

SOS Faculty Assembly

May 2, 2006

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| <i>Biology:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Blazer-Yost, Chernoff, P. Crowell, Lees, Marrs, Randall, Stocum, Wang, Watson, Wilson; <u>Non-Voting:</u> R. Yost.</i> |
| <i>Chemistry:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Long, Malik, Minto, Muhoberac, Schultz, Sen, Siegal; <u>Non-Voting:</u> Blacklock, Forsythe</i> |
| <i>CIS:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Baker, Dai, Fang, Huang, Palakal, Raje, Tuceryan, Xia, JY Zheng, Zou.</i> |
| <i>Geology:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Barth, Filippelli, Licht, Pachut, Rosenberg, Tedesco; <u>Non-Voting:</u> Thomas.</i> |
| <i>Math:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Bleher, Boukai, Burkinshaw, Chin, Cowen, Frankel, Geller, AR Its, Ji, Kitchens, Kuznetsov, Misiurewicz, Mukhin, Ng, Rigdon, Rubchinsky, Sarkar, Tarasov, Watt, Zhu; <u>Non-</u> <u>voting:</u> Carlson, Fokin, Hall, EN Its, Rainey, Rangazas</i> |
| <i>Physics:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Decca, Gavrin, Kemple, Ou, Rao, Vemuri, Wassall</i> |
| <i>Psychology:</i> | <i><u>Voting:</u> Appleby, Ashburn-Nardo, Bigatti, Bond, Devine, Fastenau, Fetterman, Goodlett, Hazer, K. Johnson, Kremer, Murphy, Neal-Beliveau, Svanum, J. Williams.</i> |

Barth called the meeting to order at 12:38 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda (Barth)

The agenda was presented and approved without amendment.

II. Approval of Minutes from Fall Faculty Assembly (Fastenau)

Minutes from the 11/28/05 Faculty Assembly had been circulated to the faculty on 12/5/05; amended minutes were posted to the SOS web page for review on 12/8/05, incorporating corrections and feedback from faculty. The minutes were approved without further revision.

III. Elections of Officers (Fastenau)

There were 75 voting faculty present (61.5%), constituting a quorum. Fastenau distributed ballots to the voting faculty. At the end of the meeting, the results were announced:

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| President: | Ray Chin, Professor, Mathematics |
| Secretary/President-Elect | Steve Randall, Assoc. Professor, Biology |

IV. Dean's Report (Cowen)

SOS must play central role in research on campus. This requires us to hire and retain excellent faculty, build strong Ph.D. programs in each department, acquire space, and promote interdisciplinary research. Thus, we need to:

- offer competitive beginning salaries and start-ups, bring salaries of all faculty to market levels, and provide a productive environment for research;
- increase the number of graduate students, bring support to competitive levels, and develop a PhD program in Earth Sciences;
- be opportunistic in seeking space on/off campus, look forward to future buildings for expansion (more than 7500 square feet of new research space will be occupied by the end of 2006, another 3000 will be available in ET, and new discussions are under way).
- support interdisciplinary research collaborations, work with SOM to identify common interests, pursue contiguous space with SOM, and promote joint seminars & appointments (> 1/3 already have active collabs with SOM);
- enhance relationships with the Alumni Association, build an active Dean's Advisory Council, invest in a strong Development Staff for the IU Foundation, and to build relationships with donors.

Budget Highlights

The budget is not a rosy picture. Why are we here?

- Decisions in 2004-05 removed too much cash from this year's budget; we made many new hires last year and this year, together with start-up funds for 14 previous hires.
- Central administration decisions regarding state allocations are inconsistent; a 62% cut in appropriations is inconsistent with meeting "doubling" goals and most other goals of SOS and IUPUI. Furthermore, SOS has been cut more than any other school (net appropriations after assessments). The consequence is that the funds returned from the university to the SOS do not cover the operating budget (and have not for many years); instead, the operating budget has been funded by cash from unfilled positions.
- For 2005-06, \$15.7 million went to salary, \$4.4 million went to Operating Funds; only \$3.2 million of Operating Funds was provided 7/1 and rest came from salary savings.
- For 2006-07, \$16 million will go to salary; \$4.9 million is required for Operating Funds. On 7/1, we will have only \$2.4 million for Operating Funds so we will need the remainder from somewhere else (cuts?)
- Start-ups from 2003 to the present add up to \$4.2 million; \$2.6 million is still owed. This is like a mortgage; it is not paid all at once. We pay about 1/3 of start-ups each year. We will pay \$1 million by the end of this year; the estimated amount for next year is \$800k.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Current cash position (in millions) | |
| +1.2 | Available now |
| +0.8 | Salary savings for 06-07 |
| -1.1 | Start Ups |
| <u>-2.6</u> | <u>Operating Fund Cash (Commitments)</u> |
| 1.7 | Shortfall |

