Admin Council Meeting Minutes  
January 22, 2024, 4:00-5:00 PM

Agenda
1. Cornerstone Transition
2. EAC Nominations
3. Unit Strategic Plan Feedback
4. New procedure for setting grad stipends
5. PMP Tuition for AY24-25
6. FRPA’s Due Feb 1
7. Admin Council Faculty Merit Review Process
8. Eng Education Tenure Home Proposal
9. Open Discussion

Dean Keith Molenaar began the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Announcements
Keith introduced Penina (Penny) Axelrad, Interim Associate Dean for Faculty Advancement, who has replaced Fernando Rosario-Oritz. Penny will serve in this role for the spring semester. There will be a search to find a permanent person for this position later this semester and the council is encouraged to think about folks to apply.

The tenure track hiring memo that was circulated to chairs in August has a few final updates following our discussions. Those changes have been formalized and Keith will email an update to chairs.

Cornerstone Transition
Monique McCloud, Assistant Dean for Organizational Development, Culture and Equity, briefly discussed the university-wide transition to Cornerstone Performance Management. There are still over 100 people that have not completed their goal setting and therefore we cannot proceed to mid-year discussions correctly in the system. It is critical that all leaders ensure their teams have completed the steps of the goal setting, approval (inbox section), and sign off process (task section). Please go into the tool and see that all action items have cleared from both the “inbox” and “tasks” notification sections for you and verify this for your teams (your HRLs can assist).

EAC Nominations
Medford Moorer, Assistant Dean for Strategic Initiatives, reminded everyone that the Engineering Advisory Council nominations are due February 1. We are continuing to grow and diversify the council and we are requesting support of the council and our college partners in the nomination process. He encouraged the council to consider nominating individuals from their respective advisory boards. Nominations are to be submitted online using this form; please contact Medford if you have any questions regarding the nominations process.

Unit Strategic Plan Feedback
Keith and Medford discussed the unit strategic plan feedback and next steps for completing the strategic planning process. Some unit plans are ready to move forward with publishing the plans and moving to identifying measurements and indicators. Other units still need to finalize sections of their plans or provide some refinement. Medford will be scheduling meetings with these departments to support completion of the plans. Departments were provided the measurement and indicator documentation in
the fall semester and will be supported with completing this process over the month of February. All strategic planning is expected to conclude at the beginning of April.

**New Procedure for Setting Grad Stipends**

Charles Musgrave, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, discussed the new procedure for setting graduate student GRA and TA salaries which will begin in the Fall 2024 semester (see attached memo). The hope is that this will provide official process timelines each year. The procedure is currently being discussed, and the final proposal will be brought to the council at the March 4 meeting, with planned final discussion and voting at the April 29 meeting.

**PMP Tuition for AY24-25**

The university is conducting their annual discussions over the graduate tuition levels for next year (see graduate tuition procedural statement for reference). Keith asked the council if the college would like to go with the standard increase that the university goes with or if we would like to have further discussion on it. At this time, the council did not ask for further discussion. Official notification will be provided by the regents in late spring.

**FRPA’s Due February 1**

Keith reminded the council that FRPA’s are due on February 1. He requested that council members reiterate the need for faculty to submit theirs on time. He emphasized the importance of timely submittals, as it is a Regent policy, impacts on faculty reviews and salary increases, and creating extra work for other people by turning them in late. The final, non-negotiable, hard college deadline for submission will be February 16.

**Admin Council Faculty Merit Review Process**

Keith briefly reviewed plans for the faculty merit review process this year. One change this year is that Keith will be soliciting feedback from faculty and staff in the units (for chairs only); he will ask the chair to provide the names of two staff and two faculty members from their units, and Keith will select an additional two staff and two faculty members for feedback. Please watch for an email from Keith with detailed instructions and scheduling information.

**Engineering Education Tenure Home Proposal**

Angela Bielefeldt, Faculty Director, Integrated Design Engineering (IDE) presented the need to find Engineering Education a tenure home (see attached presentation). As a reminder, a new PhD in Engineering Education was approved by the Regents in April 2023, and this proposal included a plan to add three tenure track faculty lines. A tenure home for this program would be in alignment with the CEAS Strategic Vision, will aid in the recruitment of faculty and PhD students, provides a central location for collaboration and mentoring, and could give engineering education researchers with other backgrounds a better fit than in existing departments. The council discussed the proposal, key factors that should be considered, and what additional administrative needs there would be.

To close the meeting, Keith reminded everyone to please take care of themselves, their faculty, and their staff when the semester gets really busy; to keep some self-awareness, and to please reach out to Keith directly if you need additional support this semester.

