

Academic Planning Council Minutes
Wednesday, April 17, 2019
1:30 PM – 3:00 PM
3609 Engineering Hall

Present: M. Allen, L. Albert, D. Anderson, M. Arnold, G. Harrington, E. Harris, G. Nellis,
R. Radwin, I. Robertson, E. Shusta, J. Tinjum
Absent: J. Blanchard, S. Hladilek, B. McPherson, M. Romero, D. Thelen, C. Walters
Guest: D. Reindl

Announcements:

Design + Innovation program proposal APC vote: 9-yes, 1-abstain, 1-no reply;
UAPC has approved the Design + Innovation program proposal.

Research Professor and Teaching Professor Titles:

Two new academic staff titles, research professor and teaching professor, were recently approved by the faculty senate. These titles allow for progression (assistant, associate and full) and do not replace existing titles such as the faculty associate and scientist title series.

Review of staff members in current titles may be needed to see if the new titles are a better fit for their responsibilities.

APC is tasked with developing the progression criteria for each new title as well as outlining the differences between the new titles and the existing titles.

The criteria should be uniform college-wide and clearly articulated, but may have to allow for variances at the department level.

The University of Illinois titling guidelines were distributed and may be a good template to use in developing the college's criteria/guidelines.

The following concerns were expressed:

- Need to identify the differences between these new academic staff positions and tenure-track faculty; academic staff should not be expected to serve the same functions as faculty
- Would prefer to not have to provide a tenure-like dossier for progression through these titles
- Compensation concerns

A subcommittee to be formed to draft the criteria/guidelines, with a completion date of early Fall 2019. Bill Murphy, Rob Radwin, Jim Tinjum agreed to serve on the subcommittee. APC members should bring back to their depts. – announce the new titles and see if

anyone is interesting joining the subcommittee; Others mentioned that might be interested in serving on the subcommittee are John Puccinelli in BME, Andrew Greenberg in CBE, and EP representative.

First-year Curriculum Benchmarking Discussion:

The subcommittee reviewed 117 R1 institutions and found that 2/3 of these institutions offer a freshman design/introductory course. Literature review of research indicates that offering an introductory course is beneficial in retention of students and other factors. This information may be added to the CEETE website and shared with instructors.

Although there is no interest in returning to a combined InterEgr 110-like course, there is a need to develop a method to distribute information on the various engineering disciplines as there is minimal information available for incoming students and those that may choose to switch programs. The current department-specific introductory course no longer provide this opportunity.

The subcommittee developed a document gathering information on the various disciplines that will be shared with advisors.

Some suggestions for ways to disseminate information on other disciplines and help identify those students that may want to change majors:

- Develop a student-facing website with content on engineering disciplines. The current department website focus is on the program not the discipline. Professional societies might be a source of content for website. The Equity and Diversity Committee is also looking at revamping/developing website.
- Rotate a representative through SOAR to present the various disciplines. This may be difficult due to the number of SOAR sessions and the tight schedule at SOAR.
- Hold a department fair/market department. Advertise other departments in the introductory courses.
- Advisors may help identify students interested in changing programs.

This discussion will be continued. APC would like Manuela Romero to provide statistics and information on how many students change programs and when do the students change programs as well as data on retention.

Student Organizations: Safety and Oversight:

All agreed that the student organizations complement the students' education experience and agreed that supervision is necessary for those activities involving mechanical, physical and/or chemical components.

Allocation of space for fabrication and/or storage is made on case-by-case basis by Peter Nemmetz or John Archambault.

There was a discussion of how to identify what types of activities warrant supervision. One idea proposed was supervision would be determined by the type of tools used; if the tool is likely to be found at home, no supervision would be required. Although, what the student is working on is an important factor to consider as well.

Jesse Decker, safety director, is developing a set of rules for all student organizations, following the Automotive Lab Safety Rules that are now available; however, it may be difficult to ensure that the rules are followed.

Training is another important component. Currently, students need the appropriate level of training dependent on what equipment will be used. It was mentioned that in industry settings, training alone is considered the lowest level in the safety hierarchy and may be insufficient.

Another discussion centered around access. Students would like access to spaces at all times. This is difficult to staff/supervise. Some suggestions include adjusting supervised hours to meet demand; perhaps more hours toward the end of the semester or near competitions and weekend hours.

Some additional comments:

- Invite Jesse Decker and Risk Management to APC

- Benchmark other institutions safety measures; GA Tech seen as a good example

- David Anderson to report back from the Safety Committee

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

1:30 – 3:00 PM

3609 Engineering