

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Faculty Meeting

Tuesday, May 11th, 2010
2229 Seamans Center
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

In attendance: Dean P.B. Butler, N. Basu, N. Grosland, J. Fiegel, C.A. Guymon, J. Jessop, A. Kusiak, H. Lee, E. Nuxoll, J. Odgaard, G. Parkin, H. Raza, A. Scranton, R. Stephens, M. Subramanian, H.S. Udaykumar, R. Valentine, O. Zhupanska

1. The meeting was called to order by Dean Butler at 2:30 p.m.
2. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the December 16th, 2009 meeting of the faculty were approved without amendment.
3. Approval of Candidates for Degrees: The motion for approval of candidates for degrees was approved.
4. Old Business: Budget Update

Dean Butler presented a budgetary update

A summary of GEF budget reductions made since start of FY09 was presented. There was a \$1.1M net reduction in both the recurring and non-recurring categories. It was noted that Tuition and Fees (\$225.56M) exceeded Budget Appropriations (\$298.55M) for FY2010. Also, GEF funds increased in FY2010.

It was noted that undergraduate admissions and acceptance has gone up by approximately 10%. Dean Butler mentioned that proposals were written and funds appropriated to support these larger classes.

Sponsored program funding for Engineering was reported to have gone up by 95% in FY 2010 (\$35.63 M) compared to FY 2009 (\$18.23M), and was \$7M above the highest annual funding acquired by Engineering.

Faculty salaries were discussed in comparison to other Big 10 schools. It was noted that Assistant and Associate Professor Salaries were lower than the Big 10 average, while salaries of Full Professors were higher than the Big 10 average. So, in the mean, the salaries were at the mean of the Big 10 average.

For FY11, it was noted that the CoE has been allocated a 2% raise pool, and has been required to revert 1.5% of GEF budget to central administration. Staff raises of 2% were included in the FY11 budget, and all core course TAs were covered. It was noted that

CoE had a net available funds of \$700K that had to be prioritized. The three high priority areas were noted as:

- Faculty raises (0 – 6.4%)
- New Faculty Hires (0 – 6.6 FTE)
- Restore Departmental TA budgets (30 – 100 %)

Dean Butler asked for input to EAC to decide among these options.

5. A) New Business: Faculty Committee Reports

- a. Lectures Committee: It was discussed that there were a lot of lectures going on in the college and not enough connections between the groups to benefit from them. What is required for better communication between departments? It was discussed that a committee be formed to discuss ways to use the “Grabbing the Globe” money, have fewer speakers, and target some of the ABET topics.
- b. EFC Committee: N/A
- c. ITC Committee: Made requisitions regarding acquiring software.
- d. Promotion and Tenure Committee: Jacob Odgaard presented the findings of the committee. Questionnaire was sent out to DEOs seeking recommendation for procedures for reappointment of directors. The recommendation was that the procedure for reappointment of directors should be the same as that already followed for the reappointment of directors.
- e. Teaching Committee: Two charges had been to the committee. The first was regarding peer evaluation of classroom teaching. It was noted that different departments had different procedures for such evaluations, ranging from one to four consecutive visits. It was recommended that two consecutive visits be considered adequate for such recommendations. The second charge given to the committee was regarding increasing student participation in ACE surveys. It was recommended that (a) consolidate surveys from all courses into one, (b) move the survey a week earlier in the semester when the students are less busy, (c) a 10 point extra credit given on the last homework to participate - an experiment conducted indicated that it resulted in an increase in student participation close to 100%.
- f. Curriculum Committee: There were 4 tasks that were given to this committee. The first was to figure out ways to deal with TA budget cuts. The committee did a thorough analysis and came up with numbers that suggested that sometimes some sessions/courses had more students per TA than others. There was an ~ 10% cost savings possible if that was taken into account. The second agenda item was to look into the question of whether or not rhetoric should be continued as a requirement. The decision was unanimous that it should be continued as a requirement. However, there should be greater flexibility in what courses to take, and probably certain sections of rhetoric could be identified as engineering sections where more focused and relevant things could be taught. It was suggested that perhaps someone from HCTC could teach a course, which could then serve as a model. The third task was to review of Course Activity Report. There was a

general dissatisfaction with Math training and it was suggested that a Math Curriculum review committee be appointed. The LEaP initiative – It was suggested that a separate LEaP committee be established.

B) New Business – EFC motions

- a. Motion I: Revision of Policy for Evaluation of Associate Professors was passed
- b. Motion II: Approving the pursuit of a Pharmaceutical Engineering Degree Program was approved.

6. Announcements

- Voting results for three new EFC members were announced: Jon Kuhl, H.S. Udaykumar and Julie Jessop
- President Mason's visit to Engineering building on Thursday with an open forum at 3p.m. – faculty were encouraged to attend the ceremony
- Graduation on Saturday – faculty were encouraged to attend the ceremony
- Awards Banquet

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4 pm.