School of Science Faculty Assembly  
Friday, November 8, 2019  
1:30-3:00 pm, LD 010

MINUTES

Faculty Attending (43)  
Dean’s Administration: Shiaofen Fang, Rajeev Raje, Dave Skalnik, Jane Williams.  
BIOL: Jim Marrs, Kathy Marrs, Ben Perrin, Steve Randall, Xianzhong Wang, Bonnie Blazer-Yost, Nick Berbari, Robert Yost, Christine Picard, John Watson.  
CCB: Partha Basu, Brenda Blacklock, Lei Li, Keith Anliker, Rob Minto.  
CSCI: Jiang Zheng, Mihran Tuceryan, Qin Hu.  
ES: Andy Barth, Jennifer Nelson, Kathy Licht.  
PHYS: Jeff Ou, Horia Petrache, Aprajita Sengupta, Steve Wassail

1. 1:30 Welcome to Faculty and Staff (Faculty President Kathy Marrs)

2. 1:30: Call to order and adoption of the Agenda  Approved

3. Approval of minutes of April 2019 Faculty Assembly  Approved

4. 1:30: Reports from the Dean’s Administration

Interim Dean Shiaofen Fang

- Gratitude was expressed for everyone who has worked to draft and discuss guidelines for the new teaching professor rank
- Climate survey was sent via email: compared with 2014, there was an increase in participation in the survey; it showed that faculty feel more free to express themselves despite the current political atmosphere; Concerns: both faculty/staff feel the growth space is limited (should be addressed, but structural and financial considerations are limiting factors)
- P&T process is complete at the school level (all has been sent on to the campus); the dean was very impressed with the high quality of the faculty and he is happy that the School is producing such high quality work
- The exterior of the new building is almost complete; The School will be conducting space planning about how to re-organize LD/SL and how to assign space in Innovation Hall
- Top 100 and Elite 50 nominations are being sought; please nominate students in the School who are worthy of this award; seems the School has not been as active in the past in the Elite 50 competition, so an increased focus on that competition is requested
- Peggy Stockdale asked to give the following announcements:  
  i. With regard to the ADVANCE grant, there is a brief climate study that will be sent to TT faculty; this is a different survey from previous surveys and will be evaluated separately
  ii. Department chairs are asked to fill out inventory of practices
  iii. Leaders in the School (admin, directors of undergrad/grad, etc) will be invited to participate in 4 workshops to occur next year (paid administrators will be required to attend, others will be strongly encouraged; the Dean specifically suggested that Chairs

https://science.iupui.edu/science/intranet/facultyassembly
Rajeev Raje (absent, update provided by Shiaofen Fang)

- Fall census data: the School is ~254K short of what was budgeted for the Fall’19. After the Fall fiscal analysis, the School predicts that there will be an additional ~200K shortage for the Spring ’20. This means that the School’s revenue will be down by ~1.7% (when compared with the budget) by the end of the fiscal year 19-20, if the projections hold for the rest of the year. This is somewhat of a concern – since there are unfilled faculty lines currently, this shortage is not a problem for the School this (19-20) fiscal year, but relying on missing faculty lines is clearly not the right solution. The School will need to navigate financial risk and academic risk. Despite the tight budget, the Dean intends to continue with hires to maintain strong programs and maintain a critical mass of the faculty.
- There are 5 faculty searches (BIO, PSYCH, CHEM, MATH, and PHYSICS) as well as some lecturer searches going on currently, along with the Dean search.

Dave Skalnik

- Research activity remains very strong; 20% higher in most metrics than last year

Jane Williams

- 150 sections of courses have submitted data for student engagement rosters; expressed appreciation of faculty participation
- Gen-ed courses are being reviewed and approved
- IU and IUPUI will be adopting a Test Optional approach for students to be admitted in Fall 2021. Students can choose not to submit SAT and ACT scores; the School will not change its direct admits; the School will do some analysis to see if math GPA might be a good proxy for SAT/ACT; this push toward Test Optional is happening nationwide and statewide
- Merit-based vs. need-based aid taskforce has met and it appears that the campus will be shifting to more need-based aid instead of merit-based aid. This seems that it will have an impact on Science recruitment; the School is trying to model how this would have impacted this past year’s incoming students; Science will monitor this closely.
- Jane was asked if philanthropic efforts can be used to replace some of this aid. This is a good idea but it is not known if this has been engaged yet
- It was noted that the taskforce was not composed of any academic units and as a result have received some serious criticism and so they have pulled back a little

