School of Science Committee Meeting  
October 10, 2014 
4:00 pm; LD 124

Voting Members present: Simon Rhodes (Dean), Michele Salyers (President), Randall Roper (Biology), Barry Muhoberac (Chemistry and Chemical Biology), Snehasis Mukhopadhyay (Computer and Information Science), Vitaly Tarasov (Mathematical Sciences), Horia Petrache (Physics), Dennis Devine (Psychology)

Non-Voting Members present: Associate Dean Doug Lees, Associate Dean David Skalnik, Associate Dean Kathy Marrs, Associate Dean Jeff Watt, Rosemarie Temple, Lin Li (Secretary)

1. President Michelle Salyers called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm. President Salyers called for approval of the agenda. The agenda was adopted by all.

2. President Salyers asked for any corrections to the minutes of the last Steering Committee (SC) meeting on September 19th. It was moved by Doug Lees, and seconded by Barry Muhoberac. The minutes were approved.

3. Dean Rhodes gave comments and updates on the following:
   ---The Dean stated he has already met with several of the departments’ Search and Screen Committees, and is scheduled to meet with the more this month. He is discussing methods to increase the diversity of faculty applicant pools in accord with the School’s Strategic Plans and Goals.
   ---The Dean stated earlier this week an email was sent covering the School of Science Newsletter. The intention is to have information flow more efficiently regarding the school. It covers faculty and staff news, the Fall Convocation power point is included, and the School of Science Strategic Plan as well. These are all clickable items. These newsletters will be available five times a year (two per semester, and one during the summer). Additionally, the students and alumni have a newsletter. Any feedback, send directly to him.
   ---The Dean mentioned all departments have been through external reviews, except the Department of Computer and Information Science. The review is in a few weeks. Most of departments have already responded to the reviewers’ recommendations.
   ---The Dean said he attended a meeting earlier this week regarding mentorship. This is important for all departments, and for all, not just junior faculty. He requests all faculty to encourage and support this “mentorship philosophy”. A discussion followed regarding mentorship in our School, the goals, purpose, and benefits.
   ---The Dean reported there are ongoing conversations in our Departments regarding our relationship with IU and Purdue. He also said there is nothing new to report. He has been visiting departments, explaining this issue and encouraging discussion among faculty of each department. More discussion regarding this continued.

4. New Business
   a. President Michelle Salyers (MS) announced the Fall Faculty Meeting is scheduled for October 31st. She then asked for agenda items. Kathy Marrs (KM) suggested adding the Strategic Plan. MS stated each committee will produce a written report. Dean Rhodes (DR) mentioned the Undergraduate Education would also have something to report. Kathy Marrs will not be at the
Fall meeting, however, Jeff Watt will be attending. He can represent her with this report. MS also stated the Dean and Associate Deans will also give an update.

b. **Feedback IU/Purdue:** MS asked for feedback from the departments regarding the IU/Purdue discussion.

   **Math:** Vitaly Tarasov reported his department has not yet met officially to discuss this topic. However, most conversations among the faculty covered the following: our name (IUPUI) is important, and would it change.
   --our independence is important
   --the department would want their own control of PhD programs

   **Chemistry:** Barry Muhoberac stated that his department meeting included a large number of new faculty. Much of the meeting time was giving them a history of this issue. He noted most faculty showed very little resistance towards IU. Some faculty voiced that students come to IUPUI to get the Purdue degree, and were concerned how that would be handled. DR stated he met with them afterwards and talked more on a one-on-one basis. He reported most of them said to “go IU.”

   **Biology:** Randal Roper reported Biology had their departmental meeting. They voted unanimously for IU, with one abstention.

   **Earth Sciences:** Lin Li stated they discussed it and faculty had lots of questions: What is the time frame? 5 or 10 years? Less or more?

   **Psychology:** Dennis Devine stated his department will meet this Friday. It was not placed on the agenda. He stated, after talking to a few faculty members, and getting bits and pieces, there was not much of a connection with Purdue.

   **Computer Science:** Snehasis Muhkopadhyay stated his department did discuss this topic covering a wide range of areas:
   ---His department has a good relationship with Purdue, and would not want to jeopardize this.
   ---They also discussed the pros and cons.
   ---Many of the faculty agreed with the old phrase, “Why not both?”
   ---Retaining student interest in Purdue and a strong interest in IU from newer students.
   ---His department presented a resolution. Snehasis did state, if not workable, he was unsure where his department would stand.

   **Physics:** Horia Petrache: His department stated they have a good system that works with Purdue, and want to keep it that way. Some other opinions were about uncertainties, and if the process would lead to a stronger push for merge with Liberal Arts, and if this a solution to a problem now or anticipating a problem.

   After all department reps presented their feedback, the conversation continued. DR stated our goal was to create a short list of “wants”, and prioritize them. David Skalnik also stated it is not viable for the school to stay the way things currently are. We need to think what would be best for our future.

c. **Topics to address this year.**

   i. **Peer Evaluations of Teaching:**

   MS opened a discussion for the next item on the agenda: Peer evaluation of Teaching. DR remarked that we needed to redefine the student piece; it is not the only way to be evaluated.
We completed the process to look into the evaluation and updated it for consistency. Need to do similar for the peer evaluation piece. Individuals who have been through the Promotion and Tenure process at the school level will agree, some procedures that have been used, could be viewed as useless. The peer reviews are not punitive, but should be formative and helpful for faculty to improve.

Snehasis stated the general feeling using a classroom visit to evaluate is not adequate or helpful. It should cover the entire spectrum, needs lots of sources, and needs to be put into evaluations. It gets very complicated. He also shared that evaluations need to be shared with the instructors. MS suggested maybe someone from the Center of Teaching and Learning (CTL) could help. Or maybe have a representative from CTL on a Subgroup that would work on guidelines for peer evaluations. Barry Muhoberac suggested to bring it up at the Fall Assembly meeting. Barry Muhoberac also suggested that as part of this process self-evaluation must be conducted by instructors. MS agreed, and suggested to bring a CTL person to the next Steering Committee meeting.

ii. Collaborative Research:
DR presented the following as a question for open discussion. Do our current Promotion and Tenure guidelines support Collaborative Research well enough? A discussion followed and it was suggested to continue the discussion with Unit Committee member/s, and also to get examples from other schools such as Dentistry, Engineering and Medicine. Additional suggestion by Horia Petrache was to change the wording from “support” to “recognize”. A discussion followed with concerns:
---has this been a problem in our school?
---how does this affect our junior faculty preparing for P&T? For example, being PI versus Co-PI, how will this affect them? Publications are another issue. Specifically, if they are involved, do they still get the credit? What about Journals outside of disciplines. Pros and cons: collaborations always take more time and effort. The time involved may be large, but it may get you places not accessible on your own.
MS stated she will acquire the P&T guidelines from the School of Medicine at the campus level. And she will request representatives from the Unit Committee to attend a future Steering Committee meeting to discuss this issue with the committee.

iii. Emergency Procedures:
DR mentioned there was a presentation for the School on safety. Not all Schools were represented. We can schedule more presentations, of even in a smaller group, maybe independently. A discussion followed bringing up other comments and questions: the presentation was not concise, and each case is different. We discussed whether we should extend training directly to students, and if so, how. MS will contact the presenters of the Active Shooter training to get recommendations. She will work with Kathy Marrs to develop a plan.

5. Old Business:
Parking:
Kathy Marrs shared parking information with the committee. While being on Bloomington campus, she used her IUPUI parking permit to park in a campus garage space. The Bloomington campus honored the IUPUI parking pass for garage parking, no additional charges were billed.
Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.