

**Minutes of the Fall 2010 School of Science Faculty Assembly**  
**Friday, November 5, 2010**  
**Lilly Auditorium, University Library**

***Faculty Present***

**Biology:** Anderson, Gregory; Atkinson, Simon; Blazer-Yost, Bonnie L.; Kusmierczyk, Andrew; Lees, N. Douglas, Randall, Stephen K.; Roper, Randall; Stocum, David L.; Watson, John (Secretary of the Faculty); Yard, Michael.

**Chemistry & Chemical Biology:** Minto, Robert; Muhoberac, Barry; Seigel, Jay; Varma-Nelson, Pratibha.

**Computer & Information Science:** Fang, Shiao-fen; Liang, Yao; Raje, Rajeev; Tuceryan, Mihran (President of the Faculty).

**Earth Sciences:** Jacinthe, Pierre-Andre.

**Mathematical Sciences:** Boukai, Benzion; Geller, Will; Misiurewicz, Michal; Ng, Bart; Sarkar, Jyotirmoy (Immediate Past President); Sen, Asok; Watt, Jeffrey; Zhu, Luoding.

**Physics:** Gavrin, Andrew; Rader, Andrew; Sukhatme, Uday; Wassall, Stephen.

**Psychology:** Ashburn-Nardo, Leslie; Cyders, Melissa; Hazer, John; Johnson, Kathy; McGrew, John; Murphy, James.

***Invited Guests***

Bantz, Charles (Chancellor of IUPUI)

Givens, Ted A. (Executive Vice-President, Blackburn Architects)

Huotilainen, Kalevi (Principal, BSA LifeStructures)

Thompson, Richard (University Architect)

1. President Mihran Tuceryan called the assembly to order at 9:04 a.m. He noted that the order of business was outlined in the bylaws but was varying from the usual order because of special guests for the day. He asked if there was motion to accept the agenda. It was so moved, seconded, and the agenda was unanimously approved.
2. Tuceryan introduced Chancellor Charles Bantz. Bantz thanked the SOS for the invitation, and asked for topics we wanted him to address, mentioning that he would respond to questions afterwards:
  - a. Andy Gavrin asked if there was a strategic plan for new instructional space as enrollment increases.
  - b. Jay Seigel noted the evolving role of the School of Liberal Arts and the SOS. He asked what ideas the Chancellor had for strengthening the role of those two schools within IUPUI.
  - c. Bonnie Blazer-Yost asked about increasing resources to accompany our increasing enrollments.
  - d. Jim Murphy asked about the current view of state appropriations.
  - e. Bart Ng stated that IUPUI hired approximately 100 new faculty this fall and asked how many of those were replacements. The Chancellor asked whether Vice Chancellor Uday Sukhatme could answer this. The Vice Chancellor estimated that 75 of the new hires were replacements.
  - f. The Chancellor then began his responses to the questions asked.

- i. State appropriations. Bantz noted that the recession is still significant here in Indiana. He noted that several members of the IU Board of Trustees are economically savvy, and express the view that the economy will improve only slowly and so we should expect a budget cut. With the increasing outlays expected for the state government, the Chancellor also expressed the view that another budget reduction is likely. He indicated that enrollment is one potential way of offsetting a budget reduction, especially non-resident enrollment and noting the success of Sukhatme's enrollment shaping initiative. He does not expect a significant increase in the tuition rate.
- ii. Resources. Bantz stressed the importance of the IMPACT (fund raising) campaign, but noted that is not reasonable to build the operating budget on gifts. He encouraged all of us to try to identify potential donors in the community or among our colleagues. The campaign will in part be used as matching funds for endowed chairs. He noted the RISE scholarship program. He also mentioned cash gifts as a way of funding buildings and start-up packages for new faculty. He mentioned that we are only beginning to employ naming rights as a source of funds. Bantz said that the IMPACT campaign is an opportunity to emphasize the STEM disciplines, noting the public understands the importance of STEM and are interested in it.
- iii. Increasing the influence of the SOS and the School of Liberal Arts. Bantz noted that neither school was central to the campus mission in a historical sense because they were created after some of the professional schools. He believes that we would be stronger if we were linked with Liberal Arts, partly because of faculty size. He noted the complications of a merger because of the diverse ways of thinking in the two schools. He said we need a better way of letting people know of the strengths of these two schools, and a better way of bringing them together. He said that within IU is easy to convince people of the importance of the Arts and Sciences because of the stature of the College of Arts and Sciences at IUB. He noted that philanthropy could again be helpful in this regard. He has no doubt of the importance of Science and Liberal Arts to the campus, and that campus cannot be successful if we are not. He stressed that he realizes our space needs, mentioning organic chemistry teaching labs and the animal facility. He believes that the decision to fund the new building through overheads was a significant and trend-setting decision.
- iv. Classroom space. Bantz indicated that he is expecting a space utilization study within the next 18 months. He mentioned that the head of the budget committee does not believe that use our classrooms enough on Fridays, and we need to face this situation because of the state appropriations committee. The campus needs mechanisms to generate new general-purpose classrooms because we are out of space during the days and evenings Monday through Thursday. Bantz noted that SELB2 is the only new building put

