SOS Steering Committee Minutes
Friday, September 27, 2019 (1:30 pm – 3:00 pm)
Earth Sciences Conference Room, SL 118

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

1. Approval of agenda – approved
2. Approval of minutes (May 2019) – approved
3. Report from Interim Dean Fang
   • The Dean outlined what he envisioned as the major aspects for this year’s Steering committee: SOS new website, the guidelines for the new rank of Teaching Professor, updates/changes to the bylaws. He does not believe the Committee will have time to update P&T guidelines for service this year (which was a suggestion from Dean Rhodes last year)
   • The Dean commented on the State of the School:
     o The School’s budget is very tight – due to actual numbers for fall enrollment, the School is ~$254K short of the amount that was budgeted for Fall. Also, building costs will go up soon (new building costs begin next year). The Dean’s goal is to increase enrollment and research productivity (ICR and reputation).
     o The School is limiting hiring this year as a result of the tight budget; there will be hiring of a tenure-track faculty each in psychology, chemistry, biology, math, and physics. This is needed, else we will compromise the academic strengths of this school.
   • The Dean commented on initiatives to increase enrollment:
     o Working with Ivy Tech to prevent students from avoiding IUPUI courses)
     o Aiming to increase summer enrollment and increase online courses (currently 7 are being developed this semester, with help from campus and CTL); summer tuition is helpful due to banded tuition during the academic year
     o Working on international recruitment (e.g., India, China) and working on developing MS programs to attract these students
     o Promoting 3 MS programs in the School: Bio pre-professional, new data sciences program (math and CS); applied stat (in math)
   • The Dean commented on some research initiatives:
     o Working with iM2CS to promote data-driven science research
     o Planning an IU health forum in November in which each department will have a few people presenting work at this forum (data science, neuroscience, and regenerative medicine are some of the current needs of the campus)
   • Additional discussion/questions:
     o The School must work on retention rates (SOS is lower than
engineering and informatics); they are working to determine precisely the source of DFW rates; at the campus level, math courses is a major target (He noted that ALEKS provides new ways to teach courses and has been shown to improve DFW rates)

- Course reviews of Gen-Ed should be taken very seriously
- Recruitment: Can IUPUI tap IU/Purdue for recruitment at the time that students apply to these institutions?

4. Reports from Associate Deans

Report from AD Rajeev Raje: Re-emphasized the tight budget of the school. Based on enrollment numbers, it seems that we are losing money in the Non-resident banded undergrad tuition category (~700K); we’ve had banded tuition for 3 years. The MSEP (exchange program) numbers were not very low, so this is rather puzzling. Things are very different from last fall when our income was more than one million dollars above what was budgeted. There is concern that the cost of the dean search will also negatively affect the budget.

Report from AD Dave Skalnik: We continue to have a record breaking year in external grants (NIH, NSF), half of which came from assistant professors. ICR is double from what it was at this time last year. Innovation Hall should be done in 10 months; it appears they are still on schedule. They are working on getting it sealed for winter to do indoor work. Remember to emphasize the importance of student mentoring and maintaining clear discussions with students in labs/etc.

Report from AD Jane Williams (absent): Please encourage the use of the student engagement roster (ask faculty to try to use it after every exam). This is one technique to improve retention. There is a method for filtering students in bulk, which should reduce the work on the part of the instructor.

