Master of Engineering Committee Meeting  
May 12, 2004   8:00 – 9:00am  
240 Carpenter Hall

Attendees:  Graeme Bailey, John Belina, Larry Cathles, Claude Cohen, Scott Coldren, Fred Kulhawy, David Grubb, Mike Hayes, Mark Otis, Dawn Warren
Guests:   Mark Turnquist, Patty Apgar
Absent:   James Bartsch, Bing Cady, Mark Eisner, Jim Jenkins, Matt Miller, Larry Newman

John Belina called the meeting to order at 8:08am.

Approval of April 2004 Minutes:  
Approved as submitted.

Engineering Management Major:  
Questions and continued discussion from April meeting.

Mark Turnquist:  
I’ve provided you with a revised description, thanks to suggestions made by Mark Eisner at the April meeting. The changes principally are the mention of the functional specialization areas that are part of the program (end of 2\textsuperscript{nd} paragraph), and we rewrote the first two paragraphs on the Rationale section to more clearly outline the differences in focus between this program, ORIE, and Systems Engineering.

The second update involves my conversation with Joe Thomas from the Management School to make sure they have no concerns with the use of the term management, and they do not. Joe perceives this program as appealing to a different set of students. The analytic focus on project management is very different from the MBA program focus.

The third update is related to the Dean’s scheduled May 25, 2004 meeting with Directors from at least 3 departments, the Systems Engineering program, and myself to discuss management related programs within the College. It’s not a full Directors & Chairs meeting, but it will bring together individuals who have some stake in programs of that character.

John Belina:  
It hasn’t gone to the Directors & Chairs yet, then?

Mark Turnquist:  
No, the Dean will decide after the meeting on the 25\textsuperscript{th}.

Graeme:  
How does this relate to the Systems/Civil infrastructure that is occurring with them?

Mark Turnquist:  
There isn’t really much of a connection at all. That’s a concentration.
Graeme Bailey:
   How much overlap of coursework or personnel?
Mark Turnquist:
   There will be very little overlap in coursework and minor overlap in personnel.
John Belina:
   Have you had any discussions with the Graduate School?
Mark Turnquist:
   No, this is the correct venue at this point, and once we receive the go ahead from the College we’ll take it to the Graduate School.

Mark Eisner called yesterday afternoon. After the revision of text, he seemed pleased with the idea, however he has been instructed by OR faculty to vote against it.

Graeme Bailey:
   Will you meet with OR faculty, individually or corporately, before May 25th?
Mark Turnquist:
   I’m not sure at this point. The meeting on the 25th will include Sid Resnick, Mark Eisner and Peter Jackson (SE representative). I’ll try to speak with a couple of them before the 25th.

Larry Cathles:
   The goal should be that we have 3 strong programs that are coordinated, organized, and advertised so the students are slotted into a program that best meets their interests.

Graeme Bailey:
   If they can present documents to the Graduate School with supporting letters from the parallel programs, it will go through more smoothly.

John Belina:
   What is your ideal timeframe for action from this Committee? Are you looking for something before going to the May 25th meeting?
Mark Turnquist:
   I realize this is the last meeting of year for this Committee and if there is no action from this group today, there won’t be any action until September at this level. Any subsequent action for this committee will wait until fall because the Graduate School won’t meet again until September.

Graeme Bailey:
   In the past, e-mail has been used to help move things along, however I suspect there will be some hesitation to do that.

Mike Hayes:
   The feedback from the May 25th meeting may alter this again. E-mail is a great way to handle it, or we could also schedule another meeting for the end of May.

John Belina:
   Jim Bartsch had hoped we could do something today, if all the interested individuals were here, but he agreed that a 2nd meeting could be held.
David Grubb:
We wouldn’t want to do something via e-mail without seeing these documents, but if the documents could be e-mailed around, I’d be happy to respond electronically.

Larry Cathles:
What information don’t we have yet? In principal we want to proceed, the concern is that they be properly coordinated. We could say that we strongly support these programs, particularly the subject one which has been operating for 15 years, but we have concerns that things be properly coordinated.

Graeme Bailey:
Will there be an M.Eng. Engineering Management option available to other programs?

Mark Turnquist:
Yes, that will stay the way it is.

Larry Cathles:
Are any of your competitors not wanting you to take this to Albany for approval?