forward by IU in the next building cycle, but expects it to be difficult to obtain state funds for the project in the next biennium. He stated that Cavanaugh Hall needs replacement. One strategy would be to request state funds, but Bantz noted we might need to generate the funds ourselves.

- g. Bantz wants the SOS to realize how much stronger we are now than 5 years ago, pointing out the growth in faculty numbers, research funding, and STEM funding.
  - h. Ng asked about pressure from the state regarding classroom utilization study. He encouraged Bantz to include research space in this study because it is unclear how individual schools allocate space. He mentioned that he has been requesting such a study for 1-½ years, and noted particular problems with space allocation in other schools. Bantz indicated that there were differing opinions regarding these specific space issues mentioned by Ng.
3. Tuceryan turned the floor over to the architectural team for SELB1
- a. Rich Thompson of the University Architect's Office explained his office's role in the planning and development of the project. He showed a site plan, with SELB1 being south of LD, and connected to LD by a bridge. He said he expects site preparation to begin about this time next year.
  - b. Ted Givens, Executive Vice President of Blackburn Architects, next addressed the Assembly. He noted on the site plan that the campus master plan indicates that additional buildings are planned on the east side of Blackford St. across from SL and LD. He explained that the design team did not want the connection of SELB1 to LD to create a "wall" that would block pedestrian flow to these anticipated buildings. Therefore, the team proposed a bridge connecting the two buildings that could be walked under and that would also contain offices. A loading dock will be located at the SE corner of SELB1 and a signature entryway will be on the SW corner. He also indicated where the likely placement of SELB2 and SELB2 would be.
  - c. Kalevi Huotilainen, Principal of BSA LifeStructures, presented the floor plans of the three floors of SELB1, stressing the bridge connected the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors of SELB1 and LD. He also noted that there was no plan for "below grade" structure (i.e. basement) in SELB1. Huotilainen then provided answers to questions from the faculty regarding the following issues: the public space on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors, the lack of a basement, lack of conference rooms and a green roof, security, the shape of the building, the effect of the recession on the building's cost. He stated that the timeline is start construction in Sept./Oct. 2011, approximately 20-24 months to completion in mid-summer 2013.
4. Report from the Dean's Search Committee. Rajeev Raje (CIS) spoke on behalf of the search committee. He noted that a written report was also available (see attachment ScienceDeanSearchNov.pdf). The committee evaluated 61 applications, inviting 10 for airport interviews, and selecting 4 finalists for interview. He noted that each candidate would participate in a public forum, meet with each department, and meet with students. Raje encouraged the faculty to use the link on the handout to provide evaluations of the candidates.