5. Report on Budgetary Affairs (Guoli Dai)

- The committee discussed questions for deans/university leaders, which will occur at the end of October
- There is a major concern regarding retention rate – our rate is the lowest (72%) compared to other comparable institutions. IUPUI is the 5th highest in financial aid/scholarship
- The main question being asked is how to improve retention rate? How to build up need-based finances for students so that students don’t leave? The main retention problem for first years students is finances of math classes
- State legislature wants to see a 4-year graduation rate of at least 70%
- Boyd Bradshaw (AVC for Enrollment Management) will be attending the campus enrollment meeting
- A comment was made among the Steering Committee discussion about the current discussion for IUPUI to be Test Optional for admittance into University College (i.e., to not require SAT/ACT scores). This will be discussed at Faculty Council.
6. Current business

A. **Technology Committee composition** (and discussion of other committees)
   - There is a current discrepancy between what is listed in the bylaws for the composition of the Technology Committee and what the actual composition of this committee has been for the past few years.
   - In particular, we need to determine if the faculty approves of the current composition of the Technology committee, and if so, we need to revise the bylaws (Currently there are 2 votes from dean, 2 IT votes; and no undergrad votes)
   - It was noted that the amount of money available to this committee has been decreased each year; proposals are sought for the use of these funds. The intent of these funds was discussed.
   - The Steering Committee started to discuss whether a technology committee is actually needed or if perhaps it should be merged with the Graduate Affairs Committee.

The committee deferred the discussion of whether different programs within the school (e.g., Neuroscience, FIS, etc.) deserve representation on certain committees in the School. The committee also intends to discuss which committees are no longer necessary or should be deemed inactive. Committee composition should be reviewed during upcoming bylaw changes; the goal is to vote on these changes in the next meeting.

B. **Confirm the composition of the committee that will draft School document for guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor**

- IU has approved the new rank of Teaching Professor. The guidelines at the campus level represent the most broad criteria, and then the school and each department must draft their specific criteria. A draft of the School guidelines must be received by November 27. It is believed that many departments have already started to work on their department-specific guidelines
- The School has received the campus-level guidelines
- Since the composition of the Steering committee are elected members by the faculty, it is proposed that all of the voting members of the Steering Committee will comprise the committee that will draft the School guidelines. All committee members agreed with this.
- This committee needs to provide a draft of the School guidelines for the Fall Assembly (it still needs to be determined whether there should also be a separate town hall to address the new guidelines).
- It was noted that we need to involve the Unit Committee at some point in this process
- It was decided that 2 senior lecturers should be included on this committee
- Additional meetings will be needed to draft these guidelines. The next meeting will be Friday, October 1
- It was decided that there is no need for anyone to chair this sub-committee
C. Discussion of guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor

- **Discussion of criteria**
  - One suggestion was to make one of the criterion for Teaching Professor as sustaining/improving the level of being a senior lecturer
    - However, it was noted by a committee member that the idea of “sustaining” does not seem to give a clear distinction between the ranks of Senior Lecturer or Teaching Professor
    - It was decided that a more specific and clearer distinction is needed
  - It was suggested that we look at the differences between assistant, associate, and full professor guidelines as a way to help guide the language of the different ranks; however, the requirements should not be copied since lecturer positions are completely different from tenure-track positions.
  - It was suggested that we will need to re-write language for senior lecturer so that there is better division among the three lecturer ranks. This will only adversely affect a few people currently and will be worth it in the long run.
  - It is important that Teaching Professor is a rank that will actually be attainable
  - It was suggested that increased dissemination of teaching publications, chairing/organizing major activities, and enhancing the mission of university are worthy components of the Teaching Professor rank.
  - Notes from the Lecturer Rank ad hoc committee:
    - The senior lecturer description was changed
    - The requirement of teaching publication dissemination was moved to the Teaching Professor rank
    - It was noted that these changes did not receive consent by executive committee since there was missing a component of the student evaluation of teaching

- **Possible Senior Lecturers to include on the committee**
  - Sharon Rangazas (choice 1) -- math
  - Andy Harris
  - Keith Anliker (Choice 2) -- chemistry
  - Brian Woodahl

- It was decided that we should discuss the FACET statement, Faculty Affairs notes, and new SOS guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor in order to write the best guidelines for this new rank
- A timeline must be determined so that the SOS draft of Teaching Professor guidelines is completed by November 27
- A timeline for the involvement of the Unit Committee must also be determined

7. Adjourn