COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
October 20, 2006

MINUTES

Present: Richard B. Brown, Milind Deo, Patrick Tresco, Marilyn Davies, Rick Rabbitt, Geoff Silcox (ChE), Paul Tikalsky, Marc Bodson, Dinesh Shetty (MSE), Kent Udell, Martin Berzins, Terry Ring, Sandy Bruhn, Vicki Jensen

Excused: Michael Kay, Phil Smith, Anil Virkar

Announcements/Updates

Rocky Mountain Power Funding Opportunities

Dean Brown thanked the chairs who had turned in proposals outlining their department’s needs. He asked those chairs who hadn’t submitted ideas yet to please do so. All ideas will be reviewed and prioritized into one College proposal to be submitted to Rocky Mountain Power for possible funding.

Warnock Engineering Building

Included with the meeting agenda was a document titled, A Proposal to John & Marva Warnock EMCB Project. Marilyn Davies reported that the College was approached by Regina Schaub, Associate Director for Space Planning & Management, about the loss of identity of EMCB once the Warnock Engineering Building is completed. In order to eliminate confusion about the newly integrated facilities, the campus would prefer to designate the entire, combined physical plant as “The John E. and Marva M. Warnock Engineering Building.” We approached John and Marva Warnock to explain this situation, and noted that EMCB’s dated appearance contrasts with the quality of the new building. The needed upgrades are mostly cosmetic. The Warnock’s responded last Friday with a gift of $1.1+M of Adobe stock. The proposal for this new designation is now before the Board of Trustees for approval. The wish list of suggested improvements will be reviewed to see what the budget will cover. This additional gift from the Warnocks brings us within $112K of our Kresge match, which is due March 2007. We are confident that between now and March we will make that goal as we continue to receive gifts from generous friends of Engineering.

Dean Brown reported that the official completion date of the Warnock Engineering Building is December 26 and the dedication is set for February 16. The activities planned around the dedication will provide an opportunity for our alumni to return to campus. Dean Brown asked the chairs to make a concerted effort to get their emeritus faculty to attend the dedication activities as this will be a wonderful opportunity for them to reconnect with the College, their students, and the campus.
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Accreditation Visit

Dean Brown thanked everyone for their time and efforts related to the Northwest Accreditation visit. Everything went well. During the exit meeting, the head of the delegation gave a verbal report on University-wide commendations and recommendations.

Commendations:
1. Commended the U on the collegiality, cooperation, and transparency they found here.
2. Commended President Young for galvanizing the many constituents behind his strategic plan.
3. Commended the U for creating a process and structure of assessment.

Recommendations:
1. Recommended the continuation of assessment efforts.
2. Recommended that there be regular and systematic performance reviews of auxiliary faculty.
3. Recommended that the governing board have a policy on use and limits of debt:
   - Have a clearly stated policy on how funds should be transferred between accounts.
4. The Board of Regents to set up procedures for evaluating their own performance.

The NWCCU delegation will prepare their written report and send it to the University to review for accuracy; a final report will be returned to the U in December. Dean Brown had a visit with Everald Mills, the College evaluator, and he said we have a lot to be proud of in the College of Engineering. In a Council of Academic Deans meeting discussion of the accreditation review, VP Pershing said that colleges should develop formal evaluation policies and practices for auxiliary faculty. This will be a College focus after we get the policies and procedures updated for tenure-track RPT.

On the University Academic Affairs website under Faculty Development there is a listing of Auxiliary Faculty positions along with a brief definition. There is also a chart to help distinguish the right title (copies are attached).