- a. Siegel mentioned that there was no provision for the candidates to meet with the department chairs. Jane Williams (Psychology and search committee member) explained that there were differing views among the committee on this point, but that the current plan was for the candidates to meet with the chairs and give a research seminar on their second visits. Considerable support was voiced by several attendees, including EVC Uday Sukhatme, for altering the current itineraries so that the chairs could meet with the candidates. Williams e-mailed the search committee chair (Scott Evenbeck) during the following discussions and noted near the end of the meeting that Evenbeck indicated a willingness to change the itineraries as discussed.
  - b. Ng indicated the candidates should meet with the SOS development staff
  - c. Randall Roper suggested that the late afternoon time slots for students was not conducive for their participation.
  - d. Simon Atkinson expressed thanks to the search committee for their time and effort.
5. Tuceryan asked if there were any modifications to the minutes of the Spring 2010 Faculty Assembly (April 2, 2010; see attachment FA\_SP10\_minutes.pdf). Raje moved that the minutes be accepted, Boukai seconded, and the minutes were approved unanimously.
6. Reports from the Dean's Administration
  - a. Bart Ng (Interim Dean). Ng noted that grant income and ICR have increased since last year. He announced that next year, David Skalnik (currently in IUSM) will succeed Jim Murphy, Associate Dean for Research. He mentioned that current enrollments are good, although not quite as high as the two previous years. He stressed that quality performance in the classroom by the faculty is essential to the future of the SOS. He noted that many of the previous issues raised about SELB1, while legitimate, were problematic because of budget constraints. Boukai encouraged innovative thinking with regard to funding for SELB2 and a basement for SELB1. Ng also sees the need for a basement in SELB1. Steve Randall commented on the difficulty of maintaining high quality instruction in the face of spiraling class sizes. Ng noted that SELB2 is primarily a classroom building and that the Dean's office has allocated more graduate student help for teaching. Boukai noted limiting resources and part-time instructors. Pratibha Varma-Nelson mentioned that the Center for Teaching and Learning is available to help faculty to develop means to deal with larger class sections. Ng noted that while faculty numbers are increasing, the increase does not match that of enrollment.
  - b. Jim Murphy (Associate Dean for Research). Murphy noted that the new Associate Dean will be aboard soon, and that Murphy and Skalnik will overlap for a period of time. He mentioned repurposing of existing space once the new building is occupied. In particular, the LD animal facility will be converted into space for Chemistry. The Dean's office will move into SELB2 upon completion. Departments with Purdue Ph.D. programs are writing requests to the IHEC to have these programs approved on the IUPUI campus (as opposed to PUWL). Murphy said that \$306,000 in RIF funds were

available, and that a new RIF proposal was being prepared. He noted that enrollment in M.S. and Ph.D. programs were up compared to last year.

7. Discussion of changes to P&T document and procedures [see attachments SOS P & T Guidelines 2005-09-02 version (with 2010-09-13 revisions).pdf, Proposed Change in Unit Committee Procedure on Presentation of Dossiers (2010-09-13).pdf, and Change in Voting Procedure of Unit Committee (2010-09-13).pdf]. Tuceryan explained the Steering Committee met on Sept. 13, 2010 to discuss the proposed changes. The relevant documents were circulated to the faculty in advance of the meeting. He noted that the last time the SOS P&T was changed, the SOS faculty voted to approve the alterations. He suggested that we discuss the current proposals at today's Assembly and again at the Spring 2011 Faculty Assembly to prepare for a vote shortly thereafter.
  - a. Ben Boukai noted that this timeline is sensible. He explained the need to make our presentation method of dossiers at the Unit Committee match that used at the campus level. He expects the Unit Committee to bring further suggestions to the faculty.
  - b. Michal Misiurewicz said he favors the current system of dossier presentation and disagrees with the proposed change to the voting procedure (where any faculty member may vote once and only once in the entire evaluation process). He also mentioned outside letters of evaluation, expressing the view that past collaborators co-authors should be able to supply letters within a few years of the end of the relationship with the candidate and that the SOS guidelines should be brought into alignment with the campus guidelines regarding this matter. Ng noted that this last issue is determined at the campus level.
  - c. Martin Bard explained that the proposed change to the dossier presentation method was intended to make the process more objective, which was a desirable outcome. He noted that the departmental representative on the Unit Committee could fill in any gaps if necessary.
  - d. Boukai mentioned the "arm's length" of the outside letter writers and form that the referees must complete explaining their relationship to the candidate. He reiterated his support for the change in the voting process.
  - e. John Hazer expressed the view that current presentation method has more positives than negatives.
8. Committee reports (see attachment Undergrad Ed Committee FA 2010.pdf)
9. Tuceryan adjourned the Assembly at 11:01 a.m.