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

Attendees: Graeme Bailey, James Bartsch, John Belina, Claude Cohen, Mark Eisner,  
David Grubb, Matt Miller, David Muller, Larry Newman, Mark Otis,  
Mary Sansalone, Michael Shuler, Michael Spencer, Dawn Warren

Guests: Patty Apgar, Scott Coldren, Marcia Sawyer, Mark Turnquist

Absent: Bing Cady, Larry Cathles, Jim Jenkins

Overview: Engineering Management Program, DSpace, Extramural Graduates,  
Enterprise Engineering Colloquium, MEng Review, Financial Aid  
Allocation Process, ORGSPE Director Update, Fall 2004 Enrollment  
Numbers/Visa Concerns Query, CEE Petition, Discussion of MEC  
Chairmanship

Approval of May MEC Minutes:  
The May 12, 2004 minutes were approved as submitted.

Engineering Management Program:  
Mark Turnquist:  
At the end of the May 12th MEC meeting, there was a sense that the May 25th meeting  
in the Dean’s office was important to the process of this Committee making an  
endorsement of this proposal. The summary sheet of the May 25th meeting has been  
distributed, and it reflects that there were 3 outcomes:  
- The Dean and the attending Department Chairs are supportive of the proposal.  
- The Dean asked Mike Hayes to coordinate descriptions of the various  
  management-related programs within the college so students understand what  
  the distinctions between the programs are and where they go to meet their  
  particular needs.  
- This same group of Department Chairs and the Dean will meet again in Spring  
  '05 to review where we are, to make sure these programs retain distinct  
  identities and serve distinct roles, and to collectively serve the management-  
  related needs of the college as effectively as possible.

Graeme Bailey:  
Regarding the second outcome, has it happened?

Mark Turnquist:  
I don’t know that much activity has happened over the summer.

Graeme Bailey:  
Is there a sense if the programs will be kept separate, rather than coordinating  
programs?

Mark Turnquist:  
At this point, yes. There is a definite sense of a collective endeavor on the part of  
the college, but each program serves slightly different needs and we want to
ensure that we don’t duplicate things but that we take advantage of each programs’ strength.

Mark Eisner:
How do we keep item 2 from getting lost?

Mark Otis:
I will work with Professor Turnquist on item 2.

Jim Bartsch:
Is there a draft document that this group can review? This is part of the overall proposal, is it not?

Mark Turnquist:
Yes, this is part of the plan for moving forward. The Graduate School will want to see this or at least have a sense that item 2 has been addressed.

Graeme Bailey:
Yes, the Graduate School will want to see item 2 before it goes to the General Committee.

Jim Bartsch:
Item 2 will be worked out, and that information will be brought back to this group in preparation for going to the Graduate School. Regarding item 3, has this been resolved? Have all the Directors & Chairs signed off?

Mark Turnquist:
Everyone who was at the May 25th meeting, which included Sid Resnick, Jim Gossett, Emmanuel Giannelis and Peter Jackson.

Jim Bartsch:
Are we prepared to vote on this today? What is your ideal timeline?

Mark Turnquist:
Ideally, I’d like it approved this morning so we can continue on with the General Committee in the Graduate School.

Jim Bartsch:
How does this Committee feel about voting at this point? Have the issues been sufficiently resolved that were raised at the May 12th meeting, or do some of you need to take it back to your faculty?

Matt Miller:
Is the question in the minutes on what we’re voting on?

Mark Turnquist:
The proposal really is to create a degree designation that says Master of Engineering in Engineering Management.

John Belina:
At the May 12th MEC meeting we recommended moving forward on the following:

“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.”

Graeme Bailey:
As someone with no vested interest in that program, my only hesitation is that I’d like to see item #2 not get lost on the sidelines.
Jim Bartsch:
Could item #2 be developed and the response and the original proposal be
circulated electronically? Are we comfortable with that?

David Grubb:
I recommend that we bring it to a vote right now – if people don’t want to vote for
it, they can vote against it.

After confirming that Mark Otis and Mark Turnquist will work together to
develop/complete item #2, a motion was made to approve the original proposal, and the
motion was seconded. The motion passed with 8 yahs, 0 nays, and 3 abstentions.

DSpace:
Jim Bartsch:
Last August, when summer degrees were prepared, BEE had a problem with
DSpace. Our field didn’t have an arrangement to approve the documents
submitted to DSpace. How are fields prepared to approve these papers? Is there a
common practice we might want to implement? MS and PhDs go through the
thesis secretary, but there is no central clearinghouse for M.Eng. We need to
make sure that DSpace submissions have been read by the Mentor and approved.
The Graduate School web page indicates that candidates should prepare their
materials in the usual way and once approved by their Special Committee post the
submission to DSpace.