Discussions with the University Administration Office (AO) and Steering Committee (SC) are underway. More credit hours and more grant ICRs could reduce or offset this shortfall. But to meet doubling goals, something needs to change at the campus level or through local cuts. It has taken a while to understand fully the RCM budget environment. The Dean will meet every other month with Chairs and the SC for continuous budget discussions. In addition, the SOS needs to undergo strategic planning, involving the faculty, chairs, and SC, with the assistance of a planning expert.

Fetterman asked why the Dean is optimistic about discussions with the AO. Cowen replied that the new Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) is familiar with science disciplines/departments and is sympathetic to our unique challenges/needs.

Boukai asked about the Dean's Office budget, which was omitted from overall presentation. Cowen presented the numbers on a slide; salary for all staff combined is \$1.7 million, and the operating budget is only 100k. The largest portion (\$1.2 million) is dedicated to expenses that are mandated by the University (e.g., hospitality, Life Cycle Fund, Scholarships, ICR tax, Tech fees).

Referring to the graph comparing SOS to other schools on university appropriations and assessments, Hazer asked why the net return of funds from the University to the SOS was declining compared to other schools? Cowen replied that the administration answered him with two words: "Hold harmless." Cowen added that he does not know what these words mean.

Misiurewicz asked how the graph (comparing SOS to other schools on university appropriations and assessments) would look if it included tuition & grant income. Cowen replied that he had not seen those data. For the SOS budget, 80% of the income comes from tuition, 16% from appropriations, and 4% from ICR. Our appropriations income will be only 12% next year. Misiurewicz asked about the cost of moving the Dean's office. Cowen replied that the renovation was \$450k, \$300k of which came from the AO (thus, a net cost to the SOS of 150k for 4 new faculty offices and some labs). The cost for the Waterway space is < \$50k / year (about 1/3 less than our on-campus space; \$14/sf vs. \$22/sf).

Boukai asked if the Dean had a clear breakdown for next year. Cowen replied that it is difficult to predict carryover to next year; the best estimate is \$1.2 million. Faculty asked how many unfilled positions there would be next year. Cowen replied that several lines are still open, but the searches are ongoing and the funds are committed. Some positions are dependent on CTE funding. We must fill positions that are required

to do the work that we need to do (e.g., teaching our classes). We need to put together a long-range strategic plan to fix what has been broken for several years. We might need to limit our hiring, with priority going to getting courses taught.

When asked if he has had discussions with the AO about the changing assessments, Cowen replied that it is up in the air. He added that we are not the first school to have problems. It might be that our recent hires will help to accelerate the process.

Sen expressed concern that the graduate students might suffer from the budget shortfall, and Cowen concurred. He said we need \$2.5 million to keep operating the way we have been. Randall asked, suppose we get one-half of the shortfall, where would it go? Cowen replied that we would still need to find the balance of the shortfall. Randall asked what budget lines the Dean considers to be most important to fund; Cowen replied that it is not his own decision but one that would occur through discussions with Chairs and the SC. Part of the problem for graduate students is that IUPUI was set up as a teaching institution in 1969, and the Trustees must change that.

When asked the extent to which the AO is aware of our budget crisis, Cowen replied that they are getting a loud and clear message, and he noted that EVC William Plater was in the back of the room and was hearing it clearly during the present meeting. Cowen concluded that this is a challenge for all of us together. He stated that he really is committed to IUPUI and the things that we all believe in. He will do whatever the AO decides is best in order to contribute to this mission, either as Dean or as a faculty member in Math. Cowen stated that the slides from his presentation are available on the web. Following his presentation and question-and-answer session with the faculty, Cowen exited the auditorium.

