School of Science  
Spring 2018 Faculty Assembly  
Friday, May 4, 2018 9:00 AM ---10:00 AM  
Venue: LD 010

Attendees: Simon Rhodes, David Skalnik, Doug Lees, Jane Williams (Deans Office); Ted Cummins, Nick Berbari, Bonnie Blazer-Yost, Robert Yost, Ben Perrin, Pat Clark, Greg Anderson, Steve Randall, Randall Roper, Christine Picard, Xianzhong Wang, John Watson, Michael Yard (Biology); Keith Anliker, Brenda Blacklock, Gina Londino, Nick Manicke, Rob Minto, Partha Basu, Frederique Deiss, Pratibha Varma-Nelson, Lei Li, (Chemistry and Chemical Biology); Shiaofen Fang, Zou Xukai, Snehasis Mukhopadhyay, Rajeev Raje, Yao Liang (Computer and Information Sciences); Cam Macris, Thomas Rossbach, Pierre-André Jacinthe, Bill Gilhooly, Lixin Wang (Earth Sciences); Jytı Sarkar, William Geller, Jeff Watt, Carl Cowen, Luoding Zhu, Ben Boukai, Vitaly Tarasov, Honglang Wang (Math); Horia Petrache, Andy Gavrin (Physics); Stephen L. Boehm, Debora Herold, Peggy Stockdale, Tina Chen, Adam Hirsh, Michelle Salyers, Marian Logrip, Wei Wu (Psychology)

1. Call to order and adoption of the agenda
   - Randall Roper conducted the meeting.
   - Agenda was distributed via email and at the meeting
   - Agenda approved

2. Approval of Minutes of Fall 2017 Faculty Assembly (December 1, 2017)
   - Minutes were distributed via email and at the meeting.
   - Minutes were approved

