Engineering College Advisory Council
Michigan State University
Minutes, March 17, 2010

FINAL

Present: Balasubramaniam, Frid, Jain, Mukherjee, Safferman, Voice, Worden

1. Minutes: March 3, 2010 meeting minutes were approved.

2. College P&T Rating Committee’s Report
   - Dr. Voice, 2010 Committee Chair, stated the overall process went well.
   - Incomplete packages remain a problem and a quality check is needed. The use of a check list, to be developed and administered by the Dean’s, office is recommended.
   - Additions to packages after the deadline were discussed. Recommend that a cutoff date be established after which the material will only be considered at the next evaluation level.
   - Concern about the lack of substance in reference letters was raised. However, some members believe that a letter lacking in substance is an indicator of the candidate’s performance. The advantages and disadvantages of providing more guidelines were discussed but the consensus of the ECAC is that this is not a substantial problem.
   - Role of the College Rating Committee, relative importance, and how its recommendations are used in the Chair’s Meeting was discussed. The rationale of having Chairs evaluate all candidates was also discussed. The importance of standardizing expectations across Departments was one justification.
   - ECAC recommends a seminar be instituted on the workings of the College Rating Committee for Chairs and new faculty members.
   - Large P&T committees offer several benefits. Consequently, departments should consider having all tenured faculty members in the committee, if not already included.
   - ECAC does not see the need for a memo relating to P&T or changes to the Faculty Handbook.

Respectively Submitted:

Steven Safferman