

Engineering College Faculty Meeting
DRAFT – Meeting Minutes
March 17, 2005

The meeting convened at 3:00pm in 3405 Engineering Building

1. Minutes of the Engineering College Faculty Meeting of October 14, 2005 were approved.
2. New staff members were introduced:
Dr. Carl Boehlert, Assistant Professor, CHEMS Department
Dr. Niell G. Elvin, Assistant Professor, CEE Department
Mr. Sean Fochtman, Specialist – Advisor, Undergraduate Studies
Ms. Amy Radford, Specialist – Advisor, Undergraduate Studies
3. On behalf of the Undergraduate Studies office, Ms. Anne Hornak provided an overview of several issues:
 - a. Undergraduate enrollment has decreased by 23% since Fall Semester 2000. The largest decreases are in the CPE and CSE programs.
 - b. The College will implement the new "admit when ready" process. The basic features of this program are:
 - A student is eligible for admission once five core courses have been completed and the student's great point average is satisfactory.
 - There is no waiting for the student to complete 56 credits.
 - This new approach will allow the College to handle "90% of the students early" rather than having all students wait "to make good decisions concerning 10% of the students."
 - This admission process is to be used as an enticement to attract new students.
4. Ms. Dana Moore, Assistant Director of Development – COE, and Ms. Bobbilynn Burns, Development Associate – COE, provided an update on the MSU Development Campaign and the All University Faculty and Staff Campaign.
 - a. As of March, the MSU Development Campaign has reached \$939 million of the \$1.2 billion goal, with \$50 million of that amount contributed by MSU faculty and staff.
 - b. The COE has reached \$177 million of its \$209 million goal, with \$2.7 million of that amount contributed by COE faculty and staff.
 - c. The top priority for the COE is endowment funds. There are a variety of ways that individuals, and groups of individuals, can contribute to endowment. Faculty and staff are encouraged to discuss possibilities with the COE Development Office.
 - d. A new "1855 Club" was announced. This is an opportunity for faculty and staff that requires a \$5,000 contribution over five years, \$1,000 per year, or \$84 per month. A key feature is that the donor directs how the contribution is used.
5. Dr. Rosenberg reported on a number of issues. Details of all aspects of his report can be found at <http://www.egr.msu.edu/egr/dean/minutes/faculty/2005- files/2005-spr-grad-res->

program.pdf. The report covers: graduate enrollment trends, degrees awarded, and application/admission/enrolled numbers; research productivity data; and university research foci.

- a. It is perceived that the recruitment/enrollment process for the College has been greatly enhanced by the departments' use of the Graduate Tracking System (GTS), phase 1. Improvements are being made to phase 1.
 - b. GTS, phase 2, used to track and work with enrolled students, is also of importance. Improvements are being made to phase 2.
 - c. The University Research Foci that are mentioned by Vice President Ian Gray are Health and Biomedical, Environment, Nanotechnology, and Family. At stake is the allocation by the University of research resources including some number of faculty lines to support these foci. The COE can work in the first three areas. The emphasis is on interdisciplinary approaches to research problems.
6. Drs. E. Patterson, S. Udpa and M. Hawley constitute a committee that is developing a College lecture series to begin next year. The general theme for the lecture series will be nanotechnology. Three lectures are planned. The speakers will be of "Nobel" caliber. The committee is working with industry to obtain financial support as sponsors for the lecture series.
7. Dr. M. Hawley is engaged in a project to establish a College of Engineering Faculty Scholars Program. A faculty scholar will receive \$5,000 in discretionary funds for five years. A faculty scholar cannot be someone who is already an endowed/chaired professor. The plan is to have 10 faculty scholars, with two new faculty scholars named per year. Funding for the Program would initially come from COE funds, and eventually from COE endowment. It is planned to begin this Program in 2005-06. Nominations from departments should be submitted to Dr. Hawley by April 1, 2005.
8. There were no reports from faculty serving on University Committees.
9. Dr. R. Lyles discussed a current review by a subcommittee of ECAC (Drs. R. Lyles, T. Grotjohn, and A. Wojcik) of the College Promotion and Tenure Procedures and the Faculty Handbook documentation in regard to these procedures.
- a. 2004-05 was the first year that the College had a single college-level tenure and promotion committee. ECAC has met with the college committee to learn of their experience and to gather information on what procedures need to be modified at the college level. It is recognized that several of the procedures as currently given in the Handbook are cumbersome, and confusing. Faculty are encouraged to send comments, suggestions, and questions to Dr. Lyles.
 - b. The intent is to complete the changes by the end of the current semester so that the reappointment, tenure and promotion process for 2005-06 will use the revised procedures/processes in an updated Faculty Handbook.
 - c. It was noted that the College Bylaws do not specify that the faculty votes on Handbook changes.
 - d. One question asked was how does the college committee's recommendations interact with the outcomes of the Administrative Group's deliberations? What