3. Reports from the Dean’s administration
   - Dean Simon Rhodes
     - BBC Bolingo the gorilla video – our chem alum!
     - Abigail Parker from Roper lab was invited to present at the Posters on the Hill in Washington DC to help lawmakers understand the importance of undergraduate research. This is quite an accomplishment. Only 60 of 400 applicants nationally were accepted.
     - My thanks to Drs. Roper and Li for their great faculty leadership
     - My thanks to the ADs for their great work – representing us and fighting for us, saving us money.
     - Just had School Honors day – Khalilah Shabazz was speaker
       - In some schools, students, staff and faculty are honored separately but in the School of Science we celebrate our students, faculty and staff together in one place, at one time. Congratulations to all of the awardees.
I am proud of the Science community of students, staff and faculty that placed 41 students in the IUPUI Top 100.
We placed 6 students in the IUPUI Top 10.
And the Most Outstanding student was Priya Dave – there may be a technicality here but I say that we share her with Liberal Arts!!
The success of our students in Top 100 is because we have great students and because they are strongly supported by our great staff and faculty.
Four students from Science in the top 50 graduate students.
Science students won 10 Plater Medallions for Civic Engagement.
The outstanding work of Science faculty in education and research has been recognized by some prestigious awards this academic year:
\begin{itemize}
  \item Dr. Alexander Its was awarded the IU President’s Medal;
  \item Dr. Kathy Licht was elected Fellow of Geological Society of America;
  \item Dr. Jeff Ou was elected a Fellow of the American Physical Society and a Fellow of the Optical Society,
  \item Dr. Pratibha Varma-Nelson was elected a Fellow of the American Chemical Society and she also received the prestigious George C. Pimentel Award in Chemical Education in 2018.
  \item Michal Misurevicz – elected to Polish Academy of Sciences
  \item Lixin Wang - President’s International Research Awards (PIRA).
  \item Jason Meyer - IUPUI Outstanding Grad & Prof Student Mentor.
  \item Michelle Salyers - Outstanding IUPUI Woman Leader
  \item Keith Anliker - 2018 Chancellor’s Award Excellence in Teaching.
  \item Tamiko Porter - 2018 Glenn Irwin Excellence Award
\end{itemize}
I/O MS program just released its “rankings” issue of TIP, and check us out! #1 in program culture and top 10 across the board!
There are many more and congratulations also to our many faculty who have national and international leadership positions.
As a reminder... Commencement is coming up. On a Saturday no less.
\begin{itemize}
  \item This cycle, the IUPUI School of Science will proudly graduate 652 recipients of bachelor’s degrees – a record, 147 Master’s degrees – an increase, and 37 recipients of the PhD – one of our best ever numbers, for a total of 836 graduates – a record total. IUPUI is the campus that educates the most Indiana citizens and we are especially proud of the number of science and math graduates that we provide for the State. There are graduates this year from 52 of Indiana’s counties. 14 States. 41 countries.
  \item That’s a remarkably positive impact on Indiana’s economy. Thank you.
\end{itemize}
Fundraising update – thanks to Lindsay and Sarah
Philanthropy – the Bicentennial campaign now extended to 2020
Old goal set by IU: $8M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philanthropic Gifts</th>
<th>Non-Governmental Grants</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>$ Raised</td>
<td>% Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4M</td>
<td>$4,652,268</td>
<td>116.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New goal set by IU: $12.5M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philanthropic Gifts</th>
<th>Non-Governmental Grants</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>$ Raised</td>
<td>% Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.5M</td>
<td>$4,652,268</td>
<td>103.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Thanks to all of the faculty and staff who make philanthropic gifts to help the success of our students and our research. The matching program in the Bicentennial campaign proved to be a very strong incentive. We have some amazingly thoughtful and generous colleagues.
* LD SELB gap and SL safety discussion
* Enrollment is looking good so far for fall – credit hours and heads
* Thanks to the work our recruiters (Becky and colleagues) are doing, our “majors” numbers are strong – we have increased them 28% in recent years.
* A reminder (because floods and hard drive failures do happen)
  * Personal property – don’t keep it in your office
  * Use Box as a syncing and unlimited backup tool
  * Do not use private e-mail such as gmail for work business
  * Please use Canvas - EVC requirement – has important content
* Science on Tap 17-18
  * Andy Harris, Cam Macris a big success talking about making impacts around the globe
  * At Blind Owl Brewery, 5014 E 62nd Street July 19 Eva Pietri
    (happy hour from 5:30-6:30, talks beginning at 6:30)
* New building in design phase
* We only meet as a group about 3 times a year – fall convocation and fall and spring faculty meetings. I want to take this opportunity again to thank you for your work – I am proud to be your colleague.

* Associate Dean David Skalnik
* The SOS awarded 37 PhD degrees this year, comparable to the output of the School of Medicine.
* Research activity remains strong
  * Faculty received $9.1 M in research funding, up 54% compared to the previous year.
  * $2.5 M in ICR, up 67% compared to last year.
  * 4 of 13 IUCRG proposals from school were funded (~30% hit rate).
Since the fall assembly, SOS faculty have received about a dozen new federal grants.

Associate Dean Doug Lees, Budget highlights for 2018-19

**Income**
- Based on the results of 2017-18 we conservatively predict an increase in NR UG tuition of $825K and a total increase in student tuition & fees of $842K.
- Our ICR return for 2017-18 will surpass our $2.2M projection and we have set $2.7M as our projection for 2018-19.
- Our state appropriation increased by 0.6% ($49,045)
- Our assessments increased by only 0.7% ($195,831)
- As a result, our **budget is $1,185,216 larger** than last year’s.

**Expenses**
- SELB costs were reduced to $905,273 from $1.4M.
- Salary & FB costs are down ~$544K with 95% of the savings resulting from the delay in refilling TT faculty lines.
- In spite of our deficit we were able to fund salary increases (2%) in line with the majority of IUPUI Schools. (Cost ~$535K)
- The fee waiver line for the MSEP was increased from $2.1M to $2.5M.
- The MDRCB Proforma had us making a full payment of $770,573 in 2018-19. We questioned this and instead set aside cash ($362,903) to cover our portion of the debt service element (We assumed that the $22M in bonds had been sold.).
- As of 1 month ago we projected expenses would exceed income by $1,172,903. Adding back the amount temporarily cut from the start-up line last year our total shortfall was $1,828,762.
- As of two weeks ago we learned that the bonds for MDRCB had not been sold and, instead, the university would finance building construction using the $22M in cash **before** borrowing the second $22M. The draw down schedule places the transition to borrowed money in late fall of 2019. This means no payment for MDRCB in 2018-19, thus reducing our **shortfall to $1,465,959.**

