

**Minutes of the Spring 2011 School of Science Faculty Assembly**  
**Friday, April 1, 2010**  
**Science Building, Room LD 010**

***Faculty Present***

**Biology:** Anderson, Gregory; Bard, Martin; Blazer-Yost, Bonnie L.; Clark, Patricia Bohnke; Dai, Guoli; Kusmierczyk, Andrew; Dai, Guoli; Lees, N. Douglas; Marrs, James; Marrs, Kathleen (Associate Dean); Meyer, Jason; Randall, Stephen K.; Stocum, David L.; Watson, John (Secretary of the Faculty); Yost, Robert W.

**Chemistry & Chemical Biology:** Anliker, Keith; Ge, Haibo; McLeish, Michael; Muhoberac, Barry; Pu, Jingzhi; Seigel, Jay

**Computer & Information Science:** Durrresi, Arjan; Fang, Shiaofen; Liang, Yao; Mukhopadhyay, Snehasis; Tuceryan, Mihran (President of the Faculty).

**Earth Sciences:** Barth, Andrew; Jacinthe, Pierre-Andre; Licht, Kathy; Mandernack, Kevin W.

**Mathematical Sciences:** Boukai, Benzion; Cowen, Carl; Farris, Duane; Misiurewicz, Michal; Ng, Bart (Dean); Sarkar, Jyotirmoy (Immediate Past President); Shen, Zhongmin; Tarasov, Vitaly; Zhu, Luoding.

**Physics:** Petrache, Horia; Rader, AJ

**Psychology:** McGrew, John; Murphy, James (Associate Dean)

1. President Mihran Tuceryan called the assembly to order at 9:09 a.m. He noted that the original item 5 (Dean search update) on the Agenda should become item 3 (see attachment). He asked if there was motion to accept the agenda. It was so moved, seconded, and the agenda was unanimously approved.
2. Tuceryan asked if there were any modifications to the minutes of the Fall 2010 Faculty Assembly (Nov. 5, 2010; see attachment). He asked if there was motion to accept the minutes. It was so moved, seconded, and the agenda was unanimously approved.
3. Tuceryan explained that Chancellor Charles Bantz announced earlier in the week that Dr. Simon Rhodes of the School of Medicine will be the next Dean of the School of Science. Boukai commented that the SOS should thank the Search Committee for their efforts, to which there was wide agreement.
4. Reports from the Dean's Administration
  - a. Associate Dean Kathy Marrs. Marrs thanked the faculty who participated in the fall barbecue and the Science Scholars gathering. She noted that the Honors Convocation and Graduating Student Reception were scheduled in the near future. Marrs noted that Executive Vice Chancellor Sukhatme personally delivered the newly approved B.S. in Neuroscience to Purdue. The proposals for autonomy of the Ph.D. programs were delivered at the same time. Marrs commented that Technology funds are available and that proposals for tech fees were due soon. Two proposals for signature centers were forwarded to campus, one of which involves computation science. She pointed out that fall admissions are so far higher than last, with a projection of approx. 2000 undergraduates and 500 graduates registering for the fall semester

