

Committee Summary of the  
Report of the Committee to Evaluate  
Richard McCullough, Dean  
Mellon College of Science

Report Date  
December 14, 2005

**1. Introduction**

The Committee to Evaluate Richard McCullough, Dean of the Mellon College of Science, was established by Mark Kamlet, Provost, in September 2005. The charge of the committee was to prepare a report to be used in consideration of the possible reappointment of Dean McCullough. The members of the committee are:

Randall Feenstra, Professor of Physics,  
Paul Karol, Professor of Chemistry,  
Jonathan Minden, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences,  
Steven Shreve, Professor of Mathematical Sciences, Chair of the Committee.

**2. Process**

Members of the committee met with:

Richard McCullough, Dean of Mellon College of Science,  
Robbee Kosak, Vice-President of University Advancement,  
Fred Gilman, Head of the Department of Physics,  
Hyung Kim, Head of the Department of Chemistry,  
Elizabeth Jones, Head of the Department of Biological Sciences,  
Roy Nicolaides, Head of the Department of Mathematical Sciences,  
Gregg Franklin, Associate Dean of MCS,  
Rebecca Freeland, Associate Dean of MCS and Associate Head of the  
Department of Chemistry,  
Eric Grotzinger, Associate Dean of MCS,  
Sharon McCarl, Associate Dean of MCS,  
Amy Burkert, Health Professions Program Director,  
Irene Fonseca, Director of the Center for Nonlinear Analysis,  
Michael Levine, Director of Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center,  
James McClelland, Co-Director of the Center for the Neural Basis of  
Cognition,  
Alan Waggoner, Director, Molecular Biosensor and Imaging Center,  
Russell Walker, Associate Head of the Department of Mathematical Sciences.

In addition, the faculty of the Mellon College of Science were notified of the formation and membership of the committee, and they were invited to contact committee members. A few members of the faculty did so, and the committee sought out a few other members of the university community for conversation.

### **3 Summary of findings**

The unanimous and nearly unequivocal opinion of the people named above is that Richard McCullough is an extremely effective dean. He acts strategically and is supportive of the programs and faculty in the college. The department heads report that he represents them very well. He has an impressive grasp of the science in the college and is an effective spokesperson for the whole college. Department heads and center directors report that he gets resources when needed and does not meddle. He has backed heads when personnel issues arose.

Under Richard McCullough's leadership, the strategic plan of the college of adding faculty in the Departments of Chemistry and Biological Sciences has been implemented. At the same time, Mathematical Sciences and Physics report that Dean McCullough has been supportive of their aspirations. Dean McCullough has invested himself personally in a strategy of maintaining close contact with alumni and friends of the college, and his performance has been superb. He speaks effectively about the broad range of science in the college, relying on faculty expertise when appropriate. On matters of diversity in hiring and program development, Dean McCullough has been supportive and realistic. He created the new position of Associate Dean for Special Projects, and many of these "special projects" touch on diversity issues.

In conversations with faculty, the committee identified some issues facing the college in addition to the well-known challenges of space and quality of space, research funding, development, and recruitment and retention of highly qualified faculty. One of these is a growing concern about matters related to undergraduate education, including the core requirements, the reduced course load for first-semester students, the preparedness of incoming students, and perceived side effects of the drive to increase retention. Another is the growing demand for computing resources. To address these matters, the committee sees a need for good communication among the Dean and other members of the college. In addition, college members who are assigned tasks need to have a clear charge and need to be confident that their labor is consonant with a commonly held goal.