Engineering College Advisory Council  
Michigan State University  
Minutes, May 4, 2009

FINAL

Present: Balasubramaniam, Engeda, Jain, Portis, Safferman, Udpa, Voice, Worden

1. Minutes: the draft minutes from the April 17, 2009 meeting were approved with minor revisions.

2. Dean’s Comments
   - The policy concerning shaking hands at upcoming graduation ceremonies is being examined in response to fears associated with Swine Flu.
   - New details concerning budget cuts are not available.
   - In response to a question concerning a recent grant between MSU, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and others, Dean Udpa reviewed the recently awarded Frontier Energy Research grant.

3. Distinguished Faculty and Teacher-Scholar Award Nominations
   - All nominations were recommended for development into full packages for submission at the university level.
   - Some packages need enhancement to be competitive. Dr. Worden will contact the appropriate department chairs concerning such packages.

4. Promotion and Tenure Procedures based on Evaluation of the 2009 Process
   - The February 18, 2009 memo from Dr. Voice to Dean Udpa concerning recommendations from this year’s College Rating Committee was distributed and discussed
   - Important issues critical for next year’s process were discussed, as listed below.
     - To help departments obtain needed data, such as review letters, the Dean’s office is developing a check list that contains important milestones and due dates.
     - Because tenure and promotion are employment actions, committees need diversity. Whenever feasible, the Dean will bring balance through his committee member selection.
     - To provide consistency, a standardized summary sheet is recommended. Dr. Worden will provide a draft for the committee to review.
   - Role of the department’s rating committee.
     - Concern was raised that departments are not providing a comprehensive and rigorous review of candidates so that an objective recommendation goes forward. This is evident by the number of candidates who do not successfully make it through the College Rating Committee.
     - Discussion on the difficulty in understanding data concerning department’s recommendation followed.
Departments may encourage underperforming faculty members to seek alternative positions before decisions are rendered.

Department specific needs in a research and teaching area may be considered in recommendations.

Recommendations may reflect concerns about losing positions.

- Dr. Worden will draft instructions to chairs and department rating committees on their roles in the promotion and tenure process for review by the committee.

Recommendations concerning other improvements to the process were discussed including the following.

- Department work load documents should be linked to a candidate’s promotion and tenure documents.
- Guidance and procedural information should be provided to candidates, chairs, and rating committee members in spring before the academic year that the package is being produced.
- Exemplary promotion and tenure packages should be provided to candidates if identifying features are removed and permission from the author is obtained.

5. **Other Issues:** in response to the explanation of engineering fees sent to the ECAC, the committee recommends that a summary of this information be included in the graduate student newsletter.