Update on Faculty Evaluations and Raise Pool – All faculty evaluations have been received and will be reviewed by a team consisting of the Dean, Associate Dean of Education and Associate Dean of Research. Meetings will be scheduled with the Department Chairs and Program Directors during the weeks of April 22 and 29 to go over any questions and performance issues. Supervisors of faculty with poor performance are encouraged to explicitly identify ways to support performance improvement. The raise pool is anticipated to be 3.1% pending Regent approval (now received).

Update on Admissions for Fall 2013 – With applications nearly complete, our college has established a new record of 5,189 applicants, which amounts to an 11% increase over last year. As of 4/5/2013, our college has admitted 2,783, an 8% increase versus 2012. The Admissions Office expects that a lower yield of admitted to confirmed, given the improved economy and the number of out-of-state admitted students. Current confirmations are running slightly behind last year. The quality and diversity of the accepted pool of students are slightly higher than last year. Departmental admits have increased as follows: AES (5%), ME (+5%), ChBE (+8%), CS (+8%), ECEE (23%) and Civil (+27%). The Assistant Dean of Students will provide a summary of admissions activity to department chairs.

EAC Meeting on 4/26/2013 – The draft agenda was distributed (attached) and all department chairs were encouraged to attend the meeting, particularly the second morning session, which includes the presentation and breakout session on the Strategic Task Force Recommendations and the Aerospace Engineering Sciences departmental presentations, and the lunch session, which includes ATLAS and student presentations. If you plan to stay for lunch, please notify Sharon Powers. All were reminded of the scheduled Engineering Awards Banquet the evening of April 26, during which the Distinguished Engineering Alumni Awards, Young Alumni Award, College Faculty/Staff Awards, and Distinguished Senior Awards will be presented.

Department Awards – A proposal (attached, updated) was discussed to determine interest in establishing several faculty awards, which each department could then award annually at its discretion. There was support for the proposal, with the addition of a research award that had unintentionally been omitted. The revised proposal will be submitted to campus for approval. Rob also suggested a slate of awards to recognize excellence of departments and programs in areas such as teaching, research and community. It was suggested that the awards be based on short proposals, which include both recognition of excellence and support for ongoing efforts, and include other areas (e.g., innovation, interdisciplinary collaboration, administrative efficiency, etc.).

Environmental Engineering – The council discussed the three models for future administration of the EVEN program: 1) develop a semi-autonomous program with its own staff and faculty, 2) become a department, or 3) be administered by the CEAE department. The EVEN-affiliated faculty are almost evenly split on these three options, though the ME faculty tend to be most supportive of options 1 and 2, while the CEAE faculty tend to be more supportive of options 2 and 3. The various tensions discussed by the administrative council include 1) a desire to continue to build EVEN, including graduate degrees, 2) the importance of maintaining the multidisciplinary nature of and participation in the EVEN program,
and 3) a priority on a structure that would strengthen the EVEN program but not weaken the current departments. It was noted that environmental engineering is currently a “hot” area, with growing enrollments and projected increases in jobs relative to other majors, but long-term history has shown ups and downs in this field. Further consideration and discussion are needed.

Proposal-preparation staff member – The Associate Dean for Research proposed the addition of a new role that would support departments in the submission of “large” research proposals to National Science Foundation. Benchmarks of peer institutions reveal that they have more significant resources available for proposal development. This college role would target a professional with prior NSF experience, strong writing and editing skills, graphics ability, and the skills to integrate work of others into a cogent document. The department chairs acknowledged the need for additional proposal development support and asked that this new position also be responsible for training departmental resources on best practices of proposal writing, including “template” materials required in both “small” and “large” proposals. The job description is under preparation.

In attendance: Rob Davis, Kurt Maute, Penny Axelrad, Keith Molenaar, Michael Lightner, Jim Martin, Victor Bright, Jackie Sullivan, Jeff Sczechowski, JoAnn Zelasko, Mary Steiner, John Bennett, Carin Knickel, and Will Medlin for Dan Schwartz.