

J. Crayton Pruitt Family Department of Biomedical Engineering Faculty Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

(Minutes are in Red recorded by Lee)

Faculty Attendees: Kyle Allen, Minzhou Ding, Rougu Fang, Dan Ferris, Aysegul Gunduz, Ben Keselowsky, Pete McFetridge, Lee Murfee, Brandi Ormerod, Kevin Otto, Ed Phelps, Sarah Rowlinson, Blanka Sharma, Cheire Stabler, Hans van Oostrom, Lin Yang

(Meeting was led by Dan Ferris)

1. Call to Order

2. Guest Speaker - NONE

3. Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Vote: Unanimously Approved)

4. Important Dates to Note (mark your calendars!)

December 8 – Department Holiday Celebration

December 14 – BME Faculty/Staff Holiday Lunch

December 14-15 – UF/FIU Mini Symposium

Discussion Notes:

- December 15: graduation ceremony (Marshals for this semester are Dan, Sarah and Lee)
- Ed is off the hook until April! Ed will be ready!
- **REMINDER: The faculty strategy retreat is Thursday, December 7th at 2 PM**

5. Discussion Items

5.1. Items Requiring Action 5.1.1. Faculty Vote: BME Program Educational Objectives (Stephen)

Discussion Notes:

- (Cherie) Will they be or become leaders post graduation?
- (Dan) ABET wants what they will become 1-5 years out.
- (Cherie, Dan, Hans) – The text is in line with ABET text from other departments.

(Vote: Unanimously approved)

5.2. Safety (Pete)

Pete's Introductory Comments: "Nothing major has happened – It is all good!"

Discussion Notes:

- (Dan) Encourage students to get involved in the scavenger hunt.

5.3. Student Org Updates (All)

Updates:

- (GSC – Brandi) Coffee tomorrow and happy hour at the Swamp on Friday.

- (GRIP – Stephen) GRIP got some recent press and Friday is semester wrap-up discussion. Contact me for more details.

5.4. Department and COE Updates and Discussion Items

5.4.1. Faculty Search update (Dan/Lin)

Lin's Introductory Comments: A faculty candidate has been contacted by Christine, Dan, and Lin. Lin thinks she is serious about moving. Reminder – she is already an associate professor and her husband will be seeking an associate professor position in the college as well.

Discussion Notes:

- (Cherie, Ben, Dan) Positive comments regarding the candidate were made.
- (Dan) I like the quality of papers.
- (Lin) I have received 3 - 4 more names, but I will hold on.
- (Cherie) Are we waiting until we see what happens? What is the plan?

Outcome: Lin will move forward scheduling an interview for the faculty candidate. In addition he will sort the existing list of suggested candidates and vet through search committee and then decide to move forward.

5.4.2. Faculty Professional Development lunches (Dan)

Dan's Introductory Comments: Prior to me coming, there were workshop style lunches (i.e. group mentoring sessions, etc.). The question is do we move it forward?

Discussion Notes:

- (Ben) When initiated (years ago) the topics were more broad. More recently, they have been focused on research.
- There was discussion regarding mentoring workshops versus research focused meetings.
- (Brandi) Comments regarding professional development lunches offered by the college.
- (Dan) Christine is very positive on having the lunches.
- (Ben) When focused on broad topics (i.e. what they used to be) I did not go.
- (Cherie) I went and thought they were incredibly helpful.
- (Kyle) Some of the research ones were well attended and some were not.
- (Dan) We first need feedback on the workshops.
- (Cherie) I thought they were helpful, especially having transitioned from a private institution.
- (Dan) An idea would be for researchers to share grant successes.
- (Mingzhou) Noted that we used to do this.
- (Sarah) I would attend the workshops.
- (Rougu) Faculty interest will be based on the content.
- (Lee) A positive aspect is that the workshops will promote faculty interaction.

Suggestion: Shorten faculty meeting and incorporate at the end.

Outcome: Based on some positive support, Dan will talk to Christine, and possible survey the faculty.

5.4.3. Budget recommendations (Dan)

Dan's Introductory Comments: Much appreciation for Christine and Zac!!!! We have a budget surplus. A suggested use of the surplus would be invest in teaching design space. Is there core equipment that needs updating or replacing? How should we spend the surplus?

