

Executive Committee Meeting Notes
March 6, 2020

Present: Rosa Krajmalnik-Brown, Samantha Brunhaver, Michael Goryll, Marcus Herrmann, Rod Roscoe, George Pan, Dianne Hansford (Secretary)
Absent: David Brafman, Christopher Buneo, Tony Lamanna, Doug Montgomery, Sefaattin Tongay, Yalin Wang,
Guest: Dean Kyle Squires

1. **Minutes** of the January 17, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously.
2. **Discuss Langer Visit.** Very positive feedback with respect to the quality of the talk and the insights. The lecture was more about innovation – you can fail a lot and still succeed. Persistence is key. Sometimes you get lucky when making connections. His liaison with doctors and students was crucial. Only positives on this lecture has been heard.

Any changes to process? Key to these visits is the time of year. Earlier in the semester is better. The speaker's schedules are going to drive it. It would be good to have someone in place by the middle of February.

The Executive Committee website has been updated to include a page that contains information pertaining to the Dean's Distinguished Speaker. Included is a "button" that can be used to submit recommendations for the names of future speakers. See the link:
<https://assembly.engineering.asu.edu/deans-distinguished-lecture/>

If we opened the lecture up more broadly could we use a different venue, i.e., Gammage? The dynamic in that room enables conversation. If we broke away from CAVC we'd have to think that through. Maybe we could try to get a lecturer to stay for 2 days and do two lectures – one for faculty; one for students. Sam suggested adding a live link for Poly.

3. **Discuss Dean's Dissertation Award Process.** The goal of this process is to celebrate Ph.D. student research and to raise awareness in addition to providing job-seeking students with another recognition to put on their CV. It was suggested that if we have numerous worthy recipients, we should increase the number of awards presented. At a minimum, one candidate per school would be ideal.

Some ideas for enhancing the process include having the students do a small presentation to the EC as part of the selection process, holding a poster session during the distinguished lecturer reception (and invite the visiting speaker to visit the poster session). Additionally, ensure the finalists are recognized in some way. A school could have multiple finalists, but only one winner. Ph.D. recruitment day could be used to help identify candidates for the award.

It was suggested that a similar process be developed for the Master's level students. This award should be distinct since Master's research has a different set of objectives than Ph.D. research. It might be more appropriate for these awards to be given within the schools.

The decision was made to make 1 award per school, but each school can present as many finalists as desired. An outline of the candidate and selection process should be created, clearly describing the new process and deviations from the old process. This information will be posted on the EC website under a new link for the Dean's Dissertation Award. The schedule will remain the same, August 1st announcement and October deadline.

ACTION ITEMS:

Create a summary of the process and changes for review during the April meeting.

Create a webpage for the dissertation award that may be used to communicate the award.

Kyle will have a conversation with the school directors.

4. **Report on Non-T/TT Faculty Serving as PI's.** The EC sent a memo to Dean Squires asking for clarity regarding non-T/TT faculty serving as PI's. What is the current status of the University on this and is there any feedback from Engineering? There seems to be a disconnect in the University and FSE policies. Can non-T/TT faculty serve as PI's?

Dean Squires commented on the memo:

This proposal has to be fragmented around lecturers and POPs versus other titles. With lecturers you're going to suggest that research becomes a set of their responsibilities which creates more conversation. Lecturers are basically doing teaching and professional development. This is the idea – we have mentoring responsibilities with FURI and Barrett students; involvement at the Master's level applied projects. We have a large demand for mentoring students to do research at the undergraduate level. We need to understand how we assess that; estimate that load. A lecturer's nominal load is 80% teaching; 20% service.

For faculty evaluations we have this annual challenge in some cases when faculty go through the evaluation process where lecturers are being evaluated on their research which isn't a formal part of their job. It creates confusion. If we open that door we create more tension. The Dean needs to understand impacts and how Barrett, etc. does it. We need to separate lecturers from other titles. If a lecturer participates on that committee, great. Everybody has a FAAR form. A different form for lecturers will be created, recognizing their role as teachers and the professional development that they do. We may end up having to separate groups that evaluate T/TT faculty vs. contract faculty. It's not what we currently do but it is connected.

Could lecturers do service-oriented research -- something that doesn't impact the teaching piece? Lecturers have to convince us of their 80% teaching/20% service commitment evaluated by group of their peers. They have to take the outcomes of that research. We would say it got cited. They need to make the argument about how it contributed to their professional development. The publication is the principal goal. For the lecturer it will make them a better

teacher. This should play a role with evaluations. We need to do a better job to provide lecturers more opportunities to grow including connections into a research program. We'll make them better and smarter and also retain them.

Lecturers should not be a PI but can participate or advise Master's theses. Lecturers can discuss changes to their workload during their evaluation process, i.e., "I'd like to do more research." PoPs are in same bucket. The title is intended for people who teach. This shouldn't be an issue with research professors. What is the scale of the opportunity? What is the number of research professors in the Fulton schools? Are there other hybrid non- T/TT positions? (PoPs are hybrid, but closest to lecturers.) Give people the opportunity to expand their responsibilities. Good examples of a hybrid would be a post doc or an instructor. Can we get a proposal on the research titles for both PI and Master's? Please revisit memos on Lecturers Master's thesis chairing and PI.

ACTION ITEM:

Revisit memos and re-submit to Dean Squires

5. **Discuss PNAS article.** Postpone to next meeting.
6. **Other items from EC Members.** None

Next meeting: April 3, 2020

12:00 – 1:00 PM; BY-420

via Zoom

<https://asu.zoom.us/j/260546017>