**What does the future look like?**
Based on our recent experience and with the Marketing Team making this a priority, we anticipate further growth in NR students through the MSEP. We believe that in one more year, with careful spending, we could erase what remains of the $3.8M shortfall. We will also need to expand our budget to accommodate the costs of MDRCB starting in 2019-20 and beginning full payments ($801,704) the following year. Another caution is that we may have additional expenses for MDRCB in the form of furnishings, technology, and core equipment (this one for sure!). MDRCB is a larger, more people intensive building than SELB meaning more offices, teaching labs, etc. to furnish. Furnishing/technology costs for SELB were >$1M.
• Associate Dean Jane Williams
  • Campus has approved the new PULs. We will spend next year to implement the PULs and conduct training with faculty.
  • We finished the first year of Gen Ed review. 22 courses have been reviewed. It requires a lot of work from our faculty. Jennifer Lee and Jay Gladden will try to smooth the process a little bit. The review will resume next spring. I can always be a resource to provide some feedback if you need help.
  • We will be searching for a new web person to work in Lauren’s office; we are hoping to fill the position in the next a couple of months. Lauren and undergraduates working with her have done a good job. We are also down a career service person for a couple of months. An on-campus interview will be held next week. Hopefully, the position will be filled quickly.
  • In national evaluation for students’ satisfaction on academic and career advising, Science faculty come out as being really good. Please go back to your department to thank those academic advisers and career advisers as they have done some important job for us.

4. New business:
  • Representation on Indianapolis Faculty Council by School of Science
    School of Science now has four elected representatives on Indianapolis Faculty Council. Both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty are eligible to be elected to represent our school.
  • Potential changes to Science P&T guidelines
    a. Reports from Subcommittees on Teaching Excellence (Presented by Snehasis Mukhopadhyay) “IUPUI School of Science Criteria and Expectations for Teaching in Promotion and Tenure” (Snehasis Mukhopadhyay, Jeff Watt, Pratibha Varma-Nelson, Kathy Marrs, Keith Anliker, Debbie Herold)

I. Overview:

Teaching is a multi-faceted activity. Whether in a classroom or a laboratory, whether teaching a course to a large number of students or mentoring a student one-on-one, whether developing new curriculum or refining course material, whether researching innovative pedagogical methodologies or developing interventions to enhance students’ learning efficiency and experience – there are many dimensions to what constitutes an excellent teacher. Everyone remembers how their lives and their world views, whether in elementary school or at a university or just in societal interactions, have been touched by one or many outstanding teachers. In the School of Science, we do not just graduate students, we graduate success stories; that is, educating students remains and always will be the primary focus of our school with an emphasis on retaining and promoting effective teachers. In that context, this documents attempts to delineate the criteria and expectations for evaluating teaching effectiveness in the School of
Science at IUPUI.

The many different facets of effective teaching can probably be best described by means of the tree diagram located on the next page. While all faculty may not fulfill all of these categories, it is expected that the candidate dossiers will have representative activities spanning the categories, depending upon the area of excellence and the level to which promotion is sought. It is generally perceived that for those who seek to improve teaching, it may be a challenge with the P&T system that requires excellence in one area (teaching) and at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas. It may often be unclear under which category, research, teaching, or service, a specific academic activity represents. In this regard, which box is checked (excellence in teaching or in research) should not be a deciding factor if there is evidence that the total case merits promotion and/or tenure. Whether to term a P&T application to be under "research excellence" or "teaching excellence" for purposes of P&T, can be left up to the candidate and the relevant departmental chair based on what they think will best advance the case. This comes down to packaging the achievements between the various research, teaching, and service “buckets” to make the strongest case for the candidate – based on which box is checked. For faculty candidates in the area of teaching excellence, the standard assessments of classroom effectiveness and professionalism are prerequisites for the “Teaching” bucket, which should begin building a strong case for promotion.