weight is given to the committee's outcomes relative to the outcomes of the Administrative Group? It was noted that both groups are advisory to the dean.

10. Dean Fouke provided an update on the College. She presented the slides that she plans to show at the forthcoming College of Engineering Advisory Board Meeting in April. Major points presented:
 - a. Status of faculty hiring.
 - b. Status of the budget. Five years ago, General Fund dollars covered 50% of all University expenses; now, it is 37%. New revenue streams are under consideration by the Administration.
 - c. Undergraduate student/faculty ratio. The University uses a different measure of this ration than does the College. The College follows the ASEE measure. The bottom line: both the University and the College need more faculty.
 - d. Status of College construction projects and renovation.

11. Mr. D. Evon, Director of MSU Contracts and Grant Administration provided an overview of the importance of the SER (Semester Effort Report) forms especially in light of an audit of all NSF funding for the past three years. It is important to note that the audit is an NSF Inspector General audit, meaning that the auditors represent Congress and NOT NSF. Additional details concerning the SER forms and the audit can be found at <http://www.egr.msu.edu/egr/dean/minutes/faculty/2005-files/2005-03-10.effort-reportprimer.pdf>.

12. Acting Provost J. Hudzik presented an overview of issues and future directions at Michigan State University. The theme of his presentation was challenges and opportunities for MSU. Key points of his presentation include the following:
 - a. Support for public college/university education by the State has steadily declined over the past 30 years. The financial burden has increased for the students.
 - b. MSU is seriously undercapitalized in its endowment. The endowment is currently at approximately \$1 billion. MSU needs an endowment of \$2 – 3 billion to augment its revenue stream to partially offset the decline of State support and the rising cost to students.
 - c. The public view of state supported higher education is shifting. It is more difficult to "sell" the need for the liberal arts as a part of every college educated person's experience.
 - d. The University needs to have flexibility to respond to the needs of the public for higher education. We are too tied to the semester system, as an example. The production and practice of higher education have not changed dramatically over the years.
 - e. The State of Michigan's Cherry Commission reports that the State must invest in universities as talent centers and must invest in research universities. If the State does not, economic development in Michigan will be severely curtailed.
 - f. MSU must make its case to the State Legislature that demonstrates that MSU is an engine of economic development.
 - g. The University is undergoing many changes in organization, over 45 major changes in the last year. Most changes have come from the faculty. Changes that

are interdisciplinary and cross-college are the ones attracting the most interest by the Administration.

- h. MSU needs to invest more in entrepreneurial activities to diversify its possible revenue streams.
- i. In a discussion with the MSU Council of Deans, he presented the case to increase the number of MSU by 200 – 300 faculty. The new lines would be in targeted areas that enhance instruction and student-oriented quality outcomes, enhance MSU's reputation and rankings, expand contracts/grants and entrepreneurial activities, and invest in emerging areas that we need to initiate now so that in 10 years MSU can be a major player.
- j. Engineering has been and must continue to be a key player in institutional initiatives to enhance MSU as an engine of economic development.
- k. The importance of computer science and information technology to MSU is critical. These areas need to cross unit boundaries and foster interdisciplinary work across the entire University.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

A. S. Wojcik