COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Faculty Meeting Minutes
May 9, 2005

1) The meeting was called to order by Dean P. B. Butler at 9:47 am in 3505 Seamans Center. In attendance were: Dean P.B. Butler, K. Abdel-Malek, J. Arora, L. Boyle, G. Carmichael, K.B. Chandran, L.D. Chen, S. Collins, K. Hornbuckle, A. Kusiak, M. Mackey, J. Marshall, T. Mattes, V.C. Patel, G. Parkin, A. Ratner, J. Reinhardt, D. Rethwisch, J. Robinson, J. Schnoor, L. Sun, C. Swan, G. Thomas, and J. Wiencek.

2) Minutes of April 19, 2005 were approved by voice vote, motioned by A. Kusiak and seconded by J. Arora. A. Ratner was commended for the quality of the minutes.

3) The list of graduates was approved with a motion to do so by S. Collins and a seconded by J. Marshall, followed by a unanimous vote of the faculty.

4) Committee reports were presented next.

   1. D. Rethwisch presented the curriculum committee report (see attached report).

   2. G. Parkin presented the promotion and tenure committee report (see attached report).

   3. L.D. Chen presented the teaching committee report (see attached report).

   4. M. Mackey presented the ad-hoc computing services committee report (see attached report). This included the recommendation to make the committee permanent (amending section 25 of the college bylaws), and was presented as EFC Motion 1.

   5. C. Swan presented the report of the ad-hoc committee on amending section 33 of the college of engineering bylaws (see attached report) in relation to procedures for selecting leadership of "other Units." This resulted in a written document that was presented to the faculty as EFC Motion 2.

   6. J. Reinhardt presented the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC) report (see attached report). The report included an addendum dated May 9, 2005.

5) With the completion of the report presentations, the faculty took up the issue of the two EFC motions.

   a) Discussion of EFC Motion 1, to make the ad-hoc commuting committee a standing committee so as to provide policy on college-wide computing and information management issues. S. Collins proposed a friendly amendment for a wording change, with L.D. Chen seconding the amendment. J. Marshall asked why we need such a committee and why should it report to the EFC. J. Reinhardt responded that the committee has been in existence for over a decade and that it formulates policy on faculty computing. G. Thomas added that the committee would represent the users (faculty) in

balancing CSS's natural conservatism. At this point a vote was taken the amendment of S. Collins, which passed with no opposition.

The debate continued with C. Swan asking if the committee should have budgetary authority. J. Reinhardt responded that since the committee discusses policy, budgetary authority is automatically included in the committee's creation. V.C. Patel asked what the interaction would be between this committee and the college's other committees. G. Thomas responded that most organizations have a CTO and this committee would function in a similar fashion. D. Rethwisch responded that such committees are not common across other colleges. J. Marshall stated that he thought that computing issues should be handled through a committee appointed by the dean, rather than one appointed by the EFC. M. Mackey responded that the college's research mission would be greatly served by the creation of this committee.

S. Collins reminded those present that the motion was to have a college wide ballot in the fall on the issue. V.C. Patel commented that he thought the research mission was not tied to what this proposed committee would accomplish. G. Thomas responded that the scope and breadth of research was broader than V.C. Patel's current vision. L.D. Chen proposed changing the committee's name to "Information Technology Committee." J. Marshall proposed to table the issue until the EFC has a chance to discuss it further since there appears to be a wide-range in interpretation of what is needed. V.C. Patel seconded the motion. G. Thomas responded that if the wording of EFC motion 1 was inadequate, then the faculty would reject it in the fall when it would be put to a college-wide ballot. J. Reinhardt called a vote on the motion to table, and the motion was soundly defeated. J. Reinhardt called a vote on EFC Motion 1 with amended wording, the motion passed.

b) The faculty next took up EFC Motion 2, relating to changing section 33 of the bylaws relative to other units. J. Reinhardt submitted an amendment to change wording to match that used in EFC Motion 1 and that found in section 32 of the bylaws. L.D. Chen summarized the motion. J. Reinhardt modified his amendment to include a deletion of "state board of regents" from the proposed motion wording as per the associate provost's recommendation. S. Collins proposed adding a sentence from section 32 of the bylaws to the motion wording. G. Carmichael proposed moving the second sentence of paragraph 2 to the end of the motion. S. Collins moved to strike fourth sentence of the motion, with J. Marshall seconding the motion. Motion passed. J. Reinhardt called a vote on the revised EFC Motion 2, and the motion passed.

c) Announcements: Dean Butler encouraged all faculty to attend the graduation brunch on May 15, 2005.

d) Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Ratner
Engineering Faculty Secretary