Any “up or out” constraints on non-tenure track promotions should not be used. The School of Science has a significant number of lecturers who are not keen (interested?) on assembling a dossier for promotion due to various reasons (such as lack of incentives), but their students, colleagues, and chairs, recognize that these lecturers are very accomplished and committed teachers who are serving our students' learning needs very well. We should make every effort to retain such faculty who are making a difference for our students, irrespective of whether or not they are interested in advancement through promotion.
## II. Summary of Criteria

**School of Science Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Scholarship for Promotion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Promotion to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Load:</strong> Appropriate for area of emphasis and breadth of courses from freshman to graduate level, general education to specialized courses. This should include training of pre- and in-service STEM teachers in secondary and post-secondary education.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising and Mentoring:</strong> Evidence of advising or mentoring undergraduate or graduate students, senior projects, etc. Development of international student/faculty exchange programs.</td>
<td>P: Suggested. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni Evaluations:</strong> Evidence from or tracking of graduated students, job or graduate school placements, etc.</td>
<td>P: Suggested. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Letters:</strong> Evaluation from teaching experts at local/regional/national level, at a rank higher than the candidate, and who have reviewed teaching evidence included among the minimum 6 external reviewers.</td>
<td>P: Required - outside of dept. or regional. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required - arms length, national. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required - arms length, national. S: Suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong> Internal and external funding for teaching activities by peer reviewed organizations, competitive funding for instructional innovations, laboratory equipment, and course development. Active pursuit of funding with documented reviews.</td>
<td>P: Required - internal funding. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required - external funding. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required - national peer-reviewed funding. S: Suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning:</strong> Evidence of clear course goals with documentation of student outcomes and results while in rank. Results normed to other sections of course or historical outcomes.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Suggested.</td>
<td>P: Required. S: Suggested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Detailed Description of Criteria

The essential differences among the criteria for the various levels are as follows. For lecturers, "scholarship" (e.g., presentations at local workshops, conferences) is expected, and not necessarily peer-reviewed publications, whereas, for tenure-track faculty candidates, peer-reviewed educational publications as well as external/national (invited or contributed) presentations are expected. For the lecturers, small scale, internal grants are acceptable, but for tenure-track faculty major, external grant(s) are expected. The difference between promotion to associate and full professor levels in the tenure track, is that in the former, an "emerging" national reputation is expected, while in the latter, substantial and sustained scholarly activities are expected leading to continuing national eminence. Such scholarly activities, once again, include external grants, national-level presentations, and high-quality peer-reviewed publications.

Evaluation of teaching excellence must take into consideration the wide range of factors that influence student learning and success. This includes an understanding of the department's instructional mission, the teaching responsibilities assumed by the faculty member within their department and school, the discipline-based standards as well as departmental standards for student learning outcomes, the size, scope, complexity, and sequence of each course taught within the curriculum, the format of delivery, and the successful implementation of active learning and other discipline-based educational approaches. Effective teaching and learning may take place in a variety of settings: in classrooms, online, in laboratories, in the field, or in clinical settings. Faculty may be engaged in team teaching within or between departments, teaching that includes service learning or community engagement, or by teaching and mentoring undergraduate students, undergraduate peer mentors, and graduate students.
## Teaching Excellence Criteria

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**

### Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent performance for promotion to senior lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Contribution to the Department/School/University

A record demonstrating that a meaningful share of the Department’s teaching responsibility has been carried. Courses taught contribute to the Department’s teaching mission, and reveal an impact on both students and the Department’s academic program.

Documentation of contributions to **curriculum and instructional development**.

Examples of effectively **working with students beyond the classroom**, including mentoring students by directing independent studies, undergraduate research projects, service learning projects, internships, participating in or chairing student committees, directing undergraduate mentoring programs, through student advising, or with recognition of excellence through the School mentoring surveys.