Jefferson Science Fellowships

Included with the agenda was information on the 2007 Jefferson Science Fellowships which was forwarded to Dean Brown from Dave Pershing. Dean Brown asked the chairs to please let their faculty know about this Fellowship. We have faculty who are worthy of having this kind of opportunity. Terri Pianka of OSP will be sending an informational e-mail to all faculty regarding this Fellowship. Additional information can be found at www7.nationalacademies.org/Jefferson. Terry Ring asked if there was a Memorandum of Understanding in existence. A Memo of Understanding does not exist between the U and the US Department of State because we have not had any nominees/applicants in the past. However, if there is nominee/applicant during this offer, OPS will execute the document.
Discussion Items

Budgets Next Fiscal Year

The final budget model for the current fiscal year has now been determined. There will be a 1% budget cut on state funds due to a drop of enrollment university-wide of some 400 students, and a one-time, 10% reduction on the 15% of overhead returned to all of the colleges. We now know that the 1% cut on the state side will be applied through the SCH model. This will be painful for engineering because of the reduced SCH resulting from the changes in the tuition waiver program last spring. Nevertheless, it is probably best that any cuts related to reduction in enrollment be tied to SCH. Within the next week SCH numbers will be available. Michael Kay will let each chair know how this will affect their department budget.

Regarding returned overhead, Dean Brown prepared a budget example, which was included with the agenda. The one-time reduction of 10% applied only to the 15% of the total overhead amount, not the additional 35% that the College of Engineering receives. The reduction will be shared by the departments and College according to their share of the returned overhead. The departments receive 0.3 of the amount that comes to the College. The College controls 0.6 of the amount that comes to the College, and the remaining 0.1 goes to the faculty who generated it. Dean Brown does not want to reduce the overhead returned to faculty, so the College will cover 70% of the reduction so that the percentage of overhead returned to the faculty will not be reduced.

Dean Brown commented that he does see many signs that show our research will grow. Several groups have been awarded large contracts in recent months and others have been selected for full proposals in large-budget programs. Patrick Tresco is working closely with HAFB and the State of Utah Office of Economic Development to create a consortium comprised of the U, BYU, Weber, and USU that would make us preferred contractors for programs that come through HAFB.

USTAR Positions

The USTAR teams’ focus areas are defined. Teams are interdepartmental and cross college lines. Members of the search committees were asked to serve by Dave Pershing, Lorris Betz, and Ray Gesteland.

The USTAR Authority has given authorization to move forward with faculty searches and Dave Pershing has given authorization to post positions. The official letter will come out soon. Dean Brown commented that it will be important to hire some USTAR faculty soon in the College. If any of our faculty members are on search committees and believe that some of the USTAR positions will be in their department, then they need to get together with the search committee and draft an advertisement. The ad needs to be approved by the department search committee, the chair, the College, and the USTAR search committee.
An important key to this process will be to keep communications open between engineering, science, and medicine. Engineering faculty should attend interview seminars presented by science and medicine and their faculty should be invited to seminars that engineering candidates give. It will be important to be informed about each candidate in order to express a valid opinion.

Dean Brown reported that Rick Rabbitt, Patrick Tresco, Jerry Stringfellow, and he are members of the Neuroscience and Biomedical Technology Building Committee which was given the charge to undertake a preprogramming effort for the USTAR building. The Committee has been meeting for the past six months, hearing presentations from architects and also visiting facilities at other universities. The Committee is now ready to issue the request for proposals to architectural firms. On October 27, the M-W Zander architectural firm will present design ideas for a new nanofabrication lab that will be part of the new building.

The USTAR Authority has given permission to start designing the building. The University will need to raise $30M, $10M of which may come from ARUP. The site will be 5 acres, and the building is expected to be 200,000 to 250,000 square feet; It will be located somewhere east of MEB or WEB. It will be the link between Engineering and Health Science.

**Engineering Initiative**

Not everyone across campus is happy with the continued support for the Engineering Initiative by the University Administration. The Commissioner’s plan this year is to request $5M of on-going money for the entire system, which would complete the Initiative.

Dean Brown thanked the chairs for the input they gave him regarding faculty and equipment needs for the Initiative. He proposed everything the chairs submitted, and added some more positions in their behalf.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 pm.