5. 1:45: Request to modify composition of Technology Committee (Will require a vote and a change to bylaws)

- Note that since UITS changed how fees are delivered and will no longer affect undergraduates, undergraduates have not been a part of the technology committee for some time
- A vote is being considered to allow the Technology committee to proceed as it has been comprised for the past several years
- Thus, the new proposed composition (which deviates from the bylaws) is: AD Raje, AD Skalnik, a faculty representative from each department, one graduate student, and all four IT staff (who would have 2 total votes) –
The faculty will have 10 days to vote on this modification.

It was asked how the choice of graduate student on the committee is made. Since AD Raje handles this and he was absent, this question was not answered. The faculty wondered if this was rotated among departments.

It was asked why IT folks are allowed to vote (note that this has been the case for the past few years).

It was suggested that the committee composition might need to contain techs from departments such as Biology and Chemistry.

It was noted that there is now a much smaller pool of money released to the Technology Committee (there are now only small technology fees).

It was noted that the representatives from each department must be faculty members (not staff).

Current composition of the Technology committee would need to be changed to follow the current bylaws if this vote is not passed.

6. Request to add representatives from Forensics and Investigative Sciences (FIS) and Neuroscience (NS) to Undergraduate Education Committee, and representative from FIS to Graduate Education Committee. *(Will require a vote and a change to bylaws)*

- Proposal to expand the Undergraduate Committee by 2 (9 voting members and AD) to include FIS and NS programs and to expand the Graduate Committee by 1 to include representation for FIS.
- Both FIS and NS have about 200 students each, and so these programs feel that it seems appropriate to have representation on these committees in case of curricular changes, etc. In addition to representation, these programs should have the ability to impact these curricular changes, and thus membership on these committees is needed.
- Other programs (e.g., Biotechnology) are much smaller in terms of number of students (less than 10 students per program), and this vote is only considering the FIS and NS programs.
- It was asked if it might be possible to have a non-voting member instead of voting representation on these committees to avoid cases of double-voting.
- Discussion of the representation of these committees on the Nominations and Awards Committee will be deferred to later.

7. Development of criteria for new rank, Teaching Professor *(Handout)*

- Brief Presentation
  i. In 2017, President McRobbie asked a variety of groups to consider a new pathway for tenure and promotion for excellence in teaching.
  ii. Last year, the Steering committee altered language in the bylaws to outline a clearer definition of excellence in teaching.
  iii. The current task is a large one to create a new rank.
  iv. In September, Kathy Johnson and John Watson said that the faculty has the authority to create new academic ranks; Campus level standards are the most basic expectation; Schools should articulate more stringent standards to reflect necessary and unique aspects of the School.
  v. Current status of drafting these new guidelines:
1. Ad hoc committee was created that involved the Steering Committee and two senior lecturers (Keith Anliker and Andy Harris).

2. First draft of the School guidelines is due by November 27 (although this date may be pushed out a bit).

3. This draft has been sent to the Chairs and to the Unit committee; the Ad hoc committee also would like to meet with the Lecturers; today, solicitation from the general faculty is solicited.

4. Major aspects to consider when developing this new rank:
   a. How can “Teaching Excellence” be documented (e.g., peer reviews, student evaluations; course development)?
   b. How can we capture the expectations for teaching-related scholarship? Scholarship includes a wide range of aspects including writing books, presenting at meetings, and public dissemination. Campus may alter the definition of “publicly disseminated” and “peer-reviewed” for the Senior Lecturer rank.
   c. How to describe “academic leadership” once an individual is already recognized as an excellent teacher? How can this special type of work that is a form of leadership be defined that is distinct from service? Should the phrase involve “specialization” or “reputation” (e.g., collaborative scholarship is important for TT rank – so perhaps we need a new word to define leadership related to teaching)?
   d. How to “operationalize” terms like “peer-reviewed, publicly disseminated, leadership in teaching, mentoring, sustained, self-reflective,” etc., so the requirements for different ranks can be defined.

