COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FACULTY ORGANIZATION (CEFO)

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, December 6, 2022, 11:30AM

Lunch available at 11:15AM

EPIC G256

The following individuals signed the attendance sheet:

Yawo Amengonu, Yamilka Baez-Rivera, Cathy Blat, Anthony Bombik, Non BouSaba, Aidan Browne, Tara Cavalline, Shenen Chen, Youxing Chen, Harish Cherukuri, Jim Conrad, Abasifreke Ebong, Ahmed El-Ghannam, Wei Fan, Wei Gao, Claudia Garrido Martins, Christopher Green, Gwendolyn Gill, Meg Harkins, Jremy Holleman, Simon Hsiang, Olya Keen, Rob Keynton, Jeff Kimble, Christoph Kossack, Kevin Lawton, Dipankar Maity, Mike Mazzola, Edward Morse, Brigid Mullany, Mariya Munir, Asis Nasipuri, David Naylor, John Nettles, David Newell, Thomas Nicholas, Maciej Noras, Jaewon Oh, Jeff Raquet, Bienvenido Rodriguez-Medina, William Saunders, Sam Shue, Ron Smelser, Kamia Smith, Tyler Stover, Brett Tempest, Mesbah Uddin, Ke Wang, Qiuming Wei, Matthew Whelan, Wesley Williams, Jy Wu, In Hong Yang, Nigel Zheng

(54 Attendees)

AGENDA:

1. **Welcome and short remarks from CEFO President Aidan Browne**

Aidan Browne called the meeting to order at 11:35AM and introduced the agenda.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

Meeting minutes from November 1, 2022 were approved unanimously. Minutes are available at: https://engr.charlotte.edu/faculty-and-staff/cefo-faculty-organization/cefo-meeting-minutes

3. **Parliamentarian**

Aidan Browne issued a call for a volunteer for the still vacant CEFO Parliamentarian position. Any interested individuals can contact members of the CEFO Executive Committee.

4. **Faculty Council**

Aidan Browne provided updates from the Faculty Council.

- The University will be introducing new opportunities to gather more faculty input ("Breakfast with the Chancellor" and online feedback form for campus processes)
- New funding model was reviewed
- Student enrollment remains a focus; faculty are encouraged to make sure seats are available for their courses (if enrollment cap is reached, consider opening additional seats and/or consider if there is enough demand to support a second section of the course.)

5. **College/University Committee Review**

Matt Whelan summarized activity reports provided by College and University committees.

- The College Review Committee (CRC) completed review of 16 reappointment, promotion, and tenure packages and prepared the appropriate letters. CRC review of administrators will be conducted in the spring with faculty opinions being solicited via a confidential survey. The CRC noted significant variances in Promotion/Tenure CVs and will consider modifying the template in the spring as well as creating a brief webinar on CV suggestions/hints.
- The Faculty Welfare Committee has identified a resource guide for faculty and staff, childcard for faculty and staff, and identifying and addressing issues around faculty retention as three priority topics for this year. Other topics of interest are part-time courses and course load and parental leave for Post-doctoral researchers.
- The Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee reviewed and approved several changes to the Catalog associated with non-degree students, course numbering and status, and graduation policy. Other items on the committee agenda for this year are adding a syllabus violation to the Code of Student Academic Integrity, discussion of a draft revision to the Student Evaluations Policy and Procedure, and a 7-year review of the academic credit hour policy.

6. Researcher "speed dating" debut

Jim Conrad introduced "Researcher Speed Dating," which is a set of short presentations given by faculty on their areas of research:

Ground rules:

- One slide
- One minute
- No questions from the audience
- Presenters will be

Dip Maity (Research areas: Distributed Systems; Controls, Optimization, and Automation), Wes Williams ("Nuts and Bolts" Mechanical; machine design; prototyping), and Youxing Chen (Small-scale mechanics - micrometer scale, materials science, additive manufacturing, also manages scanning and transmission electron microscope labs) provided one-minute summaries on their research areas to pilot this new initiative.

Individuals interested in providing a one-minute summary of their research should send an email to Jim to volunteer for January 17th.

