

SOS Faculty Assembly

October 3, 2003

Attending:

Biology: R. Yost, M. Terrell, E. Chernoff, D. Crowell, X. Wang, P. Crowell, K. Marrs, S. Randall, A. Malkova, D. Lees, R. Allen, B. Blazer-Yost, M. Bard, P. Clark, S. Rhodes, J. Watson, T. Belecky-Adams (17)

Chemistry: F. Schultz, B. Muhoberac, D. Malik, E. Long (4)

Computer Science: R. Raje, A. Olson (2)

Geology: (0)

Mathematical Sciences: E. Mukhin; P. Bleher, V. Tarason, B. Ng, W. Geller, B. Rigdon, J. Luke, M. Penna, R. Patterson, Z. Shen, B. Boukai, O. Burkinshaw (12)

Physics: S. Wassall, M. Kemple, G. Vemuri (3)

Psychology: K. Johnson, J. McGrew, C. Goodlett, G. Fetterman, J. Murphy, H. June, D. Appleby, B. Neal-Beliveau (8)

Dean's Office: B. Bishop K. Jackson, D. Stocum, K. Nguyen, K. Wilson (5)

The purpose of this assembly was to introduce Chancellor Bantz to the SOS Faculty.

Chancellor Bantz opened with a 30-minute talk focused on his vision for the future of IUPUI. Dean Plater attended the assembly for the first portion of the meeting. Major themes addressed by Dr. Bantz:

- Acknowledged that IUPUI is unique in terms of both its organizational structure and geographic location. The campus plan is currently the framework that drives decision making at the institution, and we need to remain committed to excellence in teaching and research. As a public institution we have an obligation to serve a broad range of students, and a large number of students.
- Acknowledged that he is aware of problems pertaining to laboratory space (e.g., in organic chemistry).
- Emphasized the importance of expanding excellence in undergraduate research.
- Indicated the need for facilities/infrastructure and for particular kinds of students to attain/maintain excellence in research.
- Pointed out that excellence in civic engagement is a defining characteristic of this university; this is a campus where people expect units to serve as partners in various endeavors – there are important relations between IUPUI and the state of Indiana/city of Indianapolis, but it's up to individual faculty to make connections with community organizations and industries.
- Pointed out that the achievements/rates of growth have been astounding on this campus. In 5 years there will be a campus center at IUPUI and a 1300 car parking garage (fall, 2004). There also is commitment to development of a space for information science at the head of the canal (will include biostatistics, bioinformatics and be located in the vicinity of the current horse barn), as well as the development of a 3rd research building for the medical school.
- We need to identify areas in which we can literally double what we've been doing (e.g., doubling amount of external/federal funding received across the next 10 years in SOM). It would be relatively easy to double NSF funding within the School of Science. Federal funding is judged favorably – peer reviewed work is a judgment that is made that indicates that researchers here do excellent work. Because it's a mark of excellence, we need to work to achieve goals in this area.
- Excellence in teaching and learning must also be redoubled. We need to double the number of graduates.

We graduate 4000 students per year (this is less than Ball State University, even though they're a smaller campus). We need to graduate students because they are very much needed by the state (IN is 47th in terms of baccalaureate degree holders). If we recruit students intending to pursue medical school, they tend to be better students and will improve our retention rates. We need to improve graduation rates in math and science. The goal of increasing completion is a great single outcome that forces us to think how we can improve teaching and learning throughout the institution. There are space problems associated with this goal – these must be acknowledged and worked on.

- Civic engagement: efforts must be redoubled.
- Can only be best urban institution if we think creatively about how we can leverage information technology on this campus, take advantage of proximity/involvement with Eli Lilly. Need to set very high goals, then strategically make decisions in order to get there.
- Strides in past 34 years have been amazing, even for medical school. Most dramatic growth has been in last 10-15 years. We need to continue on this trajectory (through philanthropy, grants, and clinical practice in the case of the medical school).
- What are opportunities for philanthropy? 905 million dollars has been raised through the capital campaign (comfortably over 700 M goal; some maintain that we will reach the 1 billion dollar mark).

Twenty-five minutes was reserved for questions from the faculty. Selected examples appear below:

D. Malik: How can we double research funding given problems with space and allocations from the state (funding per student per credit hour)?

Bantz: Deans will evaluate fiscal modeling/revenue projections. Currently they look bleak, given flat state funding. All schools must continue to reflect on how they can reconfigure. Pres. Herbert will give more attention to relations with legislature. This is a focus of his and he has experience in a state (Florida) that is even more complicated than Indiana. But you can't count on this in the short run – have to turn back and help state with creation of well-educated students, and develop entrepreneurs among faculty. We need jobs in this state that require education. IN is transitioning away from high-paying manufacturing jobs, which is difficult to move away from. Life science, information technology, logistics, advanced manufacturing are important suppliers of money. Need to demonstrate that we're doing what the state cares about (i.e., graduate their students). Don't mean to imply that basic research is unimportant; just need to be better about connecting applied researchers to community/state needs.

B. Ng – Internally there are things we can do – need administrative structure that will (internally) support research to the degree that resources have been poured into increasing student retention. Others agreed that the infrastructure is very thin for supporting laboratory research (“backroom operations” of processing grants, supplying trained technicians, etc.).

B. Boukai – Questioned how funding is credited (are grants reported as IUB?).

Bantz: Still working out knowledge of how this is done, but acknowledged that this is a very complicated situation. Wants to make sure that we get students through programs that will count in our national recognition. Carnegie categories are a stopgap – consequence of a group of universities arguing that funding was the sole measure of excellence (research 1 = funding). Research intensive/extensive is currently where we fit best, but it's a stopgap category. How can we make sure that we get put where we belong? Is there a short-term solution (e.g., getting 5 more Ph.Ds through per year?). Need to do this in a way that moves us ahead. New 3-campus statewide initiative should be announced very soon by Presidents Herbert and Jischke. Should be more collaboration in the near future.

B. Ng – lack of balance between support for teaching (OPD) and research. Few pots of money available for supporting research (proposal development, startup).

Bantz: Mark Brenner has been trying to build some infrastructure; will look into this further.

E. Chernoff – anecdote about difficulties with R&SP and NSF; more resources need to go into R&SP – paying attention to and supporting contracts.

Bantz invited people to share stories like this with him over email. He needs to be aware of shortcomings/problems (e.g., in area of grant accounting).

K. Wilson – This school needs to be considered as part of the “research engine” of the campus (medical school does not do all of the research on this campus).

Bantz acknowledged that this is a widely held misconception and he is trying to rectify it.

K. Wilson – president needs to think of IUPUI as a research institution.

Bantz: Compared our position now to ASU in the late 1980s; use this as a model.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Johnson

SOS Secretary

10/8/03