

**Meeting Minutes**  
Executive Committee of the AFSE  
October 7, 2022  
12 noon via Zoom

Present: Brian Atkinson, Daniel Aukes, Nancy Cooke, Heather Emady, Shenghan Guo, Dianne Hansford (secretary), Vikram Kodibagkar, Anthony Lamanna, Hyunglae Lee, Pitu Mirchandani, Xiao Wang (chair), Guoliang Xue, Yong-Hang Zhang, Yanchao Zhang

Absent: Rosa Krajmalnik-Brown

Guest: Kyle Squires

Welcome New Members

The EC welcomed new members from TPS and MSN.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from September 6, 2022 were unanimously approved by the members who were in attendance at the meeting.

Dean's Dissertation Award

The EC discussed the evaluation method. Daniel suggested that the reviews be augmented by discussion with an advocate, as it is done at NSF panels. Yong cautioned against a dominant character serving as advocate, and instead, suggested that the process be as democratic as possible.

Pitu brought up the point that the EC recently redesigned the application to make it easier to evaluate. Now each application will have the same format. To take advantage of these changes, we should use the elements/criteria of the application in the evaluation.

Guoliang asked about defining conflict of interest (COI). Pitu commented that last year the EC did consider COI. For example, Rosy had a conflict, and she excused herself from all reviews. We have no formal definition of COI. Yong added that this topic is difficult to solve; we must assume that everyone can be fair. Guoliang suggested the following COI policy:

-- If you have a student, then you should be excluded from all evaluations.

-- If you write a nomination letter, you do not evaluate that student, but you can evaluate others.

Xiao asked the EC members to score the five elements of the application with 1 – 5 (best).

1. Nomination letter
  - a. addresses criteria in introduction of award
    - why this candidate?
    - provided comprehensive/candidate status info
2. Personal statement
  - a. addresses criteria in introduction of award
  - b. Why deserving of the award?
3. Abstract of dissertation
  - a. general quality

- b. broader impacts (Societal Impact/ASU charter)
  - c. intellectual merit (new or transformative knowledge, etc.)
- 4. CV
  - a. Publications related to dissertation
  - b. Publications not related to dissertation – demonstrating breadth
  - c. Service in field
  - d. Societal contributions
- 5. Recommendation letter

Each EC member will be randomly assigned 3 – 4 students so that each student will have 5 reviews. (By random, the EC meant that Dianne or Xiao will make the assignments to minimize bias in possible self-selected assignments.)

The scoring or ranking system was discussed. Some felt that scoring was the best method. Last year the EC used 1 – 5 scoring. Yong suggested a 1 – 3 system; Pitu thought that the 1 – 5 system would be easier to use by keeping with whole numbers and allowing for more spread.\* A ranking system was also discussed. Last year, the scores were mapped into rankings (highly competitive, competitive, not competitive) for the EC’s recommendations to Kyle as a means to smooth out inconsistencies in application of scoring by EC members. Some thought that ranking is sufficient and there is no need for scoring.

To avoid sharing scores before everyone has completed their reviews, EC members should email scores to Dianne, and then once all reviews have been received, she will enter them into the spreadsheet. The EC will discuss the results via email after that. Pitu made the point that the most discussion will take place at the middle ranking.

We need to know the total number of graduates so we can recommend 5%.

Kyle: we do not know the exact number of graduates, but an estimate. We can use that to get about 5%. There are some that are exceptional. The middle ones are harder. I need feedback/ranking to make these decisions. We want 5% of the whole year. This fall about 65-75; more than that in the spring. Thus 3-4 winners in this pool would be where we would end up.

The EC will suggest 3 - 4 to Kyle, using the ranking system in the spreadsheet: highly competitive, competitive, not competitive. Brian commented that the ranking “not competitive” is not a good term because they are all good.

\*The final decision on the scoring system was unclear to Dianne. After the meeting, Xiao and Dianne decided to communicate a 1- 5 system to the EC.

#### Dean’s Distinguished Lecture

EC members were asked to review the speaker list and consider if any on list should be recommended to Kyle. Do we want to select an area for the talk to narrow the choices?

### **ACTION ITEMS**

- Dean’s Dissertation Award suggestions to Kyle are due October 24.
- Dean’s Distinguished Lecture speaker suggestions prepared for November’s meeting.

Next Meeting

Friday, November 4, 2022, at noon

Location: [Zoom](#)