Mark Otis:
The students should submit their materials in paper form, indicating from the
beginning that they will submit the final product to DSpace. The student is
responsible for submitting a PDF to the Graduate School (there is no indication on
the web site that the PDF needs to be approved prior to its submission). At that
point a copy is sent to the field and the instructions indicate that there is some sort
of communication. If the document is approved (formatting-wise), and the field
approves it as an original document, the printing service contacts the student and
copies are sent out.

Larry Newman:
Maybe we could require a page be included inside the cover sheet that reads,
“This has been approved by” with the required signatures listed, and this sheet
will be included in the student’s file to document that the materials have gone
through the approval process.

Mark Eisner:
Do they scan them, Mark?

Mark Otis:
No, they are submitted electronically with instructions to convert it to PDF.

Mark Eisner:
If it were scanned, they could also scan the signatures.

Graeme Bailey:
An alternative would be that the document is submitted on-line but is not released
until the electronic signatures are received from the field office. This would be
relatively straightforward, but they may view it as adding unnecessary work to the field office.

Mark Eisner:
Isn’t this up to the Graduate School to protect their system to make sure something can’t be submitted without approval?

Jim Bartsch:
MS & PhD submissions go through Minnie Empson’s office, but their web page parenthetically states, “M.Eng. candidates will follow different steps, described in an addendum to this document available from the M.Eng. program office.”

Mark Otis:
Graeme submitted a revised M.Eng. addendum, but the Graduate School’s web site has been revised and the link has been lost. I will resubmit the information to them.

Jim Bartsch:
Did we originally propose that a signature page be added to the report?

Graeme Bailey:
I believe we were relying on the Graduate School to handle it. In which case, I think the idea of having students submit their documents to DSpace, but have the documents held until an electronic signature is received from the field office to release it.

Scott Coldren:
Could it be linked to the approval of the provisional degree list? The list comes out three times a year, and it applies to both the MS/PhD students as well as to the M.Eng. students.

Graeme Bailey:
That’s a great idea, and the obvious way to do that would be to have it automatically linked to the Graduate School, which would mean it won’t happen this year.

Mark Eisner:
There may be multiple authors, and they may not all be on the degree list. It’s not an insurmountable problem, but it’s something to take into consideration.

Mark Otis:
We might also want to address a common deadline.

Jim Bartsch:
Can we ask the Committee to look at this problem and bring recommendations to the October meeting? Mark just mentioned the concept of a common completion date for papers being completed and approved. We don’t currently have one for M.Eng. projects, nor do we mention anything in our by-laws. Currently the individual fields set the date, and I’m not saying that’s not acceptable. The Graduate School has a completion deadline for MS/PhD candidates, and I’m proposing for ABEN that we will advertise the date provided by the Graduate School.

John Belina:
We’ve used the Graduate School date for years, and it’s alleviated a lot of problems with late submissions. The Graduate School tells students their date is
the date for all graduate fields, including professional programs (unless fields have exceptions).

Graeme Bailey:
The essential issue is that the project report is part of a project course, and there’s presumably a grade being submitted to that course. One would want to tie the submission of the grade for that project to the approval of this. It’s closer to a Registrar connected exercise than it is a degree completion date schedule – it’s more a Registrar concern than it is a Graduate School concern.

Jim Bartsch:
Let’s talk about this again. If we decide not to have a common date, the fields still have the autonomy, and I’m fine with that.

Extramural Graduates:
John Belina:
We have two M.Eng. students (they have met the minimum residency requirement) who asked to go extramurally to complete less than 12 credits for their last semester. One of the students needed to remain a student for health insurance reasons, so I suggested he speak with David Yeh who grants pro-rata tuition (the only way to remain a student and go part-time). David said the Graduate School rules state there is no part-time enrollment for graduate students. David also pointed out that it has been university policy for several years that the Extramural Program isn’t supposed to enroll any degree candidates. The Graduate School says every semester that a graduate student is enrolled must be full-time – pro-rata doesn’t even apply. David is willing to work out an exception for the Professional Masters students to go pro-rata, if the College of Engineering is interested. The only difference is that the student pays fees as a pro-rata student (currently $2,900 per semester).

Jim Bartsch:
Isn’t there a provision in the Graduate School to register for “Exam-only” and “degree-only?” I know those options exist for the research degrees.

