SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
CU Engineering Advisory Council Meeting on 4/23/10

The 4/23/10 meeting of the CU-Boulder Engineering Advisory Council (EAC), as well as the meeting of its Resource Development Committee the prior afternoon, had lively discussion on moving the College forward. Brief summaries of committee reports and recommendations from the general discussion are provided below. This summary report and also PowerPoint slides from the Dean’s updates are archived at http://engineering.colorado.edu/overview/advisory_boards.htm. The next meetings of the EAC are 9/24/10 and 4/22/11. The Engineering Scholarship Banquet is scheduled for the evening of the 9/24/10 fall meeting, and the Engineering Awards Banquet is scheduled for the evening of the 4/22/11 spring meeting. For both meetings, there will be a dessert reception the evening before preceded by the Resource Development Committee meeting in the late afternoon.

General Discussion: Recommendations during the general “good-to-great” discussion include:

1) Bolster CU Engineering participation in RASEI (Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute), and develop strong ties with NREL (National Renewable Energy Laboratory) and the planned ConocoPhillips technology and learning center nearby.
2) Weave together college strengths in energy, globalization, and Engineering for Developing Communities, including a focus on low-cost, sustainable water and energy for underdeveloped countries.
3) Develop a consistent message with mass-market appeal, including materials to send schools and reporters.
4) Provide more scholarships.
5) For the next EAC agenda, include fewer topics and more dialogue, and ask for an update by the Chief Financial Officer.

The results of the “clicker” votes are (the number of votes for each item is in parentheses):

Which one of the following three educational areas do you feel has the greatest potential for moving CU Engineering from good to great?

A. Active Learning (5)
B. Engineering for Global Society (10)
C. K-12 Engineering Education and Inclusion (10)

Which one of the following three research areas do you feel has the greatest potential for moving CU Engineering from good to great?

A. Aerospace and Engineering and Science (6)
B. Biotechnology (7)
C. Energy & Environmental Sustainability (14)

Education Committee: A task force is examining improvements in the first-year experience. The Honors Program has had great success and leadership, but discipline-specific honors courses are lacking. A multidisciplinary honors course in the sophomore/junior year is recommended, perhaps in the area of
leadership and ethics with leveraging of E-ship (Engineering Entrepreneurship) and a new leadership seminar. The E-ship program was endorsed, with a recommendation to seek endowment support.

**Inclusive Excellence Committee:** We made good progress this year, but still have a long way to the goals of 50:50 gender parity and 33% underrepresented-minority participation. Currently, 21% of our undergraduates are women, and 8% are underrepresented minorities. It is recommended that a Summer 2010 retreat be held, to create a 10-year plan for inclusion. Also, since studies show that grants/scholarships versus loans increase minority graduation, an EAC-driven endowment for need-based scholarships is recommended.

**Operations Committee:** CU Engineering has substantial space needs, due to growth in enrollments (+10% undergraduates and +20% graduate students over the past three years) and research (+66% grant funding in the past three years). It is recommended that the campus complete the entire Biotechnology Building as quickly as possible and that classroom and office space in the old Fleming Law building be made available in the next few months. The EAC leadership will write a letter to Chancellor DiStefano on this subject. It was also noted that retirement incentives have been very successful, which provide opportunities for strategic reallocation.

**Partnership Committee:** The concept of a Technology Venture Fund based on co-investment opportunities in CU spinoff companies was endorsed by the committee. It is recommended that CU move forward with this concept. The discussion of a proposed Engineering Leadership Program led to the recommendation that an Engineering Leadership Certificate be created, which draws upon and integrates existing programs (E-ship, Honors, International Engineering, etc.) and uses faculty and EAC members to recruit mentors.

**Research Committee:** Research is going well, with new grants at $58 million this past year, up 35% over the prior college record. The Research Committee and entire EAC would like to be more engaged and help increase research in the College. It is recommended that an inventory of college research expertise and EAC contacts/interests be made, and then a strategy be put in place to provide briefings and mesh these interests. The Washington, D.C. strategy of Marty Dunn, which includes his frequent travel to the area to meet with federal program managers and CU’s federal-relations team, was endorsed. It is recommended that this strategy continue to be assessed and improved.

**Resource Development Committee:** The CU campaign is behind due to the economy, and the college campaign goal has been reduced to $75 million. The College expects to raise about $5 million in FY10, which is close to totals in recent years. The EAC recommends an FY11 goal of $8-10 million, which is lower than the prior $11 million goal. The Dean’s Club, in its second year, has already achieved more members (68) and funds ($170K) than last year. Among the 40 EAC members, 17 have joined the Dean’s Club so far in FY10 (which ends 6/30/2010), and the committee recommends all EAC members join the Dean’s Club (requiring a $1000 donation to the CU Engineering Dean’s Fund for Excellence). The Biotechnology Building is under construction. About $850K has been raised toward the $10 million goal that is specific to Chemical and Biological Engineering, with several proposals pending. Additional prospective donors and naming opportunities were recommended. The Senior Class Gift had less than 3% participation; simple/modern ways to give (text messaging, Facebook) are recommended.