V. Administrative Review of the Dean (Barth)

Barth explained that the Bylaws provide for review of the Dean in the 3rd year in position, which would be conducted next Spring by the SC. The Math Department sent a memo to the AO on April 21st requesting an immediate full university review. Barth invited Dean Plater to the Faculty Assembly to provide the AO's perspective on that request. Plater confirmed that they had heard many concerns expressed about Dean Cowen's performance. Plater met with Chairs, Associate Deans, and the SC. Bantz and Plater agreed to review Dean Cowen. They propose a consolidated review using SOS procedures, combined with procedures for campus-level review. (A copy of campus review procedures was provided to faculty in the meeting.) They are charging a review committee to address a set of specific questions, chaired by someone outside the SOS but run by the SOS SC. They will not restrict the committee from asking other questions. They will try to use the survey instrument already designed by the SOS and will also rely on the Survey Research Center on campus, which has 15 years of experience in survey research of this sort. The review will be completed no later than 6/30 (with a goal of being completed by 6/15). The AO will provide logistical support. The AO has been aware for a while of the growing budget concerns; they are meeting with Cowen and his staff on a frequent basis and require a balanced-budget plan. Plater has placed a hold on all appointments until the plan is in place. There is

no question that the SOS is critical to the campus, and the SOS will not face this issue in isolation. Following this meeting, Plater will be in touch with Barth to initiate the process. They wanted the SOS faculty to discuss today what we would need from the review to ensure that Cowen can be successful—if he can be successful—as Dean of the SOS.

One faculty member was confused by the role of the SOS and wondered if it could be more of a campus review. Plater said that in all reviews, 90-95% of the input comes from within the school; at this point the only input that they might exclude (compared to a full campus review) is student input. Plater insists on having staff input, but it would be up to the SOS faculty to decide whether or not student input would be necessary. It has yet to be determined whether or not other schools on campus would have input (e.g., Dean Brater).

Faculty asked about the time frame for the freeze on appointments (e.g., for pending hires)? Plater replied that he is aware of the importance of addressing this as quickly possible. He added that it is important to understand the complexity of the situation and to make sure that the SOS has the funds to support them, which will require meetings with departments and with the Dean's staff. Plater expects it to take 2-3 weeks.

In reference to the CTE grants for next year, the faculty asked if the SOS would be allowed to search for those positions if funded. Plater said that is on the June schedule for the Trustees meeting and will hopefully be determined then.

When asked if the SOS has developed a bail-out plan, Plater replied that there must be a plan to make sure that the SOS has funds to operate; it might be that AO will allow a deficit this year which will need to be covered by the SOS over successive years.

When asked how the results of the review would be presented, Plater said that they will conduct this jointly with Faculty Council (FC) and the SC. Results will be made available to the leadership of the FC and SC, and a summary will be sent to the faculty. The review summaries are accurate and fair, but the AO attempts to minimize statements that might be extreme. The point of the review will be to determine whether the Dean should continue and under what circumstances and with what supports in place. Following his presentation, Plater exited the auditorium.

The faculty continued to discuss the review process. It was determined that an additional resolution from the entire SOS faculty is not required because Plater has confirmed that a review has been initiated already. The SOS faculty member need to specify what we would want addressed by the review and who else should provide input. In response to concerns that the review would focus exclusively on the budget, it was emphasized that all faculty would have an opportunity to provide input on all issues of concern. All faculty members were asked to notify Barth about which issues should be specifically addressed and whose input should be included, which he would relay to the Review Committee. It was agreed that the SC play a central role and that we communicate our own plan first and foremost. The chair will be another dean on

campus; the committee will consist mostly of the SC, with the remainder of committee yet to be determined. It was noted that Ng has a conflict of interest as the President of the IUPUI Faculty and as a member of the department that forwarded the initial resolution. Ng already offered to recuse himself and notified Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty that she would be responsible for serving as the broader faculty in the review process. It was moved that SOS faculty send input to Barth, which the SC will process and forward to the President of the IUPUI Faculty or his delegate; the motion carried unanimously.

It was asked if the faculty would have an opportunity to review those recommendations before they go to the FC Pres. It was also moved that staff and NTTF be included. When asked how many faculty wanted students involved in the review, no hands were raised. The question was repeated for involving community members; again, no hands were raised. When asked about involving Purdue West Lafayette, one person indicated that they have a stake in our school. Input from the Dean's Advisory Council (DAC) was also suggested, not only present members but also prior members. It was moved that input be obtained from all faculty (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track) and staff but not students or the DAC; the motion carried by overwhelming majority.

VI. SOS Course Buyout and Research Release (Barth/Randall)

Due to limited time, this item was deferred.