Mark Turnquist:
I sense there’s some turf concern on the part of a few.

Graeme Bailey:
Mark Eisner has a good feel for what makes a decent program, and if his field isn’t supportive, I recommend these issues get sorted out.

John Belina:
I know in the past we’ve given people the sense that it’s appropriate to go forward with it after cleaning up the details and then come back for the formal vote. Can we give Mark a straw vote?

Mark Turnquist:
After meeting on the 25th, I can report back to this group so you know the outcome.

John Belina:
At that point we can decide to use e-mail or schedule another meeting.

Graeme Bailey:
I would suggest a formal vote to endorse the program, with some sort of resolution included – some variation on Larry Cathles’ earlier comment.

The MEC members recommended moving forward. We strongly endorse the Program, but want to make sure it is properly coordinated. The endorsement comes with the understanding that Mark Turnquist will provide us with an update following the May 25th meeting. A motion was made and seconded. Unanimously passed.

International TA Development Program (ITADP):
Mike Hayes:
This situation is still not resolved. International TAs (including the M.Eng. Graduate Teaching Research Specialists), by provost mandate 3 years ago, are required to attend the ITADP. We were granted an exemption until last fall when it got pulled. Chemistry and M.Eng. were the only 2 programs granted exemptions. Chemistry has opted to do their own training, and we chose to have
the screening done by ITADP because we’re not in a position to do our own training. Last year 29 students should have gone through the training. Based on those numbers, we want to put the effort into it – evaluations show that the training is 65-70% effective. If the student doesn’t go through summer program, they cannot concurrently enroll in 578 (an extended, semester-long language training class taught in the fall semester) if they don’t pass screening which means they wouldn’t be in the classroom until the following spring.

Larry Cathles:
Students take 578 to be trained, and then teach the following semester?

Mike Hayes:
Yes, that is an option, and it’s the least costly option for all of us. However, the students would only be eligible to TA for one semester.

Larry Cathles:
Can students be screened via telephone interviews?

Mike Hayes:
The screening (by ITADP) happens at the end of the International TA Development Program. The students must attend the 1-week course and then be screened. If the student doesn’t pass that screening, they have to enroll in 578, the one-semester course.

Scott Coldren:
The Ph.D. TAs, can teach and attend 578 concurrently.

Mike Hayes:
They are allowed to do that only if they have attended the 1-week course. We can make everyone go through the 1-week program prior to classes starting. Then, if the student doesn’t pass, they enroll in 578, but they can TA based on the fact that they attended the 1-week training. The only problem with this option is that we have to pay the students a stipend of $500 to be here that week before classes start.

We think it will be more cost-effective to offer extended training for our TAs provided by the College of Engineering’s TA Development Program as opposed to having them come a week earlier. If we run the program in-house, we don’t have to pay the students a stipend. We’re tentatively thinking the training could be taught on a Friday evening and a Saturday institute for 2 weekends in a row (delaying their teaching by 2 weeks). If they don’t pass our training, they won’t be able to enroll in 578 (a fall-only class).

Larry Cathles:
A telephone interview will tell us if they have potential.

Mike Hayes:
I’m not disagreeing, but the Provost has dictated that they will either be trained or they won’t teach.

Larry Cathles:
We could provide training at the start of the year, and we’ll enroll them in 578 if we think there is a chance they might have a problem passing our training. If they pass the course, they drop 578.
Patty Apgar:
Enrolling in 578 might be overwhelming for the M.Eng. students (because they are only here for 1-year, and their schedules are already tight).

Larry Cathles:
If they pass the 1-week course, they could drop 578.

Mike Hayes:
I’ll have to talk with the 578 people about the possibility of numerous students dropping the course after a week or two. The other problem is that we didn’t hold up our end of the bargain last year, and a lot of our students didn’t get screened.

Graeme Bailey:
What is involved in the screening?

Patty Apgar:
The student has to give a 7-minute presentation on a topic that is relevant to the student. Based on that, the screeners ask questions.

Mike Hayes:
We have 28 hours of required language training in our TA Development Program. We have another 21-25 hours of language training to add to our Program to meet the guidelines.

Graeme Bailey:
The ESL Program was dissolved for a variety of reasons, but it served a number of Ph.D. students well. The ESL program was taken optionally to assist students with interviews. If Engineering feels it can support something in that direction, it could be a valuable resource.

Mike Hayes:
ESL wasn’t in a position to talk with us about taking this project on due to the unknown status of their program. They have been cleared by the ITADP as prospective instructors. We’ve got to get them into our curriculum if this is going to be approved.

Graeme Bailey:
The bottleneck seems to be the screening.

Mike Hayes:
The 25 hours of additional language training is the real bottleneck. Some of our fields at the Ph.D. level won’t put any students in the classroom until they take 578. If we can get this done at no cost to you, that’s our first option. Otherwise we’ve got to come up with $500 per student plus deal with the visa issues.

John Belina:
There’s no overlap between the 25 hours we do as part of our TA training and the additional 21-25 hours of language training?

Mike Hayes:
Seven to twelve hours can be pulled out of the 35-hour language training by the ITADP program, leaving us with the 21-25 additional hours of training. I’ll talk with the Dean and Cathy about money this week. I’ll try to give you dates by the end of the month.

M.Eng. Program Review:
Mike Hayes:

Next April, we will hold the Engineering College Council (ECC) meeting, which will be devoted solely to the M.Eng. Program. The Dean has spoken with the Directors & Chairs about it. The Dean’s intent is to have every department that has an M.Eng. Program talk with those individuals about their program.

Prior to the ECC meeting, the M.Eng. programs within each field will undergo a program review. We review the graduate fields every 6 years on a rotation, and we review the undergraduate programs through ABET --the M.Eng. program never been reviewed. Mike Spencer has been asked to come up with a series of criteria that looks at what we want to know about the M.Eng. Program. He will commence late summer/early fall, and this is what we will ask you to do (see handout). Our office will be happy to assist you with some of the data pieces of this.

This is up for feedback to you. I’ll take that information back to Mike Spencer for revisions. How would you like to get feedback to me?

Larry Cathles:

What length are they looking for?

Mike Hayes:

Spend as much time and paper as you need to get your message across. What do you want your program to be, the optimal size, etc. The linear formula will be in place for F’05, so the optimal size will have a direct impact on that.

Graeme Bailey:

It might be helpful to distribute the Ad Hoc Committee Report that we submitted to the Dean for reference.

Mike Hayes:

This handout and the Ad Hoc Report will be put on the Engineering Intranet for your review. Please get back to me by the end of the month with feedback. The Dean will probably use either the June or July meeting with the Directors & Chairs to discuss this.

Graeme Bailey:

Are there any agendas behind this?

Mike Hayes:

No. I have been very pleased with the outcome from the Graduate Studies Faculty Taskforce. They had strong recommendations on M.Eng. that Kent rejected. He feels the M.Eng. is a viable program that needs strengthening, and we need to tell it’s story. The formal call for your papers will probably be August or September, and it will be due in January or February.

Following Year Business Issues/Considerations:

John Belina:

Are there any concerns that should be on the agenda for early next year? Last year, while doing petitions, we came up with some questions -- Matt asked us to come back to the issue of how many credits can be pulled from undergraduate for M.Eng.
Graeme Bailey:
One thing we need to keep on top of is the Graduate School’s automated system and the field’s needs. During the application process this year, we had no idea how many students had applied, and in general we had a lot of problems. We need to keep an eye on the process to make sure it improves.

Mark Otis:
All applications will be on-line for F’04, in conjunction with the Graduate School. The system will track accepts, matriculations and campus visits.

Mike Hayes:
I’d like to ask everyone here about their application numbers for F’04 – how are they? The General consensus was that acceptance rates are way down. CEE has a 31% acceptance rate – last year 50 – 70%.

Graeme Bailey:
We’re experiencing a higher rate of deferrals – we’re looking into them.

Claude Cohen:
We typically have 15-18 usually, but F’04 will be 12 students.

John Belina:
We had 105 applications for F’04, and we’ve got about 50 coming. I didn’t get the sense that our international applications are down.

Graeme Bailey:
We’ve got roughly similar numbers of applicants from mainland China and India, and the applications from Pakistan are really strong and quite a few.

Mike Hayes:
I saw preliminary numbers at the Graduate School, and I was shocked at how far down the COE applications (overall) at the graduate level are. China and Taiwan are significantly down.

End of Year Comments:
Thanks to Jim Bartsch for Chairing the MEC for another year.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10am.