- b. Bart Ng (Interim Dean). Ng noted that three years ago on April 1 he accepted the position of Interim Dean. He indicated that he would review some of the accomplishments of his time as Dean over the last 3 years.
- i. Ng stated of the most visible accomplishments of his term is the number of faculty hired. In the last 2 years, 27 faculty were hired, and 10-12 are more are likely to be recruited this year. Approx. \$7.2M of start up funds were made available to the new faculty. All of the funds are “paid for.” Ng noted that hiring should be a “constant state of mind” in the SOS. He expressed the view that the SOS will have 140 faculty members next year.
  - ii. Ng explained that another major initiative was building infrastructure to better serve the students and faculty. He created offices to provide student services and increase fund raising. Hiring an experienced staff person is strengthening the research and graduate education office. Improving the service of this office is important because of the increasing research performed in the SOS and complexity of proposal being submitted. At present, external funding is keeping pace with last year.
  - iii. Ng next addressed the budget situation. He stated that positive developments are on the horizon. The SOS is financially strong, and now there are funds available for the purchase of core equipment and renovations. He noted that, over the next several years, space rather than money is a greater challenge for the School. He stressed the importance of maintaining our enrollments while improving the quality of our students. He noted that the current university budget working its way through the state legislature is based in part on performance-based incentives proposed by the Indiana Commission on Higher Education. IUPUI is benefitting from this new allocation formula because of our improvements in retention and graduation rates. EVC Sukhatme played a central role in keeping the campus focused on retention and graduation. Ng indicated that he had encouraged the campus to change its methods of allocating state funds to the schools. This is in process. Moreover, a study of the formula used to determine the assessments charged to the schools is underway. It is likely that there will be compensatory changes in allocations vs. assessments, but over the next few budgets many of the previous inequities will be addressed.
  - iv. Additional points. Ng noted that IUPUI should evaluate its allocation of space. He stated that the SOS is the 6<sup>th</sup> largest budgetary unit within the IU system. The SOS now has permanent representation on the Resources Planning Committee, which will be important as the campus studies and alters allocation of state funds, space, and assessments.
  - v. Q&A. Boukai asked what schools at IUPUI were overfunded. Bard initiated a discussion of the relative significance of underfunding by the state vs. underfunding by campus. Stocum noted that the underfunding of the SOS has a long history, and that improvement

began with the creation of the community college. Randall asked if increased funds from implementation of the new funding formula would find their way to the schools. Ng indicated that this would occur. Boukai asked if the Resource Planning Committee reviewed a campus roadmap during its deliberations. Ng indicated that this did not occur. Rader asked how well the SOS and campus visions of the future were aligned. Ng indicated that his perception is that this has never been the case but that this should in no way preclude us from moving toward our goals. Blazer-Yost asked if any of the “excess” funds were coming back to the departments to address salary inequities, to increase the number of graduate students, or to help faculty build research programs. Ng responded that he is not keeping large sums of money in the general account. He increased spending on graduate students and is ahead of schedule on his master plan with regard to increasing graduate students numbers. He asked that senior faculty not be too concerned with the higher salaries being offered to incoming faculty. Siegel asked about the transition plan for the arrival of the new Dean. Ng replied that he and Dr. Rhodes had been meeting weekly and would continue to meet. Ng noted that Rhodes is looking for SOS members with institutional memories.

5. Discussion of changes to P&T document and procedures (see attachment). President Tuceryan asked Ben Boukai, Unit Committee chair, to summarize the changes to the document. Boukai noted that President Tuceryan and Secretary Watson participated in a recent Unit Committee meeting about the revisions. His goal is to bring to the SOS faculty a revised document containing all the necessary changes to conform with the changing expectations from campus. He stressed that there were no changes to standards or criteria, only to procedures.
  - a. Steve Randall asked about the preparation of the reader who was to prepare the Unit committee’s report and whether the entire committee would vet the report. The reply was that the reader would be assigned ahead of time, and that the entire committee discussed all reports before finalizing them.
  - b. Boukai noted the difficulties in dealing with frequent mandated changes to the P&T document with regard to formatting of the candidate’s dossier if a faculty vote is required each time. He suggested giving the Unit Committee the power to make such changes. He noted that page limits of the dossier format were still under discussion, as was the definition of “arm’s length” with regard to those asked to provide outside letter.
  - c. Siegel asked if a specific % of references would be from the candidate’s list. Boukai replied he would check on this item. Misiurewicz noted a specific % might punish candidates who do a good job of preparing the list. He also noted that the “arm’s length” definition should have a time limit for former co-authors, collaborators, etc... Blazer-Yost noted that the campus guidelines indicate a 5 year time limit. Fang asked about overlap at universities.
  - d. Randall asked how approval of the revisions would proceed. Tuceryan reiterated that the last revisions were approved by a faculty vote.
6. There was no old or new business.

7. Committee reports: see attached committee reports
8. Tuceryan adjourned the Assembly at 10:40 a.m.