VII. School of Science Committee Reports (Reports Attached)

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| A. | Steering Committee* | Andy Barth, President of the Faculty |
| B. | Educational Policy Committee | Shiaofen Fang, Chair |
| C. | Nominations and Awards Committee | Rajeev Raje, Chair |
| D. | Graduate Affairs Committee | Pam Crowell, Dean's Office Liaison |
| E. | Research Committee | Pam Crowell, Dean's Office Liaison |
| F. | Technology Committee | Andy Gavrin, Chair |
| G. | Academic Appeals Committee* | Andy Gavrin, Dean's Office Liaison |
| H. | Unit Committee* | David Malik, Chair |
| I. | Library Committee | Marcos Betancourt, Chair |
| J. | Teaching and Learning Committee | Drew Appleby, Chair |

* No report.

VIII. Announcements

IX. New Business

Jay Siegel, Director of the Forensic Investigative Sciences Program (FIS), read a statement addressing concerns that he had heard expressed within the SOS regarding the FIS Program. His remarks are appended in their entirety.

SOS Faculty Assembly
May 2, 2006

Fastenau acknowledged the work of Dr. Jane Williams, who spearheaded the revision of administrative review instruments this year and converted the process to a web-based format. He presented her with a certificate and gift card.

Fastenau acknowledged the leadership of Dr. Andy Barth, who assumed the role as President of the Faculty when Dr. Pam Crowell was appointed Associate Dean six months into her two-year term. He presented him with a certificate and gift card.

X. Election Results (Fastenau)

At the end of the meeting, Fastenau announced the results of the election:

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| President: | Ray Chin, Professor, Mathematics |
| Secretary/President-Elect | Steve Randall, Assoc. Professor, Biology |

There was a motion to destroy the ballots, which was seconded and approved.
There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded and approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Phil Fastenau, Secretary of the SOS Faculty

Distributed to the Faculty on May 9, 2006.
Approval pending.

Educational Policies Committee Report

Shiaofen Fang
May 1, 2006

The Educational Policies Committee met twice since the last Faculty Assembly, once in February and once in April. Two major action items (among others) were discussed and voted.

1. Graduate program and courses in Forensic and Investigative Science. The committee approved a set of FIS graduate courses via emails in March. These courses include FIS 505, FIS 511, FIS 512, FIS 521, FIS 522, FIS 531, FIS 532, FIS 696 and FIS 698. In April's meeting, the committee discussed and unanimously approved the MS graduate program in Forensic and Investigative Science. The program requires 30 credit hours of course work that may include 10 credit hours of thesis research or up to 6 credit hours of internship. Three concentrations are initially proposed: Forensic Chemistry, Forensic Biology, and Forensic Toxicology.
2. Jr/Sr Integrator courses. The committee discussed extensively about the current school-wide Jr/Sr integrator course requirement. The members all agreed that while it was a good idea, there had been major difficulties in the implementation of the program. The current supporting system is simply not adequate to sustain at a school-wide scale. In April's meeting, the committee voted unanimously to suspend the Jr/Sr integrator course requirement for all SOS students. The 3 credits freed up as a result of this suspension will go back to the individual departments and can be used only as elective course credits. The committee did not specify when (or to which group of students) the suspension is to be applied, and basically left it to the dean office to decide.

Several other issues have also been discussed including: students' use of IUPUI emails, probation dismissal policy, and transfer credits. But no voting took place on these issues.

**SoS Nominations and Awards Committee Report
(2005-2006)**

Rajeev Raje

Committee Members:

Martin Bard (Biology)
Greg Fetterman (Psychology)
Rajeev Raje (CIS – Chair)
Durgu Rao (Physics)
Gary Rosenberg (Geology)
Jyoti Sarkar (Math)
Frank Schultz (Chemistry)

The SoS Nominations and Awards Committee met during the months of February and March 2006 to select the recipients of various Student, Staff, and Faculty awards. The recipients, along with their awards, are mentioned below.

1) Teaching Award

Prof. Martin J. O'Donnell
Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology

2) Research Award

Prof. Michal Misiurewicz
Department of Mathematical Sciences

3) Service Award

Prof. Bart S. Ng
Department of Mathematical Sciences

4) Academic Advising Award

Ms. Michelle R. Boshears
Department of Computer and Information Science

5) Full-Time Lecturer Award

No award this year.