## Feedback and Recognition Related to Teaching Excellence

Periodic **peer review** in more than one course over several semesters. Peer review should include more than classroom observations, such as the review of material including a course syllabus, tests or other assessments of learning, textbook or learning materials provided. Candidate critically reflects on feedback and considers it to make or adjust course decisions.

**Recognition** of teaching excellence or leadership in education by the University or in the surrounding region. Such recognition might include School, University, or system-wide **honors and/or awards** for teaching excellence, or offices held in the education programs of local or regional professional societies.

Solicits and considers **student input/feedback** and uses it as a part of the process to make decisions or changes to course design, classroom activities, assignments, and/or other assessments.

## Professional Development/ Scholarly Approach to Teaching

**Professional development** through reflective examination of teaching practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus and or disciplinary peers, with indicators of substantial positive impact on colleagues and/or positive peer assessment of these activities in demonstrating teaching excellence.

Evidence of **knowledge and application of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning** literature to course design, development of learning objectives, and teaching practices.

A record **demonstrating growth** to excellence as a teacher; this may include developing and improving course materials, devising and/or incorporating innovative, evidence-based, high-impact teaching practices.
Developing measurable student learning outcomes. “Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes specified by the unit and evidence that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided.” (include from Campus guidelines for TTF?)

Scholarly Dissemination of Knowledge

Documentation of scholarly activity as a teacher through dissemination of scholarship of teaching and pedagogy. This may include: giving presentations on teaching and pedagogy at conferences and workshops at the local or regional level; mentoring and/or contributing to the training of peers and colleagues; development and dissemination of descriptions of innovative or improved teaching materials or curricular practices in the discipline that are publicly disseminated; publishing scholarly materials pertaining to teaching (such as texts or manuals), journal articles, or educational reports.

Attaining grants or other funds at the department, campus, or regional level to support scholarly activities of teaching and pedagogy, to build teaching and curricular infrastructure, or to support undergraduate projects and program.

Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Satisfactory Performance: (p 19)</th>
<th>3. Excellent performance for promotion to associate professor</th>
<th>4. Excellent performance for promotion to full professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent performance at this level is evidenced by: (p.20)</td>
<td>Excellent performance at this level is evidenced by:</td>
<td>Excellent performance at this level is evidenced by:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution to Department/School/University: Courses Taught, Curriculum Development, a Implementation

c. A record demonstrating that a reasonable teaching load and a fair share of the Department’s teaching responsibility has been carried.
b. A record demonstrating that a substantial teaching load and a substantial share of the Department’s teaching responsibility have been carried. Performance must reflect an active record willingness and enthusiasm for contributing to, and an impact on both students and the Department’s academic program.
b. A record demonstrating that a substantial teaching load and a substantial share of the Department’s teaching responsibility have been carried. Teaching assignments should span several types and levels of courses. Performance must reflect willingness and enthusiasm for contributing, and a substantial impact on both students and the Department’s academic program.

e. Documentation of creative activity as a teacher.
d. Documentation of creativity as a teacher. Creativity must
Creativity may be documented, for example, by publications and presentations on research in teaching and success in obtaining grant support for this activity, and by descriptions of major innovations in existing or new courses.

be documented by publications and presentations on research in teaching, success in obtaining grant support for this activity, and by descriptions of major innovations in existing or new courses.

f. Documentation of improvement in the teaching of the discipline. This may include leadership in departmental curricular changes or papers on subjects relating to teaching presented to Indiana or other regional professional society meetings or other regional universities.