5. Discussed handout
   a. The current draft of the guidelines for promotion based on excellence in teaching was provided on a handout. It was noted that these guidelines are true for both tenure and non-tenure tracks of faculty who seek promotion with excellence in teaching. These guidelines were approved last year and are common for all three ranks.
   b. On the handout is a comparison of current guidelines for Senior Lecturer (SL) and what is being proposed for Teaching Professor (TP) in points g – j. Here is a summary of the differences:
      i. G: SL would not need to show leadership in course development/etc, but TP would.
      ii. G: SL would be involved with local outreach and TP could need to be involved with national outreach.
      iii. H: SL would require dissemination of best practices of teaching, but TP would require peer-reviewed scholarship; TP would not.
just present but would not need to organize the conferences

iv. I: SL would need to show documentation of grants while TP would need to show success in obtaining grants

v. J: enlarge the scope for TP to include campus/state and beyond

c. Note about the campus guidelines: there is a campus site outlining the proposed guidelines at the campus level; it was noted that the campus is recommending multiple pathways to promotion

- Next steps towards final drafts of School, Department, Campus guidelines
  i. Consider all the comments from today
  ii. Steering committee members will take this draft to their respective departments; department comments will be taken back to the steering committee (comments needed by Nov 20)
  iii. Document will be sent to the lecturer listserve group (and hopefully a meeting will be scheduled)
  iv. Unit committee will convene and discuss what the guidelines proposed by the Campus vs. the School vs. the Department
  v. This entire process will be repeated before ready for a vote
  vi. Initial goal of the campus is for this to be ready by March/April (unsure if this timeline will be maintained)

- Questions and discussion from the faculty:
  i. Concern is the level of specificity that gets included in these guidelines; there is always someone with a unique case, and so overly specific guidelines may cause difficulties
  ii. It was suggested that course development should be left to the tenured faculty
  iii. Comment that a lot of course development already occurs at the level of lecturer and that this is appropriate
  iv. Per gen-ed, lecturers are responsible for course improvement and course development already
  v. Since these guidelines are examples but not a checklist, it is important that candidates do not need to exhibit all points in order to be promoted
  vi. Perhaps department criteria should be drafted to be even more stringent than School guidelines
  vii. Question on point “H” – should the term “best practices” be used? How can this be known without some passage of time to show that the practices are indeed the best?
  viii. A global concern was raised that it seems that we are setting TT criteria for lecturers, but given the high teaching workload and low salary, such criteria seem untenable. Perhaps the campus needs to re-think how these SL and TP ranks should be rewarded?
  ix. There is some question of what distinguishes excellence in teaching
  x. There was a comment on the usage of the text “Student evaluations” vs. “student satisfaction of teaching surveys”
  xi. Actual implementation of peer evaluations and student evaluations
is biased and faulty as currently employed

xii. P&T guidelines do not use that exact phrase currently to represent student evaluations

xiii. Point H: perhaps a different term can be used for “organization” since this seems to be perhaps too strong of a requirement

xiv. Should letters be eliminated in this list? Perhaps it should be just a list of bullets as examples, since not all of these points need to be mastered by the candidate (i.e., not a checklist)

xv. Is the word “criteria” being misunderstood? Perhaps we should use “activities” instead?

xvi. Lecturer voice should be heard by Steering Committee; need buy in from the people this new rank affects

xvii. Campus needs to determine who are the external reviewers for this rank? How to define “arms length” reviewers?

xviii. Perhaps we will need to model new phrasing from the “collaborative scholarship” phrasing

xix. Five years in rank is about typical before a SL would consider promotion to TP, although an exact number of years needed before attempting promotion will not be defined

xx. Perhaps now is also a good opportunity to think about less documentation for lecturers (they are spending too much time doing busy work and do not have enough time to accomplish what is on this list)

xxi. Comment about checklist – if all elements of the checklist are suggestions, then what in actuality is distinguishes these ranks

xxii. Definitions of “arm’s length” and “external” seem to differ from unit to unit

- Mechanism for feedback prior to 11/27 (Draft due to campus)
  i. Pass additional comments to Steering Committee Representative
  ii. Goal is to have a serious draft completed by 11/27/19

8. **New Business** None noted

9. **Adjournment 2:57 pm**