6) Associate Faculty Award

Ms. Sidneye T. Trowbridge
Department of Biology

7) Partners in Education Full-Time Staff Award

Mr. Scott M. Orr
Department of Computer and Information Science

8) The Trustees Teaching Award

i) Trustees Teaching Award for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

- a. Prof. Kathleen A. Marrs (Biology)
- b. Prof. Mihran Tuceryan (Computer and Information Science)
- c. Prof. Lenore P. Tedesco (Earth Sciences)
- d. Prof. Asok K. Sen (Mathematical Sciences)
- e. Prof. Marvin D. Kemple (Physics)
- f. Prof. Kathy E. Johnson (Psychology)

ii) Trustees Teaching Award for Full-time Lecturers

- a. Mr. Jeffrey T. Allen (Computer and Information Science)
- b. Ms. Debra R. Hall (Mathematical Sciences)

9) Bowling-Jones-Russo Undergraduate Research

Mr. Eric Woerly (Chemistry Major)

10) John D. Barnwell Memorial Scholarship

Mr. Eric D. Curtis (Physics Major)

11) Frank G. Lambertus Memorial Scholarship

Ms. Jessica N. McKamey (Psychology Major)

12) Teaching Assistant Award

Ms. Jennifer A. Sembach (Geology Major)

SOS Faculty Assembly
May 2, 2006

School of Science Research Committee Report

Pamela L. Crowell, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education

May 1, 2006

The Research Committee reviewed and selected the following PRF award recipients:

PRF Summer Faculty grant: Leonid Rubchinsky, Math

PRF Research Grant: Bonnie Blazer-Yost, Biology

PRF International Travel Grants:

Shiaofen Fang, Computer & Information Science

Jeff Ou, Physics

Krzysztof Wojciechowski, Mathematical Sciences

The next PRF International Travel award competition for travel from is now open. The details will be communicated to School of Science faculty this week.

School of Science Graduate Committee Report

Pamela L. Crowell, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education

May 1, 2006

The Graduate Committee has not met this semester.

Technology Committee Report (Spring, 2006)
 A. Gavrin, Chair

Purpose: To make recommendations to the Dean for the use of student technology fee money, and to discuss and recommend technology strategies for the School of Science

2 meetings (2/17/06, 3/10/06)

A detailed budget is attached. In round numbers,

| Item | Amount (to nearest \$1000) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| STF allocation | 400,000 |
| Carryovers from 2005 | 81,000 |
| Total income | 481,000 |
| Personnel | 56,000 |
| Maintenance | 6,000 |
| Software Licenses | 21,000 |
| SL070 Cluster | 83,000 |
| Psychology Computer Lab | 28,000 |
| Computer Science PC Lab | 38,000 |
| Departmental maintenance funds | 80,000 |
| Total fixed costs | 311,000 |
| Remaining discretionary funds | 169,000 |
| 11 Departmental projects | 161,000 |
| Carryover to 2006 | 8,000 |

Major Activities

Operation of SL070 (one open lab, one reservable lab, 2 testing labs). Expenses are primarily lifecycle replacement of equipment, consultants/proctors, a graduate student manager, and supplies.

Allocation of funds for departmental project

Funds for departmental projects are allocated based on peer-review of departmental proposals by the committee. This year, 14 proposals were received, 11 were approved, 2 were withdrawn, 1 was not approved.

Policy recommendations

Pay-for-Print will be implemented by campus starting 7/1/06, at a rate of \$0.04/page. We will install card swipe systems in all labs in which the general public can print. We are seeking to have a card machine installed in LD/SL basement lobby. This machine will be able to add funds to an existing card or Jagtag, and will be able to issue cards. Costs recovered from printing will

be folded into the technology budget to partially defray costs of providing print services (paper, toner, service, depreciation of equipment...)

