SUMMARY OF THE CU-BOULDER ENGINEERING ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL MEETING ON 9/17/2012

**Brief Items**

- **Enrollment update** – We are estimating 3385 undergraduates and 1606 graduate students this fall, compared to 3199 undergraduates and 1550 graduate students last fall. In contrast, the campus as a whole is expected to have a slight decline in enrollments.

- **Lobby construction project update** – The project started in mid-September and is expected to be complete in January.

- **Engineering Advisory Council meeting on 10/12/2012** – Chairs are encouraged to attend, especially 8 – 10 am and 1 – 2 pm.

- **Agenda Items for future Administrative Council meetings** – The admin council meetings this semester primarily will focus on reports and discussions of findings of several Blue Ribbon Committees:

  - Sept 17 – Faculty Evaluations (Rob)
  - Oct 8 – Retention (Diane), Engineering for Society (Jackie)
  - Oct 22 – Staff Evaluations (Lynn), New Degree Programs (Diane)
  - Nov 12 – Department/Institute Relations (Jeff)
  - Nov 26 – Space Planning (Rob)
  - Dec 10 – Materials Science and Engineering (Chris), Aerospace Systems Science and Engineering (Penny)

  Presenters are asked to send materials to Rob in advance, who will forward them to the Admin Council members.

**Proposed Faculty Evaluation Process:** Rob reported on the Blue Ribbon Committee on Faculty Evaluations. A more course-grained and qualitative approach is recommended, in which faculty are given a descriptive rating (meets expectations, exceeds expectations, etc) in each category (teaching, research, and service) and overall, and then a raise pool is provided to each department for distribution with a recommended range for each ratings level. In addition, the evaluation process will include self-evaluation, goal setting, and more extensive feedback than in the past. The first page of the evaluation form is the campus standard form (very similar to what we have used in advance), and it is submitted to the Provost’s office and is accessible under the open records act. The second and third pages provide for expanded performance and planning narratives in each of the major categories: teaching, research and service. There was general support for this approach, and chairs are welcome to discuss it with their faculty. Rob will fine-tune the process and forms.

**Provocative Propositions and Next Steps:** Below are draft “provocative propositions” that were presented for research and education. These are vision statements of how we want to be viewed in the future, grounded in our prior accomplishments and current strengths.
Research:
The CEAS is a world leader in research, providing comprehensive, integrated solutions to global societal problems and developing inspired and capable engineers.

Education:
The CEAS attracts the most capable and motivated students and, through an environment of living and learning, inspires and graduates them fully equipped to contribute to the world.

As described by Nan Joesten at the Admin Council Mini-retreat in August, a Provocative Proposition is a statement that bridges the past/present of “what is” with the future of “what will be.” It is intended to describe the College at its very best, to help evoke the best that we can be. The best Provocative Propositions are grounded, meaning that the ideal has been demonstrated as a possibility based on past success. Our Admin Council must desire the outcome of the Provocative Propositions, as they are intended to guide our collective and individual actions going forward.

There was considerable discussion of these propositions, especially the one on research, with feedback including:

- As an academic institution, we should generate knowledge that pushes technological frontiers and provides the foundation for solutions of global problems, but not necessarily develop integrated solutions ourselves.
- The statements should be clarified with a focus on “engineering”.
- We should do impactful, multidisciplinary research, which trains students.
- One of the best ways to be impactful in research is to be the first to establish a new approach, area, or paradigm.
- Our research mission should be coupled to training students.
- Innovation is needed, which will help develop future leaders.
- Not all of our research will be comprehensive and integrated – it is not likely that we will receive more than one ultra-large ($10M+ annually) ERC-type grant.
- Our current mission and vision statements (in the Engineering 2020 Strategic Plan) should be retained.

It was concluded to not further wordsmith the provocative propositions but instead turn to “provocative actions” to support our mission and vision statements. Rob asked each member of the Admin Council to work with his or her unit to develop at least one provocative action in research and one in education that could be undertaken to help support our mission and vision statements and promote excellence in education and research – they should be
sent to him by the end of September.

**Other Business:**
- Jackie noted that Oct 20 is the Engineering Sampler for prospective students
- Diane reminded chairs that Independent Study should not be used to enroll students in regular, filled courses
- Congratulations were expressed to the CS department for the positive reception by the Regents of the BA in CS proposal
- Mike and Diane are on the CU system committee on IT opportunities for education

**In Attendance:** Rob Davis, JoAnn Zelasko, Carin Knickel, Jackie Sullivan, Jeff Sczechowski, Diane Sieber, Kurt Maute, Dan Schwartz, Mike Brandemuehl, Jim Martin, Mike Lightner, Victor Bright