Meeting Summation:

Cathy Long is finalizing the details of the M.Eng. Teaching Appointment with Human Resources. The M.Eng. The Dean’s Office is reviewing the Financial Returns proposal, and Cathy will submit their suggestions to the MEC for further consideration. Two CEE petitions were approved, and the Daniel Franco petition was approved. An M.Eng. Early Admit Petition form was discussed and will be investigated further.

Approval of February 12, 2003 Minutes:
The MEC reviewed the minutes and requested the following amendments:

Fred Kulhawy’s comment on page 3 should read:

Most of the student projects, especially undergraduate ones, occur over a fairly short time period every year, and we are talking full-time personnel and commitment of majority resources. How is that spread out over the year when there is a demand for only 4 or 5 months?

Jim Bartsch’s 3rd comment on page 5 should read:

Spread the word and get back to Michel. We are looking for other departments to throw in and work with this.

Mark Eisner requested that a summary be included at the beginning of each month’s minutes.

The MEC made a motion to approve the minutes with the requested amendments. Approved.

Update on M.Eng. Student Teaching Appointments:
Mike Hayes:
- The job description that Cathy forwarded to the MEC (which doesn’t include the word “Assistant”) has been forwarded to Mary Opperman for finalization. It looks as though it will be approved and the M.Eng. Teaching appointments will be changed to “Graduate Teaching Specialists.” The change affects the M.Eng.
program, the Johnson School and others. The Graduate School isn’t happy about this change, and Cathy Long, Sarah Hale and I will continue discussions. The source of their concern is that if any of our students are doing anything close to what an MS/PhD TA does, they should be compensated accordingly. The alternative to creating this new position title would have been to use COLTS, which would have been an administrative nightmare. This is the easiest and cleanest way to handle it.

Jim Bartsch:
  • The hourly (COLTS) must be comparable because the students work so few hours.

Mike Hayes:
  • It could be, but administratively it created too many problems.

Jim Bartsch:
  • Has the Johnson School weighed in on this?

Mike Hayes:
  • The Johnson School is waiting to see the job description. They have been paying their TAs through COLTS.

Larry Cathles:
  • The Graduate School’s proposal is that every student be treated exactly the same? Is that correct?

Mike Hayes:
  • The policy is equal pay for equal work. If any student is in the classroom teaching, they should receive a tuition award equivalent to their M.Eng. stipend. If a student is receiving $3395 (considered a 25% appointment), they should receive a 25% tuition award by the department. –it doubles our budget.

Larry Cathles:
  • I don’t understand the intensity of their feeling if it’s a matter of someone properly signing off on…

Mike Hayes:
  • It’s a consistency through the Graduate School policy, and they feel that we went behind their back to get this taken care of.

Larry Newman:
  • Is there some liability on the part of the university if a student goes to court saying that they are doing the same work as an MS/PhD TA and they aren’t being compensated the same?

Mike Hayes:
  • Yes, so they will have a different title and job description from the MS/PhD TAs.
Matt Miller:
- That’s a separate issue. We need to understand that the unionization thing is what stirred this up, correct? It’s not the same argument.

Mike Hayes:
- Yes. It’s a huge political battle, no question. We are the ones who drove that proposal to get it changed, and Mary Opperman was very helpful. We may, however, have made some enemies in the Graduate School.

Larry Cathles:
- We don’t want to prepare for unionization by changing our rules…

Mike Hayes:
- This is not a rule change. Our appointments should fall under the Graduate School policy and we are getting an exemption through this process. Otherwise, we would be paying our people 50% stipend and 50% tuition award, which more than doubles our budget. Every teaching M.Eng. student would cost us about $21,000 if not more. It would devastate the program.

Mark Eisner:
- And leave the undergraduates without sufficient teachers. There is a delicate balance of all the staffing.

Mike Hayes:
- Absolutely. Mary has seen the draft. I’m not sure when the final description will be coming out. We will get it out to everybody when we receive it.

Mark Eisner:
- Do we need to use the new terminology in our offer letters for next year?

Mike Hayes:
- Not until it has been approved.

Claude Cohen:
- These students will still go through the College TA program?

Mike Hayes:
- Yes.

Jim Bartsch:
- Do you have any ideas on the expected timeline?

Mike Hayes:
- I think we’ll know within the next couple of weeks. We’ll keep you posted.
Financial Returns Update – Returns Subcommittee:

Larry Newman:
- We proposed a straight dollar amount for every graduate student, not counting EAs. Under that proposal, if the number of graduate students drops dramatically the Dean’s office will drop below what they need for their budget. They want some protection if there is a low-end drop. One way to provide this protection is to say that if a unit drops below a target amount, they won’t receive as much money per student, and then set a target amount for each unit. That hasn’t been decided upon, but that is the formula that is being evaluated.

Mark Eisner:
- Cathy Long will come back to us with a proposal.

Graeme Bailey:
- In an earlier meeting, Cathy wanted to know if we wanted to continue counting the EA students. I’m wondering whether that makes a difference to people. How does everyone feel about that?

Mark Eisner:
- OR would prefer to continue counting EAs, but we were trying to be good citizens. The question is, what the group as a whole thinks about it. If EA students are counted, the amount per student is a little lower.

Larry Newman:
- The problem with counting the EAs is if there is a large influx of EA students, you are paying out of a lot of money and you aren’t getting that money back.

Jim Bartsch:
- Wasn’t the revised, linear formula based on the income-generating students and therefore it was viewed as a cleaner way to track things.

Graeme Bailey:
- Cathy seemed surprised that we weren’t considering counting the EA students.

Mark Eisner:
- The Subcommittee needs to reconvene after we hear from Cathy Long. To summarize, the two open issues are:
  - Protecting the Dean’s Office should there be a precipitous drop in enrollments. --I’ll point out that that budget is not for this building – that $ gets redistributed back to the units. If so, how does that protection get calculated? What kind of minimum participation do we expect before people start losing, relative to the total; and
  - The other question is the counting of the EAs – should funds be transferred for them or not.

Mike Hayes:
• I have a meeting with Cathy tomorrow – I’ll ask when she will be able to get that information out to us.

Mark Eisner asked if Michel Louge is still a member of the MEC, and Matt Miller indicated that he is the official representative for MAE, but Michel intends to complete his commitment to the Returns Subcommittee.

**Student petitions:**
Fred Kulhawy:
• I would like to bring forth both of these petitions together because they are virtually identical. Both students are from CEE. Nami Tanaka, 2.64 GPA and Eugene Kim 2.67 GPA. Both were slow starters. For the last 3 semesters, they have averaged over 3.0 GPA. We would like to propose that both students be admitted on a provisional basis. They must get a 3.0 in their first semester and take a full course load.

Mark Eisner:
• If their average were to come up to a 2.7 based on a full undergraduate, would that meet the conditions? You could admit them conditionally on getting a 3.0.

Jim Bartsch:
• If they meet the 2.7 you essentially tear up your provisions because they have met the standard admission criteria.

John Belina:
• Admitting them provisionally helps to motivate students in their first term.

A motion was made to approve both students and was seconded. Unanimously approved.

**Unfinished Business on Daniel Franco’s Petition:**
Jim Bartsch reminded the MEC of Daniel’s MAE petition from the February 2003 MEC meeting. Daniel was an AEP undergraduate. The petition submitted in February addressed a request to exceed the 20-credit load. The second issue that remains unresolved was that Daniel hadn’t spent a semester enrolled in the Graduate School.

Matt Miller:
• Daniel did a semester abroad, but he didn’t complete his undergraduate credits. Daniel was supposed to receive credits from an Australian school for a Statistical Mechanics class, but the course wasn’t held. He is taking his final undergraduate course this semester, and this is also his final semester in the Graduate School as an M.Eng. student. Michel Louge and Matt met with the Graduate Registrar, Ron Watkins, and he retroactively admitted him into the Graduate School for S’03. Daniel now has his semester of residency. One detail that worked in Daniel’s favor was that he will receive his BS in May and he’ll finish his M.Eng. in August.
We were under the impression that the petition for above 20 credit hours had been approved, but we were also under the impression that it was a moot point because the MEC didn’t think the Graduate School would allow him to graduate with his M.Eng. without having spent a semester in residence as a graduate student. We aren’t sure if Daniel’s petition was approved or not.

Mark Eisner quoted the following comment made by Jim Bartsch from page 9 of the February 2003 minutes:

I’m hearing that the MEC is favorably disposed to approving Daniel’s petition to take more than 20 credit hours, however, the issue of one unit of graduate residency is what is holding us back at this point.

David Grubb:
- Where is the student registered?

Matt Miller:
- The Graduate School recognizes Daniel as a graduate student.

Several conversations took place with regard to this situation.

Jim Bartsch:
- Ron Watkins was aware of all this before he made this decision, correct?

Matt Miller:
- Yes, and this apparently is not a completely unusual case.

Mark Otis:
- There were two miscellaneous elements to this case. Daniel is a Dean’s list student. Also, Daniel neglected to file his Early Admit form with the Engineering Registrar, so that was one of the problems that they had.

Jim Bartsch:
- We didn’t vote on Daniel’s petition at the February meeting because we had a much more serious problem to deal with. Now that Daniel’s residency issue has been dealt with, we can vote on his petition to exceed the 20-credit maximum. A motion was made to approve the credit hours, seconded. Approved.

**Early Admit Petition Form:**
Jim Bartsch:
- What sort of information do we need on these forms? I suggest that every petition include a student’s unofficial record or some way of determining their GPA. Seeing Daniel’s transcript helped me to understand how much this student has done while he has been at Cornell, and it really changed my attitude toward his situation. We don’t need the entire folder copied, but bringing the student’s file to the meeting would be helpful. I would like to see us be more consistent.
Mark Eisner:
• 1-page should suffice.

Mark Eisner:
• Providing a semester-by-semester GPA helps -- we are interested in trends.

John Belina:
• We don’t really have a standard petition form. I think the fields create their own.

Larry Newman:
• Tell what petitions the form is good for, what things need to be petitioned, why a petition would be needed -- remind us in one place when the petition should be made.

Mark Eisner:
• This form will be for submission to this group?

Mark Otis:
• Yes. The MEC area on the M.Eng. web site is not in a secure folder. I am planning to kerborize that area. I thought we could make some of the materials that accompany a petition available through that kerborized area.

John Belina:
• We don’t want 10 pages from Just The Facts. The internal transcript (SI42li) from SIS provides the necessary information.

Graeme Bailey:
• I am hesitant about posting confidential records in this kerborized area.

Mark Eisner:
• I don’t think it’s worth putting a lot of effort into securing that area for confidential information.

Jim Bartsch:
• I’ll work with Mark and others to provide input.

2003 Engineering Graduate Research Symposium Reminder:
Mark Otis:
• I’ve included a copy of Dean’s e-mail reminder in your packets. The abstract deadline has been extended to the 20th and we hope you will encourage your students to participate. This year the Symposium is included as part of the Cornell Society of Engineers weekend event. We’re hoping for good participation.

Mark Eisner:
• The event should be advertised in the Sundial electronic newsletter.
Mark Otis:
• I’ll submit the information to the Sundial. It has also been advertised in the E-Quad (an EGSA electronic newsletter) and through their listserv.

Other Business:
Fred Kulhawy:
• When will we see our allocations for 2003-04?
Mark Otis:
• I’ll have those numbers to you by tomorrow or Friday.

Mike Hayes:
• Fred Kulhawy volunteered to be on the Financial Aid Subcommittee, but hasn’t received information.

Mark Otis:
• We will distribute the nominations to Fred today, and we will move tomorrow’s Financial Aid Subcommittee meeting to 10:00am to accommodate Fred’s schedule.

Jim Bartsch:
• The following members make up the Financial Aid Subcommittee: Fred Kulhawy, Mark Eisner, John Belina, Graeme Bailey and Larry Newman.

Adjourn Meeting:
A motion was made to adjourn at 8:45am. Seconded and approved.