College of Engineering
Executive Committee Meeting
April 19, 2013
1:00 – 3:00 pm
Eccles Boardroom

Guest: Geoff Silcox
Excused: JoAnn Lighty, Marilyn Davies, Ajay Nahata

Announcements/Follow-up
W. W. Clyde Visiting Chair – Dr. Daniel A. Crowl – (MTU) Michigan Technological University, Professor, Chemical Engineering. September 2013- May 2014
Research Interests: chemical process safety, loss prevention

Fellowship Report – Departments have extended offers. 8- Browns, 3-ARC’s and 2-Campbell’s have been accepted.

Parking Issues – In summer 2014, parking structures will be built next to the ambulatory care center and also west of the Sutton building. Since 2008, because of campus construction, 678 parking spots have disappeared. Even with the new parking structures, campus will still be down 792 parking spots. The cost for these structures is $13K per parking spot. We can expect increased fees for our parking, and fees for parking in the evening are being discussed.

Faculty Name Changes – The Senate has recently changed the names for faculty types. This was driven by the medical campus. They have 200 tenure track faculty and 800 clinical faculty. The new name for what was “auxiliary faculty” is now “career line.” Regular faculty will be called “tenure-line faculty”. Adjuncts will remain “adjunct faculty”.

RPT Letters will be coming out from the president starting next week, April 22 – 27.

Bookstore – The price of textbooks is a concern to students, parents and faculty members. The book store will help students by giving comparison prices for other sources (Amazon, etc.). They sell textbooks at zero profit and will buy as many used books as possible. They would like everyone to know that they are making a good effort to keep the price as low as possible on textbooks.

Calendar
• Commencement May 2, 2013, 6:30 pm
• Convocation May 3, 2013, 4:30 – 6:15 pm
• ENAC May 31
  The meeting will be highlighting EAE
• U of U Block Party October 12, 2013, Stanford Game
  The University is trying to start new traditions on campus. This huge block party is a new event which will be 3 hours before the game starts in the southwest corner of campus.

Discussion Items

1. Intellectual Property and Consulting Policies
   The suggestions from the March Executive committee meeting were very valuable for getting a revision of the policy. The policy now has language that should help avoid abuse. The consulting policy was changed from 2 days a month to 4 days a month allowed. Language was added about the fact that faculty cannot neglect their faculty duties because of consulting.
2. **TCO** – A huge review of commercialization has gone on over the past year. There has even been pressure from some to dismantle TCO. Commercialization helps us attract faculty and good students and also helps with the legislature. TCO will now report to Tom Parks, not in his roll as VP for Research, but in his role as President of the Research foundation. TCO is providing more information to the colleges and departments than ever before, and they are shortening the time to make a decision about whether to pursue patents on a given technology.

3. **Center for Engineering Innovation** - The medical campus has organized a Center for Medical Innovation. There have been talks with Florian about a center focused on facilitating commercialization for engineering faculty. We would like to have Engineering provide prototyping for the whole campus; this could include the “Garage,” an open shop for students, that is to be part of the new Pierre Lassonde dorms. We would like that dorm to be as close to Engineering Campus as possible.

4. **Budget Updates** - Michael Kay - The new budget process has been a real challenge. Thanks to all for your hard work.

5. **College Council** - College Council proposed a major change in its charter to the Executive committee. In the past there has been an ongoing struggle to find enough meaningful work for this committee, and members did not feel their time was well used, despite true efforts to make that happen. It is important to have a process for the faculty to bring things to the council and this council is required by university policy. Sandy Meek, the current chair, made revisions to the charter with input from Amy Wildermuth. In the new model, the council would be composed of the Exec. Committee, College RPT Committee, and 2 students; one student from the Student Leadership Council and one student elected by members of SACs. Meetings would be held twice a year. This will have to go to a faculty vote for approval.

6. **CLEAR** – April Kedrowicz, director of CLEAR, is leaving in May to go North Carolina State to the College of Veterinary Science, where she will have a tenure track position. CLEAR has done a great job improving our students’ presentation skills, and were a huge asset in the ABET process last year, but there are questions about the current program’s effectiveness at teaching technical writing. It would also be nice to have a graduate-level writing course. It’s a good time to review what has worked well and not so well in our CLEAR program, and then adopt best practices throughout the College. Departments chairs came prepared with comments about how effective CLEAR has been in their departments.

   **BIO** – The Bio Student Advisor is a former CLEAR instructor; she works with their CLEAR TAs, which provides some continuity. Bio teaches a senior-level technical writing course using multiple Bio faculty as instructors and CLEAR TAs as support. It is working well.

   **CHE** – Use CLEAR for lectures and one on one. They grade presentations and assess student’s professionalism. Variable effectiveness and also varies by instructor. Best instruction is on the verbal.

   **ME** – Is integrated in Freshman and Sophomore years but not as much in Jr. years. Sophomore year they focus on team work. Most student comments are highly negative and they would prefer a stand-alone class. CLEAR gets overwhelmed in freshman sized classes. Used in Sr. design – writing intense course, 5 lectures with assignment feedback. The faculty feels best about their oral communication. Seniors did not feel that the written exercises were beneficial. Not enough one on one with CLEAR.

   **MSE** – very positive especially in Sr. design. Instructor variability does make a difference. MSE uses CLEAR in 7 courses. This is way too costly.

   **CVEE** – 3 courses. The Speaking, writing and teamwork skills are very helpful. Variability based on instructor.
ECE – Mixed feelings. Students can be confused in courses that have some CLEAR content, but in general it has been helpful. ECE has two 1 ½ credit hour courses to teach technical writing. SoC – used in 6 courses over time. Twice in Sr. capstone, Peter & Bill Thompson class using it. CLEAR has a process and quite often it slows everything down. The downside is that the technical content is not understood by CLEAR. Does CLEAR as an entity have value or would it be better to have departments hire their own instructors to teach writing? What about hiring Engineering CLEAR TA’s

All of the input will be considered as we recruit a new CLEAR director and decide how to go forward with best practices to teach our students better communication skills.

Adjourned at 3:00 pm.