Michael Shuler:
“Exam-only” you register for 1-day only.

Larry Newman:
The Lockheed Martin students now register through Ex-Mu. The process involves having the students apply through the Graduate School, they take a Leave of Absence for 3 years, and they re-register with Graduate School in their final semester to graduate. We essentially used a pro-rata system for the last 4 years, but it didn’t make sense.

Graeme Bailey:
There are several implications involved with registering Ex-Mu.

Larry Newman:
The Faculty Advisor system won’t work for those students who aren’t registered through the Graduate School, making it difficult to track them.

Mark Eisner:
I like the idea of registering pro-rata.

John Belina:
It protects the students as far as loan pay back, insurance, etc. David asked what the MEC, on behalf of the College, wants to recommend?

Mark Eisner:
We want to avoid unintended consequences. I think we should give it some thought.

Jim Bartsch:
Let’s investigate this further and talk about this at the October meeting.

**Enterprise Engineering Colloquium:**
Mark Eisner distributed the list of speakers for the Enterprise Engineering Colloquium (formerly known as the Manufacturing Colloquium), and he explained the program. Speakers (alums) from industry are brought in to talk about what engineering is like in the “real world.” It’s held on Thursday afternoons and it can be taken as a 1-credit class or pass/fail. Cornell Engineering Alumni Association (CEAA), formerly known as Cornell Society of Engineers (CSE), sponsors the class. In the spring semester, and subsequently, it will be offered on Wednesday afternoons at 4:30 to avoid interfering with recruiting travel.

**M.Eng. Review:**
Mark Otis:
The M.Eng. review is moving forward. Mike Spencer will present questions at the Directors & Chairs meeting this Thursday, and the Dean will call for a Committee to gather feedback from the M.Eng. programs to put together a proposal to guide the Engineering College Council (ECC) in their discussions.

Graeme Bailey:
Do we know what sort of questions will be asked?

Michael Spencer:
The questions were driven from the initial Ad Hoc Committee study and discussions with Jim Bartsch. They are also driven by the need to come up with definitions for the M.Eng. program. They are framing a self-study. The first set of questions are basic information gathering. The Review Committee will develop a sense of common themes of various programs; identify the best practices, and what some of the issues are. A set of questions will be put together to help the ECC when they hear the various presentations of each department. The view was that because M.Eng is unique, it really hasn’t been able to promote itself.

The timeline hasn’t been officially decided, but the ECC meeting takes place in April, which means the materials need to be submitted by March. The self-study deadline will be in February, and the Review Committee will develop their questions in March. A tentative timeline will be presented.

Graeme Bailey:
You used the Ad Hoc Report that was revised 2 or so years ago?

Michael Spencer:
Many of the questions were based on that report and the various priorities that were assigned in response to the questions. That was the nucleus of this review.

Mark Eisner:
When the earlier report was done, each member was told to interview their Chair – sounds like this is more formal, but generally the same.

Jim Bartsch:
We’ll know more in a couple of weeks.

Mark Eisner:
In terms of giving our Directors and Chairs a heads-up on this, are we positive or negative as a committee?

Jim Bartsch:
There was a lot of work done in the Ad Hoc Report, and if it can be used as a launching pad for this one, we won’t need to begin from scratch.

Mark Eisner:
The Directors & Chairs should have a fresh copy of the Ad Hoc report, as well as a copy of our by-laws.

Mark Otis:
I’ll send a copy of both of those documents out.

David Muller:
The Dean commented last year that he was looking to decouple the revenue from the number of students in the M.Eng. programs, is that on their agenda?

Michael Spencer:
There are two things that are happening separately, and they are both tied to the Strategic Plan. There are certain elements of the Strategic Plan that directly address the M.Eng. program. The issue of the funding model is being handled by Cathy Long as a separate item in the Directors & Chairs meeting tomorrow. This Review/Self-Study is dealing with the M.Eng. program, where it sits, the quality of the program, etc. The Revenue Model will be addressed with regard to how those funds are related to the execution of the M.Eng. programs, but that’s the only way this Self-Study will address revenue.

Mark Eisner:
For clarity, the issue wasn’t decoupling it from enrollment, but decoupling us from each other with respect to enrollment. There was a committee that recommended making the returns to the departments linear based on the number of participants.