| School of Science Student Tech Fee Budget - 2006-2007 | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Final 5/1/2006 | | | | | |
| Student Tech Fee Allocation | | | | | \$400,000 |
| a. Carry-over | | | 12339 | | \$80,562 |
| b. Student Council Lounge Computers | | | 15000 | | |
| c. Distance Education upgrade | | | 1428 | | |
| d. School Maintenance | | | 5000 | | |
| e. Pay for Print | | | 8603 | | |
| f. network security teaching lab | | | 38192 | | |
| Total Spendable Allocation | | | | | \$480,562 |
| | | | Cost | | Funded |
| 1. Department Budgets | | | \$80,000 | | \$80,000.00 |
| Per Department = | | \$11,429 | | | |
| 2. Tech support person Salary and Benefits | | | 55633 | | 55,633.00 |
| 3. General Maintenance School Items | | | \$6,000 | | 6,000.00 |
| 4. Software | | | \$20,996 | | 20,996.00 |
| SAS | | \$1,600 | | | |
| Maple | | \$4,200 | | | |
| Matlab | | \$2,821 | | | |
| Sigma Plot | | \$2,000 | | | |
| Minitab | | \$1,550 | | | |
| Geo Sketchpad | | \$500 | | | |
| Chemdraw | | \$8,000 | | | |
| SPSS | | 325 | | | |
| 5. SL 070 Computer cluster and testing center | | | \$82,746 | | 82,746.00 |
| Psychology Computer Lab | | | 28441 | | 28441 |
| Computer Science PC Lab | | | \$37,500 | | \$37,500 |
| Total Preapproved Items | | | \$311,316 | | |
| Amount remaining for allocation | | | \$169,246 | | |
| Funded Proposals | | | \$161,064 | | |
| Amount remaining | | | \$8,182 | | |
| Proposed Projects | | | | | |
| Backup System | Psychology, Deans Office, Biology | | \$8,500 | approved | \$8,500 |
| Biology A | Mounted projectors | | \$18,917 | approved | \$18,917 |
| Biology B | Spectrophotometer and scanner | | \$2,200 | not approved | |
| Chemistry A | PH Meters and electrodes | | \$12,360 | approved | \$12,360 |
| Chemistry and FIS | Spectroscopy | | \$21,414 | approved | |
| Chemistry B | Mounted projectors | | \$16,384 | approved | \$16,384 |
| Computer Science A | Mobile Computing | | \$16,620 | approved | \$16,620 |
| Computer Science B | Streaming Media | | \$35,950 | approved | \$35,950 |
| Geology | GPS and Autocad | | \$17,099 | approved | \$17,099 |
| Math | response pads | | \$3,875 | withdrawn | |
| Math | Backup System | | \$19,234 | approved | \$19,234 |
| Physics A | Lab Equipment | | \$7,500 | approved | \$7,500 |
| Physics B | Audio Equipment | | \$3,470 | withdrawn | |
| Psychology | SQL Server | | \$8,500 | approved | \$8,500 |

Library Committee Report

Marcos R. Betancourt
May 1, 2006

On February 13 we held a meeting to discuss Journal cuts. We decided on a plan close to David Lewis plan on how to cut 60K worth in journals.

This is the approximate numbers (cuts) we agree upon:

| | |
|----|-----------|
| BI | -\$10,762 |
| CH | -\$20,315 |
| CS | -\$1,032 |
| GE | -\$4,620 |
| MA | -\$11,580 |
| PH | -\$10,650 |
| PS | -\$1,037 |

In our plan each department suggested the number of journals to cut. This was done over e-mail during the following weeks. All but one department (Chem) has made the suggestions so far.

Report from the 2005-2006 IUPUI School of Science Assessment Committee

Submitted by Drew Appleby, Chair

April 23, 2006

1. The 2005-2006 School of Science Assessment Committee was composed of the following members.
 - a. Biology Department → Kathy Marrs
 - b. Chemistry and Chemical Biology → Barry Muhoberac
 - c. Computer and Information Science → Yuanshun Dai and Michelle Boshears
 - d. Geology → Chris Thomas
 - e. Mathematical Sciences → Robert Rigdon
 - f. Physics → Brian Woodahl
 - g. Psychology → Drew Appleby
 - h. School of Science → Andrew Gavrin
 - i. School of Science → Joseph Thompson
2. The committee created a systematic, six-stage strategy that all seven departments will use to assess the extent to which their majors are acquiring the knowledge and skills that are the desired outcomes of their programs. The five stages of this strategy are as follows.
 - a. The first stage in assessment for an academic program is to determine what it wants its students to know (i.e., knowledge) and to be able to do (i.e., skills) as a result of successfully completing its program. This knowledge and these skills will be referred to as the department's student learning outcomes (SLOs).
 - b. The second stage is to identify specific assignments in the department's curriculum where the degree of accomplishment of the SLOs can be measured.
 - c. The third stage is to identify existing methods or create new methods to determine if students are accomplishing the SLOs.
 - d. The fourth stage is to collect data with these methods and from other sources (e.g., alumni surveys, student satisfaction surveys, etc.) that can be used to determine if the SLOs are being achieved.
 - e. The fifth stage is to use the information collected during the fourth step to make data-informed changes to the curriculum where these changes are deemed necessary.
 - f. The sixth stage is to return to the fourth stage and collect data again (after a reasonable amount of time has elapsed for the effects of the changes to become apparent) to see if these changes have produced their desired impact.
3. As the Chair of the School of Science Assessment Committee, my aspiration for the 2005-2006 school year was to accomplish the following three goals.
 - a. The first was to have the representatives of the seven departments determine where their departments currently exist in the six-stage assessment process presented above. Progress will be indicated as (1) Accomplished, (2) In-the-Process of Being Accomplished, or (3) Not-Yet-Accomplished.
 - b. The second was to have each department complete at least the next stage in the assessment process during the 2005-2006 school year.
 - c. The third was to have each department write its 2005-2005 Annual Assessment Report by describing (a) how it has carried out each of the stages it has accomplished during the 2005-2005 school year and (b) how it plans to accomplish at least the next stage during the 2006-2007 school year.
4. Other activities that took place during the 2005-2006 school year
 - a. Trudy Banta reviewed the six-stage assessment strategy created by the committee and offered a minor revision. She attended one of our meetings, explained her revision (which was accepted by our committee), and answered questions about assessment.
 - b. Brenda Bishop and Kim Helton (SOS's liaison to the IU Alumni Office) were invited to attend a meeting during which they explained how departments could access alumni data for assessment purposes and accepted an invitation to create a protocol that departments could use to access this type of data in an efficient manner.
 - c. The Senior Assessment Package that graduating seniors are expected to complete during their final semester was distributed to each member of the committee and will be examined carefully to determine if it can be modified to (e.g.,

