

---

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**  
**Faculty Meeting Minutes**  
**December 14, 2005**

---

- 1) The meeting was called to order by Dean P. B. Butler at 2:15 pm in 3505 Seamans Center. In attendance were: Dean P.B. Butler, A. Scranton, A. Ratner, R. Stephens, W. Krajewski, R. Ettema, C. Beckermann, G. Parkin, L. Weber, W. Nixon, R. Valentine, T. Mattes, J Reinhardt, S. Collins, H.C. Wu, L.D. Chen, G. Thomas, J. Lee, C. Swan, G. Constantinescu, G. Christensen, J. Kuhl
- 2) Upon a motion to approve the minutes of the May 9, 2005 meeting, J. Reinhardt indicated that the statement “the [Ad-Hoc Computing Services] committee has been in existence for over a decade” was inaccurate, and that the time period in question should be changed to “a few semesters”.

The motion to amend the May 9, 2005 minutes was approved by voice vote.

- 3) A. Scranton distributed a list of COE candidates for degrees from the registrar. S. Collins made the usual motion to approve the list and it was approved by unanimous voice vote.
- 4) Dean P.B. Butler indicated that he introduced three new faculty members at the last State of the College Address, and repeated the introductions. The new faculty members include:
  - Mani Subramanian, Professor in CBE and Director, Center for Biocatalysis and Bioprocessing (CBB)
  - Pavlo Krokmal, Assistant Professor in MIE
  - Xiaodong Wu, Assistant Professor in ECE

Dean Butler also introduced Tim Mattes, Assistant Professor in CEE, as the Secretary for the Faculty for the 2005-2006 Academic year.

- 5) S. Collins stated that the issues as to precise definition of “Voting Faculty” are to be decided via Manual of Procedures and past practice. A list of non-voting faculty will not be presented for two reasons: It is difficult to produce an accurate list, and a list, if produced and approved by the faculty, could not be used because no email addresses or mailing labels are provided. Therefore the EFC decided to defer production of a list of non-voting faculty. It was indicated that Doug Eltoff will take care of generating the list.

With regards to the Voting List, it was stated that there was no need for a motion, but that this list was worked over and a vote was required. The Voting List was subsequently approved by voice vote.

- 6) Old Business: none was discussed

7) New Business:

- a. R. Stephens voiced his opinion that, eventually all students will have the solution manual to problems in any faculty's particular textbook. In his class, all the students wanted to have the solution manual, so he decided to let them and also decided that the grading the homework should be reduced to a "check" only, which indicates that the student had completed and turned in the homework. The relative contribution of the homework grade should also be reduced because of the availability of solutions. Quizzes were used in lieu of homeworks for grading. Apparently, the use of quizzes worked so well in this case that the students overwhelmingly supported receiving quizzes instead of having to solve homework problems.

R. Stephens wondered about how to solve this issue. Should quizzes be continued or new problems developed that are not coming from the textbook? R. Ettema questioned whether the students were actually doing the homework. R. Stephens replied that, in general, yes they were, but that in one situation, the solution manual was wrong and many students subsequently got the homework problem wrong because they copied it verbatim from the solution manual. W. Nixon wondered how this situation relates to ethics issues. S. Collins responded that the EFC will soon be examining academic misconduct issues. R. Stephens suggested that the philosophy on ethics is imaginary. S. Collins indicated that he was disturbed that students were just copying the solutions. Discussion continued on possible ways to circumvent copying of homework. P.B. Butler suggested that the faculty should be made aware of electronic access to solution manuals and that it was prudent to be aware of the situation. This comment basically ended the discussion of copying from solution manuals.

- b. The discussion moved on to the next agenda item, the EFC motion revising COE Promotion and Tenure (P&T) decision making. S. Collins provided a handout that detailed the motion. The goal of the motion was to resolve conflicts between University policy and COE policy. R. Stephens asked the meaning of a simple majority during AFG voting. In his experience, candidates more or less require a unanimous vote of the AFG, and that those candidates receiving something like a 7 to 6 vote in the AFG get denied tenure. S. Collins replied that, in general, a 2/3 vote is required for a positive P&T recommendation and did not feel that the amendments will change the way COE handles P&T. P.B. Butler agreed with this assessment. R. Ettema indicated that he is more familiar with the term "DCG" or "Departmental Consulting Group" instead of AFG. S. Collins responded that an attempt is being made to merge the two documents (UI policy and COE policy) as best as is possible, and that perhaps eventually DCG will replace AFG.

A. Scranton asked about Item 5 in the Motion – should issues with confidentiality be considered in this item? Rapid discussion continued on this topic with many faculty voicing opinions. The general consensus was that P&T candidates should not have access to their promotion file – ever. R. Stephens voiced concerns over faculty inadvertently having access to their file. It was suggested by C.

Beckermann that even though P&T files are stored in a locked cabinet, that perhaps there should be a separate locked cabinet for faculty dossiers that are no longer under consideration.

W. Nixon questioned Item 2 of the Motion. What if someone broke their leg and cannot make the P&T Meeting to vote? Are they out of luck? S. Collins replied “that’s how I read it.” W. Nixon responded, “As my grandmother says, ‘That’s news to me’.” R. Ettema stated that CEE has a closed balloting system that allows votes from absentee faculty to be read at the P&T meeting. It was generally agreed that the language in Item 2 was ambiguous. P.B. Butler suggested that perhaps EFC should look into this issue and interpret the language soon, but confirmed that no motions were on the floor to make any amendments to the original motion. S. Collins also agreed that whether or not faculty are to be present at a P&T meeting to vote is an important issue to clarify because if we don’t follow our own rules we lose grievance cases.

The EFC motion to Revise COE P&T Policy was approved by voice vote. P.B. Butler reiterated his opinion that the issue as to the presence of voting members of P&T committee should be considered soon.

- 8) P.B. Butler announced that Randall and Barbara Meyer have generously donated \$1 million to support the Honors Program in Engineering.
- 9) The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy Mattes  
College of Engineering Faculty Secretary