The 10/30/09 meeting of the CU-Boulder Engineering Advisory Council (EAC) had less attendance than normal, due to a snowstorm restricting travel. Nevertheless, a full meeting was held and provided lively discussion. Brief summaries of subcommittee reports and other discussion items are provided below. This summary report and also the PowerPoint slides presented for the Dean’s update may be found at http://engineering.colorado.edu/overview/advisory_boards.htm.

**Resource Development Committee:** An abbreviated RDC meeting was held early on 10/30/09 prior to the EAC meeting. Doug Smith reported on the Engineering Dean’s Club, which started in FY09 and will be expanded in FY10. Multiple levels, beyond the $1,000 minimum, were recommended. The ChBE/Biotech Building Subcommittee and Friendraising Subcommittee did not meet the afternoon before, due to the snowstorm, and teleconferences will be scheduled.

**Diversity Committee:** Frank Figueroa stated the overall goal of CU engineering demographics that mirror the state population. Associate Dean Jackie Sullivan presented background data and also described the BOLD (Broadening Opportunities through Leadership and Diversity) Center as an integrated effort to improve access, retention and performance. The main recommendations of the subcommittee are (i) benchmark successful programs, (ii) conduct focus-group sessions with students on strategies, and (iii) establish metrics to evaluate success.

**Education Committee:** Mike Wirth noted that discussion focused on the freshman experience and enrollment-limited majors. A possible alternative is an open-option first year for all engineering students, who would then declare their majors after the first year. Such a common year does not solve the need for enrollment limits but it does remove a disadvantage that current students face when choosing open option and then not getting into their majors of choice. It was recommended that we (i) review our data and the models of other schools for the freshman experience and (ii) create more flexibility for changing demands for different majors.

**Operations Committee:** Kristy Schloss reported that discussion and advice was provided on facilities, finances, and personnel. The main recommendations are to (i) define productivity metrics at the college, department, and even faculty levels that could be reported monthly or quarterly, and (ii) rebalance space allocations using appropriate metrics such as revenue per square foot.

**Partnerships Committee:** The partnerships committee had small attendance due to the weather. Mike Herriage reported three main recommendations: (i) the concept of a CU venture fund should be moved forward, (ii) our college should develop a leadership program, drawing on existing programs, and (iii) build on existing strengths in biotechnology and energy.

**Research Committee:** Dereje Agonafer reported that the office of the Associate Dean for Research is growing, as are the number of proposals and amount of research funding in the college. The committee also discussed CU’s new Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute (RASEI). Key recommendations include (i) our college should play a key role in RASEI, (ii) EAC members should help champion corporate relations for our college, including sponsorship of RASEI fellows, and (iii) we should seek to further
increase our research funding, which would help increase our rankings, and build on relationships in Washington, DC.

**State and Campus Budget Outlook:** Senior Vice Chancellor Ric Porreca made a presentation on CU-Boulder’s budget. Of a $1.1 billion annual amount, 42% comes from tuition and fees, 27% from research grants, 16% from auxiliary enterprises (housing, football, bookstore, etc.), and only 6% from state funds. There was a $22 million cut in state funding last year, and more cuts are expected this year. These cuts have been temporarily backfilled with federal stimulus funding, but CU-Boulder is making some permanent cuts as it does not expect state funding to be fully restored. EAC members recommended that (i) we continue to add faculty, who bring in revenue, and (ii) CU move ahead on a new model for higher education that does not rely on state appropriations and has higher tuition, provided that state control is relaxed.

**General Discussion:** General discussion included two questions: What can we do best? How can we improve our reputation and rankings? It was noted that research drives rankings, even at the undergraduate level, and that the college and campus should focus on strengths in areas of strength such as aerospace, biotechnology and energy. Specific recommendations made during the discussion and planning session include: (i) Doug Smith’s appeal that all EAC members join the Dean’s Club was well received, with many noting the importance of such discretionary funds, (ii) include a campus or system speaker again next time – Bruce Benson, if possible, (iii) provide pre-reads well in advance of the next meeting, especially for the subcommittees, (iv) too much time was spent on background in the subcommittees, which could be covered with pre-read materials, and more focus is needed in the subcommittee agendas and readouts, (v) a Washington, DC liaison is still needed, especially with agencies such as DOE and DoD where our college has less funding, and (vi) the next meeting should include a presentation on RASEI architecture, a report on the findings from a student focus group on diversity, and report on benchmarking of peers and how we are positioned for lead roles in energy and other areas. Dates were announced for the next several EAC meetings:
