Master of Engineering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, September 12, 2001  
8:00am – 9:00am 240 Carpenter Hall

Attendees:  James Bartsch, John Belina, Graeme Bailey, Claude Cohen, Harold Craighead,  
Mark Eisner, David Grubb, Mike Hayes, Fred Kulhawy, Bruce Kusse, Michel Louge, Larry Newman,  
Joe Shultz, Michael Spencer, Dawn Warren

Absent: Bing Cady, Lawrence Cathles, Tim Healey

The meeting was called to order at 8:04am

Introductions/Welcome New Members
Jim Bartsch opened the meeting and asked the MEC members to introduce themselves for the benefit of the new members.

Proposed Partnership with Howard University
Dean Craighead opened the discussion and asked Professor Michael Spencer, formerly a Howard University faculty member and now a faculty member with Electrical and Computer Engineering, to introduce the proposed Howard University partnership to the MEC members. Professor Spencer indicated that he and Associate Dean Isaacson had been involved in discussions with the Dean of Engineering at Howard University regarding a possible partnership program between select fields within the Colleges of Engineering at both schools. The program would involve the fields of Electrical Engineering, Computer Science, Civil Engineering, Chemical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering.

Program guidelines would need to be created for the Howard University students that would allow them to complete their undergraduate degrees at Howard and transfer to Cornell University to complete their Master of Engineering degree. Funding for the student’s 4 years at Howard and 5th year at Cornell would be externally funded by corporate dollars. The partnership program would help Howard University to attract students in addition to enhancing their relationships with companies. Cornell would determine the academic criteria. Because Howard University initiated the proposal of the partnership program and we have a strong connection through Professor Spencer, Howard University would hopefully be the first of many schools to be involved in this type of program.

The MEC members voiced their support of the concept. Associate Dean Isaacson has several thoughts on how the program could be implemented, and Dean Craighead encouraged the MEC that this type of program be considered as a possible mechanism to achieve the goals expressed in the MEC Ad Hoc Committee report.

Ad Hoc Report Discussion/Prioritizing
Dean Craighead commended the Ad Hoc Subcommittee for their work on the DRAFT Ad Hoc Report. He requested that the MEC members meet with the faculty and Directors and Chairs in their departments to provide him with a prioritized listing of issues to be addressed. Jim Bartsch suggested that the MEC submit their prioritized (Medium, High, No Action) listing to Joe Shultz via email before September 26th, allowing the Ad Hoc Committee to convene on October 3rd to finalize the prioritized listings. Email reminders will be sent to the M.Eng. representatives requesting the data.

Dean Craighead asked the MEC members for feedback on the M.Eng. Program, and two comments were made. John Belina indicated that the M.Eng. Program sits in an awkward place – sometimes it is considered to be a valued program, and other times it seems to be neglected. Visibility is low on campus, and there isn’t a good understanding of the program by the faculty.

Michel Louge commented that there seems to be a lack of understanding from the faculty members of the M.Eng. Program’s incentives. He recommended that the benefits of the M.Eng. Program be made clear to the
faculty members.

Dean Craighead mentioned that there is no direct coupling with tuition received from the undergraduates or graduate students, but a portion of the M.Eng. tuition monies are returned to the individual fields for their use. This incentive should be made known to the faculty in each field—it’s a strong incentive to maintain the Program. Several of the MEC members asked about the formula used to determine the return to the Engineering fields, and Joe Shultz suggested inviting Cathy Long, Assistant Dean of Administration, to a meeting to explain the formula to the MEC.

David Grubb noted that the Ad Hoc Report doesn’t clearly identify who is responsible for the “Recommendations” outlined in the Ad Hoc Report. Mark Eisner indicated that the next step of the Subcommittee is to delegate the responsibilities.

Fred Kulhawy requested information on the authorship of the Ad Hoc Report.

Jim Bartsch asked Joe Shultz to arrange for necessary materials to be distributed to new members of the MEC.

Petitions

Michel Louge presented two petitions to the MEC. First petition was for Musyoka Munyoki. Musyoka was originally accepted as an Early Admit student in S’01 semester. He misjudged the level of coursework and his GPA fell to a 2.6 at the end of last semester. Michel has agreed to forget Musyoka’s EA semester and would like the MEC to look at Musyoka as a new M.Eng. student as of F’01 semester. He feels that Musyoka is fully capable of handling the workload now that he understands the level of coursework. The MEC unanimously agreed to forget the student’s S’01 Early Admit semester.

Michel’s second petition involved a F’01 Early Admit student with a GPA of 2.6 and 9 unfinished credits. Because the student exceeds the 8 credits or less MEC rule, the MEC requested that the student be removed from Early Admit status, begin his M.Eng. Program in S’02 and at that time request to transfer his F’01 graduate credits.

Jim Bartsch presented a petition to the MEC for Guy Furman. Guy thought he had submitted everything for Early Admit status before he left Ithaca last May, but ABEN didn’t receive his Statement of Purpose. Jim’s recommendation is that the student be allowed to consider this semester his Early Admit semester. The MEC voted unanimously to approve his petition.

Motion to adjourn at 9:10am.