7. Dean's Report

Dean Keynton clarified that the new funding metrics include the scheduled credit hours. For example, a student increasing their course enrollment from 12 to 15 credit hours does not see a cost increase, but it improves our metrics within the funding model because it will increase the total number of scheduled credit hours. Faculty will be requested to attend recruiting events (SOAR) and are encouraged to interact with students that are touring our campus.

Mike Mazzola asked the Dean whether there is concern about unintended consequences of encouraging students to take 15 credit hours instead of 12 credit hours. Dean Keynton noted that the data indicates that students that take 15 credit hours perform better. The additional course load is not for all students and faculty will need to help identify the students that are capable of this. Aidan Browne noted that completing 120 credit hours in four years (eight semesters) will need to average 15

credit hours per semester, so maintaining this rate is actually need to keep students on track for graduating on time.

8. Curriculum Change Consent Calendar

Aidan reviewed the steps required for consent of changes in LCOE curricula, which are different from those followed in other colleges at the University. Currently, course and curriculum changes entered by departments are routed to either the College of Engineering Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee or College of Engineering Graduate Committee. After committee approval, the proposal moves to the Dean's Office to be placed on the Consent Calendar for 10 business days. The Consent Calendar allows any faculty member to review the proposed changes and lodge an objection to the proposed change with the College Faculty President and trigger a resolution process.

Proposed Changes:

A. Eliminate the consent calendar step altogether, as the college curriculum committees already provide review.
B. Only use the consent calendar for major changes (for example: >50% program changes, new degrees) and reduce the consent calendar to 5 days.

Harish Cherukuri suggested that the consent calendar occur concurrently with LCOE curriculum committee review. Aidan Browne noted that management of the consent calendar is a manual process so this may create additional work for staff. Ed Morse mentioned that the consent calendar serves an informational role in keeping faculty updated on course and curriculum changes. Aidan suggested that this information could still be routed to faculty for informational purposes without the consent calendar. Asis Nasipuri suggested that the consent calendar should occur before the committee reviews so that the faculty have a change to provide feedback to the committee members before their review. Bill Saunders mentioned that the college committee is currently able to spot issues and conflicts. He voiced support for revising the requirement so that only major changes be posted on the consent calendar. Wes Williams asked where the 10 day window become onerous. Aidan responded that the curriculog process is lengthy and delays can jeopardize the ability to have changes made before deadlines required for the changes to be effective for the next academic year. Dean Smelser noted that the 10 days is 10 business days, so it can be quite lengthy, as it does not include dates when the University is not open. Also, items cannot be posted on the consent calendar during the summer since faculty appointments are only 9 months in duration.

Aidan requested informal support for the feedback to be incorporated into a proposal that will be voted on during the next faculty meeting.

9. Brainstorming: Capstone Experience 2024 and Beyond

Aidan reviewed the authority of the faculty and the desire of CEFO to get back to serving as a vehicle for faculty to exercise their authority to establish and/or policies. Aidan requested that faculty review our authority and bring issues to CEFO that are within our authority to make changes to policy.

A request was made to defer the discussion of the Capstone Experience until the next meeting. Concern was raised that folks have not been given enough time to prepare for this discussion. Aidan denied this request, noting that this discussion is not intended to be controversial, is not specific to Senior Design, and will need to occur over more than one meeting.

Jim noted that ABET identified a lack of standards instruction in the current Senior Design. Mesbah Uddin asked about other outstanding issues; noted that the current Senior Design is very well established and a highlight of our college's experience. A request was made to set aside additional time for this discussion. Aidan reminded faculty that there are new opportunities being presented by the Innovation Space being developed and there is a need. Capstone Experience encompasses more than just the college Senior Design. The intent of the CEFO ExCom is to initiate this discussion and encourage more input than is typically received through surveys. Lack of software expertise to execute some projects, potential for collaborating with other colleges, if possible; entrepreneurship is of increased priority nationwide (an entrepreneurship course has been featured in Senior Design in the past with great success). Dean Keynton noted the importance of these discussions and reminded us that we need to constantly evolve if we want to maintain excellence, strengthen, and meet changing needs.

10. Closing

Motion to adjourn was made and seconded at 12:47 PM.