SUMMARY OF THE 10/28/2013 MEETING OF THE CU ENGINEERING ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Faculty Evaluations – Support was expressed for continuing the qualitative vs. quantitative annual faculty evaluation metrics introduced last year. The use of narrative forms was mixed, with some departments using them, some not, and yet others using them for some of the faculty members but not others. We will be able to better judge their value after the coming year, based the effectiveness of goal-setting and self-evaluations.

What Makes for Good Renovation Proposals? – JoAnn reviewed a handout that she prepared on renovation proposals. Departments and programs are urged to plan these proposals in advance, considering their research and educational needs. For the coming request for proposals, “beautification” proposals will be due in early February (with decisions in late February), while “renovation” proposals will be due in early April, with decisions in late April. Beautification proposals are small (about $5K or less) and do not require a cost share, while renovation proposals are larger and require a 1:2 (department:college) cost share. Large renovation proposals for research infrastructure will also be considered for campus support. They represent a good opportunity for preparing labs for new faculty hires and shared research facilities, among other needs.

Discussion of College Growth and Space – Rob noted that he had talked to campus leadership about the EAC recommendation to consider a stretch goal for college enrollment growth, with a consideration of doubling enrollments from about 4000 when our strategic plan was written five years ago to about 8000 by the end of this decade. The campus leadership (Provost Russ Moore and CFO Kelly Fox) had a positive reaction to this possibility, as our college is viewed as a campus strength. The Admin Council also had a positive initial reaction, noting for example the splash being made by Texas A&M from its recent announcement of a goal to double the size of its engineering school. Comments include the need for resources, the desirability of growth in strategic areas, the importance of growing the graduate program at least in proportion to the undergraduate program, continued increases in student quality and diversity, and the opportunity to engage the state of Colorado using the angle of economic development. Rob further noted that growth of this magnitude would likely require that three of our departments move to East Campus, and that this possibility may be realistic, with ChBE in the Biotech Building, AES planning an Aerospace Building, and Environmental Engineering and potentially more if not all of CEAE considering the SEEC (Sustainable Energy and Environment Complex) neighborhood. Construction of smaller buildings for individual departments or grouped activities appears to be much more realistic than constructing a large complex for engineering in the foreseeable future. Rob will develop a description or white paper on growth scenarios and required resources.
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