SOS Faculty Assembly
May 2, 2006

converted to an on-line survey) to improve and streamline its ability to serve as an instrument to gather assessment data.

Jay Siegel, Ph.D., Director
Forensic and Investigative Sciences Program (FIS)
2 May 2006

Good afternoon. My name is Jay Siegel and I am the Director of the Forensic and Investigative Sciences Program at IUPUI. I would like to thank Phil and Andy for permitting me this opportunity to speak to you today.

My request to speak to you today about the forensic science program arises from my recent awareness of the circulation of a number of rumors, half truths and distortions about the status and development initiatives of the FIS program. I hope, in the next few minutes to provide some clarity to the situation.

First, a bit of history. I came to IUPUI in the fall of 2004 after spending 25 years at Michigan State University as the Director of the forensic science program. By all measures, the MSU program was very successful.

Why then did I come to IUPUI? I felt like I needed a change after 25 years in the same place. More to the point, I realized, after researching the university, the city and the proposed program, that there was a “perfect storm” brewing here in forensic science. There were no forensic science programs in Indiana. Indeed, the Indiana State Police and the Marion County Forensic Services Agency had been hiring MSU graduates for many years. Indianapolis possesses all of the criminal justice resources needed for a forensic science program to thrive; police, crime labs, courts, coroners, the state police, the medical and law schools. IUPUI has a reputation of being entrepreneurial and innovative, and an up and coming research university. The potential was and is here to develop a forensic science program that would rank with the best. When I came here in early 2004 to interview for this position, I told this to Dean Stocum, Vice Chancellor Banta and to the committee that developed the program. I also told them that I wasn’t going to come here and preside over a small, local Bachelor’s degree program. I wanted to come and build one of the premier programs in the US. When I accepted the position I knew that I would likely retire from this job but not into it.

The blueprint for the FIS program called for hiring a forensic biologist, which I did. I got a very good, experienced one in Dr. Richard Li. I also hired an advisor/recruiter: Kristi Shea. She has turned out to be an outstanding member of the FIS team and indispensable to the operation of the program. New courses have been developed and taught for the first time this year. These include a course in ethics and other professional issues that was not contemplated in the original blueprint for the program but which is needed and is required for accreditation of the program. The introductory course, taught for the first time last fall, had nearly 150 students registered. There are more than 50 majors in the program and currently, we have 22 freshmen entering in the fall who are declaring FIS to be their major. These are all well above projections and my expectations for the first year of the program.

I would like to now address some major issues that have led to misunderstandings about this program. First the cost and budget: Although this program is multidisciplinary and was formed with the understanding that several Schools would participate, 100% of the funding for the program comes from the CTE funds that support my salary and those of Dr. Li and Ms. Shea, and from the School of Science. No other School contributes to the support of the program. This gives rise to **MYTH #1**: The budget of the School of

Science is a zero sum game and every dollar spent by forensic science is a dollar taken away from other programs in the School. This assumes that the forensic science program is a drain on the School's budget and brings in no new money. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the first year alone, the FIS program brought in the following dollars:

\$261,000 from a Federal research grant (mine) of which more than \$70K is ICR. Over the next two years, 2 months of my salary will be paid out of this grant, thus making additional funds available to the SoS.