e. Documentation of improvement in the teaching of the discipline. This may include leadership in departmental curricular changes or papers and presentations relating to teaching presented to professional society meetings or other universities. **More than local or regional visibility is required.** Evidence could consist of papers or presentations to universities outside the Midwest to national and/or international meetings of professional societies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of quality teaching, advising, and/or mentoring (required for satisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Peer reviews</strong> documenting satisfactory teaching. For promotion to Associate Professor, at least two reviews must be completed during the evaluation period to document continued satisfactory teaching performance or improvement toward satisfactory teaching performance. At least one such peer review is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. A record demonstrating excellence as a teacher,</strong> through periodic peer evaluations (using procedures described in section 1b above) in <strong>more than one course over several semesters</strong> that documents growth towards the achievement of teaching excellence. In addition to peer evaluations, this should include contributions to new course development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. A record demonstrating sustained excellence as a teacher</strong> through peer evaluations in <strong>several courses over a period of several years.</strong> Letters from external reviewers and colleagues are also forms of valuable support and should be included in the appropriate section of the dossier. In addition to peer evaluations, this should include contributions to successful new course development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended prior to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third year review.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Student satisfaction</strong> measurements that are consistently favorable. (Some form of student satisfaction measurement is mandatory in every course taught by the candidate.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A record demonstrating <strong>quality</strong> teaching. In addition to favorable peer evaluations of classroom performance, this may include <strong>contributions to new course development and improvement of course materials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Peer Review... The completed review, using the Classroom Observation Report, will be shared with the candidate and the department Chair. The candidate will determine how best to represent the content of these peer reviews in the body of the dossier. However, copies of at least the minimum number of completed Classroom Observation Reports must be included in the appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Learning Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricular learning objectives should be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation or Evaluation</th>
<th>Documentation or Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of effectively working with students beyond the classroom, including mentoring students by directing independent studies, undergraduate research projects, service learning projects, internships, participating in or chairing student committees, directing undergraduate mentoring programs, through student advising, or with recognition of excellence through the School mentoring surveys. “Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.</td>
<td>of effectively working with students beyond the classroom, including mentoring students by directing independent studies, undergraduate research projects, service learning projects, internships, participating in or chairing student committees, directing undergraduate mentoring programs, through student advising, or with recognition of excellence through the School mentoring surveys. “Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Dissemination of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. A record of scholarly activity. This may include a list of published materials pertaining to teaching — texts, manuals, journal articles, etc. — as well as innovative curricular materials, participation in educational projects and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Recognition of teaching excellence or leadership in education by the University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Dissemination of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. A record of scholarly activity. This may include a list of published materials pertaining to teaching — texts, manuals, journal articles, etc. — as well as innovative curricular materials, participation in educational projects and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Recognition of teaching excellence or leadership in education by the University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or in the surrounding region. Such recognition might include School, University, or systemwide honors and/or awards for teaching excellence, or offices held in the education programs of local or regional professional societies.

**leadership in education.** Such recognition is expected to include national and/or international honors and awards for teaching excellence, and national and/or international offices or leadership roles in the education programs of professional societies.

Note that promotion to full professor implies that the candidate is recognized by his/her peers as a nationally and/or internationally recognized authority in his/her field of specialization.
I. PREPARATION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS  (p25)
The contents of Sections 06: Teaching, Section 07: Research and Sections 08: Service, of the Dossier are described in Sections J, K and L below. The Candidate’s statement (of up to 2 pages) on the chosen area of excellence must also be included in in the appropriate section. (p26)

J. DOCUMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING Section 06 of the dossier must minimally contain:

1. **Candidate’s statement** addressing his/her teaching philosophy (not to exceed 2 pages)—mandatory only if Excellence in Teaching is the basis for the current application for promotion and or tenure.

2. **A list of the courses taught** by the candidate since his /her last promotion or in the case of a new faculty member since his/her appointment at IUPUI. This list should contain the number, titles, and enrollments of courses, and be organized chronologically.

3. **Summaries of student satisfaction** measurements for all courses taught since the last promotion, or in the case of a new faculty member since his/her appointment at IUPUI. (If the last promotion preceded the School of Science mandate for performing student satisfaction measurements, summaries for all courses taught since the mandate must be presented.)

4. **A description of the diversity and variety of teaching** (course levels, sizes, majors, content) and of the level of difficulty of courses taught (required courses, non-major courses, complex subject matter, etc.).

The candidate’s teaching-related *awards, honors, grants, contracts, publications, and professional presentations* should be listed formally only in Section 09 of the dossier, and not again in Section 6.

This section may also contain documentation and evaluation of the following items, omitting reference to those that do not apply (this list is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive). Whichever items are included must be evaluated according to the criteria described in Section F above.