Michael Spencer:
About a year ago, the Directors & Chairs were presented with the idea of the funding model, and Mike Hayes gave several alternatives and scenarios associated with those alternatives. The Directors & Chairs were asked to come back with feedback – there was none. At tomorrow’s meeting, Cathy will give two funding model options to the Directors & Chairs.

Financial Aid Allocation Process:
Mark Otis:
Our financial aid estimates were problematic this year. We have been working with an estimate process that hasn’t been addressed for numerous years, and this
year we ran into problems with reliability. We have met with our accounting
group, and we are discussing the possibility of bringing an accountant in to set up
a new system that will allow for more transparency and will provide real-time
reporting on numbers. We are anticipating a new system, not done in-house. We
are also exploring the possibility of coupling this system within the Graduate
Application Processing System (GAPS). The numbers will be more reliable, and
we will have them earlier in the year to prepare a more reliable allocation
estimate.

Mark Eisner:
How much earlier will you be able to provide us with numbers?

Mark Otis:
We should have projected numbers by the end of February, but we are still
working with the financial planners.

Mark Eisner:
Do other departments use financial aid as a recruiting device?

Michael Schuler:
I think it’s the best use of those funds – it makes sense.

Mark Eisner:
I’ve used the funds for years and found it to be very effective. It means going out
on a limb a little bit.

Matt Miller:
To familiarize the new people on the Committee, would you summarize the
financial aid program and how it works.

Mark Otis:
We have a number of donor accounts that have annual payments and some have a
share system. We are allocated a certain amount each year from these 50
accounts. Each field is allocated an academic year Graduate Teaching Research
Specialist (GTRS) stipend from those funds, and the remaining monies are
divvied up based on enrollment from the past 3 years. Final numbers are
available to us in July, so throughout the year we track the anticipated the yield
from those accounts.

Mark Eisner:
What was the total amount of financial aid available this year?

Mark Otis:
1.5 million.

Matt Miller:
Our financial aid goes toward GTRS appointments, and we don’t notify our
students of the money until they are offered a position.

Mark Otis:
From my experience, generally the funds are awarded after the fact in most fields.

Patty Apgar:
CEE uses the money as a recruiting tool. Otherwise we’re asking the M.Eng.
students to accept with no financial aid encouragement, and we aren’t going to get
good students that way.
Under the current system, we are assuming there are a certain amount of allocations going into the process and we’d like to provide you with actual numbers early in the year. Another possibility in the revamping of the financial aid allocation system is to get a better idea of the accounts that some fields have outside of the M.Eng. financial aid accounts that we maintain.

Graeme Bailey:
   To clarify, money from year one is used for financial aid in year two.

Mark Eisner:
   It’s the return on investments.

**ORGSPE Director Update:**

Mark Otis:
   Mike Spencer feels that filling the Director position is a priority, and he’s hoping to review the current job description to make possible revisions. No target date has been set on when the position will be filled.

**Fall 2004 Enrollment Numbers/Visa Concerns Query:**

Jim Bartsch polled the members in attendance for their enrollment numbers:

John Belina: low 60s, last year 109
Graeme Bailey: 93, last year 110, almost exclusively visa-related.
Mark Eisner: 97, down from the expected 108 (I targeted for 90). Visa issues are primarily the problem, but also financial concerns.
Michael Shuler: 8 enrolled, 2 EA
David Muller: 10 this year, 6 last year
Matt Miller: 43 this year, about the same as last year
Claude Cohen: 16, several will be here only 1 term (they were EA)
Jim Bartsch: 9 this year
Mary Sansalone: 45 students, down from about 59 students – partly visa problems, and partly financial.
Larry Newman: We have 13, 3 EA, 10 new. We lost one due to visa problems, and we’ve got 20 students in the Lockheed Martin Program.
Mark Eisner:
   Int’l numbers are relatively high, despite the fact that several are coming without financial aid.

**CEE Petition:**

Patty Apgar:
   This individual is an employee who doesn’t qualify for the Employee Degree Program until S’05, and he’s only here for a 2-year term.

Jim Bartsch:
   We saw this petition over the summer, didn’t we?

Patty Apgar:
   You received it, but the rest of the Committee didn’t.

A motion was made to approve the petition, it was seconded, and it was approved unanimously.
Discussion of MEC Chairmanship:

Jim Bartsch:

I’ve been the MEC Chairman for several years, and the by-laws say I serve at the pleasure of the Dean. I’ll continue to serve for one more year if you see fit, but my real concern is that there are many concerns in the College of Engineering that I may not know much about. If you have comments about the chairmanship, please don’t hesitate to make them known to Mike Spencer.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01am.