall is the school representative on the campus budget committee. We discussed last year that he will retire from that. This group will elect one of its members to be that person and that will be good for communication, with direct conversations between School and Campus levels. We think this is a one-year commitment.

We talked about the timing of the meetings next semester. The proposed dates may not work well for VT because of Math seminars. MS will go back to DR, BNB, and LL to check for new dates and times. The meeting adjourned at 5:31.
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