Discussion Notes:

- (Brandi) NEB needs a copier etc.
- (Mingzhou) There is a need for large data storage.
- (Aysa) Or the department could pay for HyperGator.
- (Kyle) Teaching space in NEB is terrible. The other one – imaging facilities is limited on campus.
- (Ben) There is a departmental flow cytometer that keeps breaking!
- (Lin) Biomedical data sciences needs data storage space or a server. We need a room or extra space.
- (Hans) BME used to have a computing space. This became a burden.
- (Kevin) We need a new computer projector in this room.
- (Cherie, Brandi) The confocal will not last much longer.
- (Brandi) There is a need for class space.
- (Kyle) The issue with long walks to classrooms can be partially attributed to us getting in our requests late.
- (Sarah) Has the department ever considered undergraduate TAs.
- (Ben) Is there an opportunity to invest the money to generate revenue moving forward?
- (Dan) The more money we put into the endowment, we get less money from the dean.
- (Pete) If we sink money into the rooms, we should get assurance that we can use the rooms moving forward.
- (Dan) If there a reason to visit program officers, you can request support from Christine.
- (Dan) Also, we can use the money to upgrade the website. (Multiple, hands went up in support).
- (Cherie) There is a disincentive to the PI for students receiving NSF F31's.
- (Ben) We need to fix this for the T32's immediately.

Outcome: We will look into renovating space and getting a commitment, we will solicit group proposals. There was also support for website upgrades.

5.4.4. UG Coordinator update (Dan)

Dan's Update: David Gilland is moving his appointment to the medical school. This move is motived, related in part to the changes to the medial physics program. Sarah will be the new UG Coordinator as of Jan 1.

5.4.5. UG Admissions update (Kyle)

Kyle's Update: I will be looking at ABET electronic folders starting next week. I will send a reminder. We changed how we do admissions and now there is an appeal process. Denials can be revisited in November. We review applications in September. Students can appeal in November. After November, decisions are final. Approximately, 103 students have been accepted.

5.4.6. GSPA model (Cherie)

Cherie's Introductory Comments: I will be sending out emails soon regarding Fall 2018 recruitment needs. Please identify max and min needs. We still do not know what the allocation from the graduate school will be and have only gotten 50 total applications so far.

Reminder: Discussion of GSPA models (split or unsplit) – last faculty meeting. The issue of the “awards” versus “all but 1-2 students feeling left out” was debated.

GSPA MODEL SELECTION

Discussion Notes:

- Ben's One question: Can we find half of 10-12 students that are worthy for a GSPA?

Vote:

Move to Unsplit Model (Yes = change) = 14;

Stay with Split Model (No = no change) = 3;

Abstain = 0

OUTCOME: Move to Unsplit Model (Yes = change)

STUDENT SELECTION PROCESS

Discussion Notes:

- Awards must be to the STUDENT. However, we could make the awards contingent on working with a specific faculty.
- (Kyle) Do the faculty make decisions or is it really up to the chair? My concern with the Unsplit model is that we will land in a majority rule scenario influenced by research areas.
- (Kevin) Popular vote by the faculty has never been discussed by the council.
- (Lin) How to make decisions about how students are selected?
- (Ben) A concern is that you are going to get an accumulation in a lab. We need to have the ability and flexibility to make changes. We still will be differentiating between students who do not have tangible differences. We need a formal way to spread out awards.
- (Cherie) There is so much randomness associated with recruitment, acceptance of awards, and eventual student fate.
- (Pete) Reinforced concern.
- (Kyle) Another scenario is that students only come to work with a specific faculty member. My preference is that a recommendation is made and the chair makes the call. I think the chair's input is important. Nominations should go the chair.
- (Kevin) At Purdue, students typically had 2 nominations.
- (Aysa) Junior faculty are at a disadvantage during recruiting.

First Vote:

Option A (GPC (+ Public Input) to chair): 5

Option B (Faculty Nominations to GPC to Chair): 3

Option C (Faculty Nominations to Chair): 6

Abstain: 0

Second Vote:

Option A (GPC (+ Public Input) to Chair): 6

Option C (Faculty Nominations to Chair): 9

Abstain: 0

OUTCOME: “Faculty Nominations to Chair” process was selected.

5.4.7. Awards Committee update (Kevin)

Kevin's Update: BME did not have a nominee for a “doctoral dissertation” award this year. There were 5 nominees and 5 awards. We need to nominate more and we can win!!!

5.4.8. Administrative & fiscal updates (Zac)

Zac's Introductory Comments: THANK YOU for p=card compliance. Submit travel requests in advance of your travel. Don't forget! All receipt/invoices needs to include the necessary information! Other reminders were made.

A slide was presented detailing the Financial Origination for the college – Comparison of HWCOE Units. BME has the second highest in # of transactions (less than 200 transactions behind the “biggest” department). BME has the highest # of Transactions/FTE.

Question for Discussion: Is the faculty OK with hiring a new fiscal person?

Discussion Notes:

- (Kyle) We need to make sure that decisions are not made on the expense of other needs.
- (Cherie) Is the department doing too much? Is there anything PI's can do to relive stress?

5.4.9. BME seminar grad class (Dan) **NOT DISCUSSED** due to time

6. New Items (all) NOT DISCUSSED due to time

7. Adjourn

Committees Not Responding/Reporting:

Executive Committee (Jon); Tenure & Promotion Committee (Mingzhou); Seminar Committee (Blanka); Research Committee (Ben)