Approximately \$15,000 from a Federal grant the Dr. Li brought with him from his previous university.

Tuition dollars from more than 150 students. At least 40 of the 150 students in FIS 205 were SPEA and Liberal Arts students and many more were University College Students. The rest were students majoring in a science.

A number of our FIS majors have transferred to IUPUI from other institutions. Only a few of the FIS majors are students from other science majors at IUPUI.

I have also brought in more than \$235,000 in brand new, state of the art laboratory instrumentation from Federal sources, that is being shared with the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology. One of these came from the US Secret Service. It will be used for teaching and research. The other came from the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and is being used in part, in a pilot program of drug analysis for local counties at the request of the Governor's Office.

This summer the FIS program is hosting a 3 day workshop for 100 high school science teachers from all over the country on how to incorporate forensic science into high school curricula. We have raised over \$20,000 to support this conference.

I suggest to you that the FIS program is more than paying its own way thus far.

This brings me to **MYTH #2**: It concerns the structure of the FIS program and our future plans. I have heard on more than one occasion that the Forensic Science Program is going to become the Forensic Science Department and that we are going to hire more staff to run the Department. There is no proposal before any governing body on this campus to create such a department and no such proposal is contemplated. The FIS program **IS** seeking to establish a master's degree in Forensic Science within in the School of Science. This program will enhance and add depth and breadth to the existing bachelor's program. The impetus for this proposal came because it seems to be needed. Since the FIS program started, we have received many, many inquiries from within Indiana and outside the state: "When are we going to have a graduate degree?" The Indiana State Police and the Marion County Forensic Services Agency both strongly support such a program because they want graduates with a master's degree for managerial positions in their labs. It will enable us to recruit outstanding high school graduates to a 5-year program leading to the MS degree in forensic science that will be developed as part of this proposal.

What sorts of graduate students would such a program attract to the School of Science? My experience at MSU proves to me that we will get outstanding applicants to a master's program. In 2003-04, my last full year at MSU, the master's program received 180 applications for 20 total spots in forensic chemistry, biology and anthropology. The

average GPA of the students that got into the program was 3.8 and only 3 of the 20 came from MSU. The rest came from all over the country. $\frac{3}{4}$ of the students paid their own way through the program. I see no reason why that experience will not be repeated here if we start a master's program.

The need to continually improve the Bachelor's degree program and effectively serve its students and to run a Masters degree, make it necessary to add additional faculty to the program. In the short term, we can run the programs with present faculty but the long term health and success of the FIS program require more teachers and researchers. To that end, I have requested CTE funding for two additional faculty, one in forensic chemistry and microscopy and the other in forensic toxicology. The latter position will give us the opportunity to offer a concentration in forensic toxicology at the BS and MS levels; something that only a very few institutions offer today. It will also permit us to develop additional collaborations with the medical school and the department of biology. The CTE request is somewhere in higher administration still being considered, but it was rated among the top proposals this year. If we do not get CTE funding in this cycle, we will apply again next year. It is not my intention to seek funding for the two faculty positions from SoS funds at this time. Yes, I want to grow this program but, to the extent possible, I want it to grow using new sources of funding.

Although there are few sources for research funds for forensic science today, both Richard Li and I have received Federal support. I have no doubt that this will continue and new faculty will also be able to bring in new research funds.

At some point down the road, I feel that the forensic science program will evolve into a department. It will be easier and more efficient to administer it that way. However this step has nothing to do with my plans to grow the program and I repeat that there is no proposal to create a department.

Some people in the School of Science and elsewhere on the campus are asking: Am I moving too fast with the forensic science program especially in these times of difficult funding? At Michigan State, every department on the campus received a 1% budget cut every year for the past nearly 20 years. Nonetheless the forensic science program thrived and grew. The perfect storm in forensic science here in Indy continues unabated. Now is the time to move, to grow the program. There will never be a better time. Other universities in Indiana including Purdue in West Lafayette are proceeding with plans to create programs. We must stay ahead of the curve. We must dictate the future path to forensic science education in Indiana. We must lead; not follow. I believe that this can be done by bringing in additional sources of support as the program grows. People are asking, should we hire more faculty and have both a bachelor's degree **AND** a master's degree now? I say: "Why not both?"

Thank you.