*Meeting adjourned at 5:00*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Council
CC: Charles Musgrave, Associate Dean for Graduate Education
    Graduate Education Council
FROM: Keith R. Molenaar, Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science
RE: Charge to Develop Annual Graduate Student Salary Process
DATE: January 22, 2024

The College of Engineering and Applied Science (CEAS) has a Ph.D. student enrollment of more than 1,000 students across its departments, programs, and the ATLAS Institute. The majority of these students are compensated as graduate research or teaching assistants. The CU Boulder Graduate School sets a minimum salary annually. To be competitive with graduate student offers, CEAS has consistently set a salary above the Graduate School minimum. To promote interdisciplinary work and for reasons of consistency and equity, CEAS requests that salaries are consistent across the college. The process to date for setting these salaries has been ad hoc, which has created confusion and inefficiencies. This memo outlines a charge to the Graduate Education Council (GEC) to create an annual process for setting graduate student salaries across the departments, programs, and the ATLAS Institute.

Charge:

1. The GEC shall propose an annual process for setting graduate student GRA and TA salaries. This process will begin in the Fall 2024 semester.
   a. The process address factors to include, but not limited to: competitiveness with peer institutions; promotion of interdisciplinary work; equity; and cost of living increases.
   b. This process will be in alignment with the annual processes for the Graduate School and the Office of Contracts and Grants.
   c. The process will be proposed to the CEAS Administrative Council at its meeting on March 4, 2024.
2. The CEAS Administrative Council will review and approve this process on March 4, 2024.
   a. If modifications are required, the CEAS Administrative Council will rereview and approve the process on April 29, 2024.
3. The Associate Dean for Graduate Education will post the approved policy on the college website.
4. The Associate Dean for Graduate Education will inform the Graduate School of the process and coordinate communication of the raises annually.
5. The Associate Dean for Graduate Education will inform the Graduate School of the process and coordinate communication of the raises annually.
Proposing a New Tenure Home in IDE for Engineering Education Faculty
Why do we need an Engineering Education tenure home?

Alignment with CEAS Strategic Vision

- **Research and Innovation**
  - Multidisciplinary, center-scale grants require engineering education
  - Historically, 15-30% of CEAS research awards relate to engineering education

- **Education**
  - Embraces and advances educational innovations
  - Improve retention and close equity gaps

- **Inclusion**
  - Implement inclusive learning opportunities and practices
  - Recruit faculty and students that contribute to our mission
Background: New PhD in Engineering Education

Approved By CU Regents April 2023

Housed in Integrated Design Engineering (IDE) program

30 cr coursework

- Min. 12 cr related to education; a few new ENED courses, EDUC, PHYS, PSYC,...
- Min 9 cr engineering (may transfer in from Master’s)
- Electives

Dissertation focused on Engineering Education topic (preK to gray; can include the profession)

Affiliating faculty from CEAS and beyond

Degree proposal included plan to add 3 TT faculty lines
Benchmarking

16 PhD degrees in Eng Education in U.S.

Top schools have stand-alone departments for Engineering Education (n=9)

- Host tenured faculty
- Coordinate first-year engineering
- Design-centric and student-centered learning expertise

Examples of Engineering Education Departments / Schools:

- Purdue University (started 2004; 20 T/TT faculty)
- Virginia Tech (2008; 19 T/TT, 11 instructors/prof of practice)
- Ohio State (8 T/TT), Clemson (9 T/TT), U Florida (7 T/TT, 17 I), Utah State (10 T/TT), FIU (6 T/TT), Cincinnati (11 T/TT), U at Buffalo (11 T/TT, 12 I)
Why do we need an Engineering Education tenure home?

- Engineering education research (EER) cuts across the College
- Higher profile program for EER with PhD and tenure lines together
  - Helps recruit faculty and PhD students
- Engineering educational researchers may have additional backgrounds in education, psychology, etc. (not a great fit with existing departments)
- RPT criteria appropriate for EER
- Central location for collaboration and mentoring
  - Support a home for doctoral student cohort
Why do we need an Engineering Education tenure home?

Collaboration with CEAS faculty on new NSF grants including center scale, STC
Collaboration on CAREER proposals

Proposals appear more ‘unbiased’ to have evaluators outside department

   Historically, NSF required ‘external’ evaluator (outside organization)
   Current, evaluation must be independent (NSF Evaluation Policy, Apr 2023),
   and being outside home department facilitates this independence
FAQ: Why not tenure home in existing CEAS departments?

More isolated research activities to departmental / disciplinary focus

Research very different from typical technical research

   Ex: Qualitative studies are highly valued

   Ex: Studying people, thus different measures of reliability, validity, etc.

... creates evaluation challenges in RPT

... isolating (if ‘only 1’ or very little EER in department)

Program less visible, creating challenges for attracting top faculty and graduate students
FAQ: Why not tenure in School of Education?

Most EER faculty we would hire have degrees in engineering and no degrees in education.

Folks with EER interests often not compatible with scholarship venues of School of Education.
FAQ: Can CU CEAS faculty change their tenure home?

There is a process for this: https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/relevant-policies-and-procedures-1

(Historically folks have changed from CEAE to Mechanical; Integrated Physiology (A&S) to Mechanical; ECEE to Applied Math (A&S). The same option would be available)