SOS Steering Committee Minutes  
Friday, October 25, 2019 (1:30 pm – 3:00 pm)  
Earth Sciences Conference Room, SL 118

Attendees: Guoli Dai, John Goodpaster, Yuni Xia, Greg Druschel (Jenny Nelson), Leonid Rubchinsky, Jeff Ou (Horia Petrache), Cristine Czachowski, Shiaofen Fang, Rajeev Raje, Jane Williams, Dave Skalnik, Kathy Marrs, Julia Arciero, Lei Li

1. Approval of agenda

2. Approval of minutes (September 2019)

3. Report from Interim Dean Fang
   - Comments on new teaching rank position
   - Space planning regarding new building (there will be space implications for SL and LD); considering some reservations in the chemistry and physics departments (lab space, etc)
   - Test optional admission discussion is occurring at the campus level (SAT may not be required); campus is leaving this decision to each school regarding admissions – School of Science does not want to go in this direction but instead will keep the requirement of SAT (most likely); decisions will be made in early spring; It was noted that test optional admission could mean 15-20% more applications but might cause increase in DFW rates and other detrimental effects
   - Campus climate survey was sent – apparently several changes between 2014-2018 have occurred. The staff feels less optimistic, while the faculty seem more optimistic, which is a surprising result.
   - Seek nominations for Top 100
   - Focus on the school having national and international reputation; good to have local/Indiana impact, but we need to work more on national ranking

4. Reports from Associate Deans
   - Jane: we’ve been allowing students to double-count capstone for double majors if the project fits both disciplines; UAC members should return to departments to see if we should formalize this process to see what the process might need to be to make this process easier to establish; more money is being distributed to need-based instead of merit-based situations. This changes the amount of money talented students will get and will negatively affect ability to recruit (Joe Thompson is going to calculate how this will impact the situation). Regarding the dean search, the job ad will be active/open until January. Goal is to have applicants in by February, and hope to have search determined by spring break; there will be an open forum with the candidate for faculty; dean candidates will also meet with the steering committee; candidates will not be going to each department – but we recommended push-back (Jane later notified the Committee that the candidates will have 45 minute meetings with the individual departments).
Dave: very strong research activity in the first quarter of the fiscal year: number of external awards is up 79% from the previous year; dollars brought in are up 48%, ICR is up 26%; research expenditures are up 16%.

Rajeev: Regarding fall fiscal analysis, we are projecting about 200K deficit for the spring (when compared to the budgeted amount), which means we would be around 1.7% in the red by the end of the academic year (if the projections hold for the Spring and Summer I semesters). So, if we come out positive at the end of fiscal year, it will be mainly due to faculty/staff salary savings; this cannot be sustained. The deficit is mostly due to banded tuition in the non-resident undergrad category (MSEP vs. non-MSEP); Michigan is pulling out from MSEP (due to in vs. out of state tuition model in MI) and that may have future impacts.

5. Report on Budgetary Affairs (Guoli Dai)
   - Meetings will occur on Oct 28 and 30 – the following questions will be asked of the administration:
     1. How are you promoting academic programs and faculty? How will this impact visibility? How does this relate to the optimal size of the school?
     2. Given the campus is projecting a decrease in enrollment over the next decade, retention is important. How will this impact the size and scope of the school? What is your opinion of need or merit based financial support?
     3. What are current barriers to cross campus collaboration? What policy or administrative perspective will you adopt to address such barriers?

6. Current business (Conducted by Subcommittee)

   A. Discussion of Program representation (Forensic and Investigative Science and Neuroscience) on various School Committees (e.g., Nomination and Awards, Undergraduate Education, and Graduate Education committees)
      - Steve Boehm and Christine Picard requested representation of Forensics and Neuroscience on certain committees last spring, but this was deferred to the Fall.
      - The undergraduate education committee discusses different admissions requirements, new courses, etc. Both FIS and Neuroscience would like representation on this committee.
      - FIS would like representation on Graduate committee, as well.
      - Only minimal rationale was provided by these programs, stating they need more representation. Perhaps more specific rationale can be obtained from these programs.
      - Other committees up for debate included:
        - Steering – no, decided that representation should be by department only
        - Nominations and Awards – issue is that additional representation could lead to double votes, etc. Perhaps
someone could represent a student at the meeting but not vote
- There was some discussion about how committee membership and representation should work and whether additional representation is needed or if just more effective techniques of seeking representation should be suggested.

B. Follow-up discussion on Technology Committee composition
- Committee should be run according to bylaws with:
  - 7 departments
  - One dean’s office member, second member
  - No staff members of technology
  - Undergrad student
  - Grad student
- Should the by-laws be changed to reflect current composition?
- Does this committee need to exist? Perhaps this can be rolled into the graduate committee?
- Steering committee was asked to contact the department representative on the Technology committee to determine if departments would support eliminating this committee
- Funds are distributed in the spring, so there is a little bit of time to decide

C. Discussion of guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor

The following aspects were discussed:

- Focus on leadership component of this new rank. In particular: Overall “theme” being discussed to take forward: “In addition to the requirements for appointment as Senior Lecturer, promotion to Teaching Professor should also demonstrate a sustained record of leadership in teaching and learning and/or service in support of teaching at the School, Campus, University, State or National level.”
- At PUWL, a teaching professor can teach courses for a major, but lecturers cannot
- Use of the term “sustained” matches the tenure track route
- From FACET document, this rank should not just be about excellent teaching, but we may also want it to include:
  - Curricular leadership
  - Service in support of teaching and learning
  - Research in support of teaching and learning – although we need to explain what this means and how it should be interpreted (education research vs. other); this is not typically an expectation for lecturers so it doesn’t seem like research should be a requirement. Note: we can think of the difference between development than actually conducting research. The following are ideas of research components that could be included:
    - Receipt of grant for teaching and improvement
    - Published articles
    - Chapters on teaching and learning
- Presentations on teaching and learning
- Participation as a reviewer for journals
- Service as a reviewer or editor

- Ideas of School of Science third lecturer tier from U of Arizona
  - Consistently deliver courses with engaging programs
  - Documented student outcomes
  - Above average student and peer evaluations
  - Develop, investigate, and lead new methodologies and innovative practice and pedagogies (learning focused) in student centered teaching

- Teaching professor should be also thought of as an effective implementer not just the developer (this is often a goal of lecturers)

- We should be more precise about the definition of dissemination – public dissemination, etc (there is not a very specific guideline in the campus description as it now stands)

- Perhaps there should be a requirement of mentorship by teaching professors for lecturers to become senior lecturer, so this could be an additional component of this rank

- Perhaps to strengthen the process of peer review to evaluate excellence in teaching, the method of peer evaluations should be revised school-wide (e.g. more than one classroom observation from a single colleague within a semester, classroom observations from those outside the department/school, unannounced class visits, develop best practices for on-line classes). These were all suggestions that will require more discussion.

D. Review dates/timeline for remainder of semester
   - Nov 1 – Subcommittee only (CSCI, SL 280)
   - Nov 8 – Faculty assembly (LD 010)
   - Nov 22 – Regular Steering Committee meeting (Earth Science SL 118)
   - Nov 27 – Teaching Prof. Draft guidelines due to campus!

7. Adjourn at 3pm