1. **Instructional materials prepared** (textbooks, laboratory manuals, statements of course objectives, software, course outlines, visual aids, etc.). [d.above]

2. **Contributions to course and curriculum development.** This may include a description of changes in courses taught more than once (text, emphasis, laboratory materials, examination format) to show both impact on the curriculum and development as a teacher. It may also include a description of how selected topics are presented and developed for different levels (e.g., thermodynamics for the freshman, the upper-class major and the graduate student) to demonstrate awareness of student level and adaptability to student needs. It may also include a description of how courses have been designed for specific students (majors, non-majors, etc.) and how these courses fit into the overall curriculum. [d.e.f. above]

3. **Courses for which the candidate has had administrative or supervisory responsibility.** Include a description of responsibilities. If applicable, include a description of teaching assistant training and supervision.

4. **Experimentation in teaching methods and techniques.** Include a description of teaching innovations and experiments to demonstrate creativity. [d.above]

5. **Special activities** which have contributed to teaching effectiveness. [d.above]
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Unusual features</strong> (such as having many research students, high student enrollments, or contributed to a large number of new course developments).</td>
<td>[b,d.above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Meetings</strong> (conferences, workshops, and institutes) and other programs attended.</td>
<td>[f,h,i. above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Impact on students.</strong> Include details, analysis and summaries of student satisfaction measurements, awards, and peer evaluations documenting teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>[g. above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Other items</strong>, such as documentation of a teaching reputation established beyond the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>[i. above]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I MIGHT ADD SOMETHING LIKE THIS FOR “EXCELLENCE”:** “Documentation of ongoing exploration, adoption and/or creation of **evidence-based instructional practices** - practices that have been scientifically shown (shown in the research literature) to increase student learning for diverse student populations.**

**Campus guidelines:**

**Faculty: Documenting Teaching**

1. Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or higher)
2. Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).  
3. Evidence of effective teaching through **scholarly dissemination of knowledge** about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.
4. Evidence that courses taught contribute to the **overall student learning outcomes** specified by the unit and evidence that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided.
5. Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.
6. Evidence of the **nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation** to enhance the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching is expected.
b. Report from Subcommittees on the P&T Process (Presented by Rajeev Raje)

The P&T Process Sub-Committee (“the Sub-Committee”), consisting of Profs. Barth, Decca, Goodlett, Stockdale, and Raje, was charged with comparing the SoS P&T Guidelines with the Campus P&T Guidelines and suggesting changes. The Sub-Committee met twice in the Spring semester, including a meeting with Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (“SAVCAA”) Ferguson. Following are the findings of the Sub-Committee:

1. There are inconsistencies between the guidelines and the typical process followed in the SoS and the Campus with respect to delivering the outcomes of each step to the candidates during the P&T process. In past, it was the Department Chair’s and the Dean’s responsibility to disseminate the letters from each appropriate Committee (i.e., the Primary Committee and the Departmental level and the Unit Committee at the SoS level) along with their own letters. Considering the typical delay that occurs between the creation of the Committee letters and the letters by the Department Chair/Dean, the need to respect independence of the faculty and administrative evaluations, and the right of reconsideration of the candidate in case of the first negative vote, the practice of delivering the letters together is neither appropriate nor pragmatic. Hence, the SoS P&T Guidelines need to be amended to separate the delivery of the letters – the Chair of each Committee (Primary and Unit) should be responsible for delivering their letter to the Department Chair/Dean and the candidate simultaneously, and each Committee Chair should insure that the candidate acknowledges receipt of the completed letter with a signature and date. This will allow for timely reconsideration in the specified 2 week period following the first negative vote at either of these levels.

2. After such a formal reconsideration request and associated documentation are provided by the candidate, the request needs to be re-evaluated (and re-voted) at all preceding levels of review. The outcome of such re-evaluation would be an addendum to the previous letters with a report as to the process taken to address the reconsideration request and whether the previous vote was changed.

3. In order to address points (1) and (2) above, the P&T cycle at the Department level should be initiated earlier than the current practice followed in the SoS. For example, the Primary Committee may need to convene at the beginning of the fall semester and the Unit Committee may need to convene in September rather than in October.

