Engineering College Advisory Council  
Michigan State University  
Minutes, May 12, 2009

FINAL

Present: Balasubramaniam, Jain, Koochesfahani (Guest), Portis, Safferman, Udpa, Voice, Worden

1. Minutes: the draft minutes from the May 4, 2009 meeting were approved with minor revisions.

2. Dean’s Comments
   • Concerns were raised about the low number of faculty members that participated in the spring commencement ceremony and that the majority of faculty award recipients were not in attendance when called to the stage. Recommendations are discussed under item 3.
   • Recommendations from the ECAC are sought on developing procedures to assess and motivate tenured faculty members who are not substantially engaged in university activities. Such guidance is becoming common across the university and an example document is circulating from the College of Social Science.

3. Faculty Attendance at Commencement
   • The ECAC made the following recommendations.
     • Each Department should send a minimum number of faculty members, perhaps 4, to each commencement ceremony.
     • Each faculty member should attend at least one commencement ceremony each year.
     • Award recipients must attend the commencement ceremony that recognizes their accomplishment.
   • The ECAC passed a motion to add a section to the Faculty Handbook concerning the expectation of faculty members participating in commencement ceremonies and to possibly include this as an item on the faculty activity form.
   • Concerns will be included on the agenda for the next chair’s meeting.

4. 2009 Promotion and Tenure Procedures Review
   • Associate Dean Koochesfahani is working on a check list that contains target dates to complete important milestones associated with tenure and promotion. Examples of existing lists are being considered. Once the draft is complete, reviews by the chairs and ECAC will commence.
   • The difficulty in consistently comparing candidates was discussed including the utility of the various impact factors.
   • The need to understand how specific disciplines define quality research was emphasized.
   • ECAC recommends that departments should consider developing minimum standards and this issue will be an agenda item in the upcoming academic year.
5. Form D Addendum

- To obtain the previous goal of having a concise summary of important data associated with tenure and promotion, Dr. Worden developed a draft form that was reviewed by Dr. Jain.
- ECAC passed a motion to approve the concept, send the draft document to chairs, and include further review of the document on the ECAC agenda for next year.
- As evaluations continue to become digitized, automated techniques to generate a summary form will be explored.

Respectfully submitted:

Steven Safferman