4. The Sub-Committee also inquired about the firmness of the campus deadline (typically end of October/early November) to submit the dossiers to the Campus P&T Committee. The Sub-Committee also asked whether that deadline could be moved to the end of November to accommodate any possible reconsideration requests and the associated process. SAVCAA Ferguson indicated that she will look into that request.
5. Currently, the SoS does not submit dossiers via the eDossier system until the review at the Unit level and Dean’s level is complete. This process allows candidates to address any comments made by various Committees and helps them to assure that their dossiers conform to the Campus P&T Guidelines before committing them to the eDossier system. SAVCAA Ferguson indicated that this is not the typical process followed by the other units on the campus – the use of eDossier system is initiated right from the beginning. She stated that she respects the SoS internal process as currently configured. However, she indicated that SoS may need to transition to early implementation of e-dossier in the future.

6. The Sub-Committee is in the process of drafting changes to the SoS P&T Guidelines and these will be presented to the Steering Committee in the upcoming Fall Semester.

7. Finally, the Sub-Committee, along with SAVCAA Ferguson, is exploring the possibility of offering an informal discussion session about the P&T process with candidates for the 2018-19 cycle and other interested faculty in the month of May.

8. The Sub-Committee concludes that the SoS process, as amended here, is functioning well. However, if the SoS decides to initiate a transition to implement SAVCAA Ferguson’s recommendation to use of the eDossier system, we should target a time no earlier than the 2020-2021 P&T cycle to have it formally established for all candidates seeking tenure or promotion. This procedure would require the candidate and the designated official (Chair or designee) to be responsible for uploading the approved dossier contents to eDossier in advance of the Primary Committee meeting. As discussed by SAVCAA Ferguson, using eDossier from the beginning of the process helps to prevent breaches in due process and can assure that the dossier will automatically route back to the appropriate committees if the candidate presents new information at any stage. This automaticity assures that process rules about reconsideration are followed with sufficient time for completion of reconsideration at all levels. SAVCAA Ferguson indicated that we could follow the current SoS process, but that a transition to align us with the Campus process has important procedural advantages. As an interim step, the Sub-Committee also recommends that candidates preparing for the 3rd-year review begin to use the eDossier format.
School of Science Standing Committee Reports Spring 2018

Unit Committee:

The SoS Unit Committee met on April 12, 2018. During that meeting, the Committee discussed the 3-year review cases and submitted its reports to Dean Rhodes.

A Sub-Committee created by the Dean and Chair of the Steering Committee was charged with identifying the inconsistencies between the SoS P&T guidelines and the Campus P&T guidelines. That Sub-Committee met a few times and also met with the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Margie Fergusson. A brief report based on these efforts is being created and will be sent to the Steering Committee soon.

Research Committee:

Currently reviewing applications for Purdue Research Foundation International Travel Grants, Summer Faculty Awards, and Research Grants.

Graduate Education Committee:

Approved proposal by the Departments of Computer and Information Sciences and Mathematical Sciences for a new Purdue MS in Computational Data Science.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:

During the semester, we met in person or electronically three times. The following items were approved:

New courses
- PSY-B434 Capstone Laboratory in Behavioral Neuroscience
- STAT-S351 Honors Introduction to Statistics

Course renumbering
- FIS 30101 Forensic Microscopy Lab and FIS 20100 Forensic Microscopy were separated the existing course FIS 30600 (change of numbering requested by PUWL Registrar)
- FIS 50101 Forensic Microscopy Lab and FIS 50100 Forensic Microscopy from FIS 50600 Forensic Microscopy (change of numbering requested by PUWL Registrar)

Degree requirements were adjusted
- Pure Math concentration course requirements in BS Math Degree (reduction of course choices in the Advanced Core)
- BS Chemistry majors: CHEM-C484 Biochemistry replaces CHEM-C384
- PSY 201 (Ivy Tech) transfers as PSY-B294

Courses Renamed
- Introduction to Molecular Biophysics PHYS 58500 was renamed Molecular Biophysics
- Biological Chemistry concentration in BS Chemistry is now the Biochemistry concentration

The revamping of PULs was discussed.