

**MICHIGAN STATE**  
**U N I V E R S I T Y**

August 27, 2008

To: Dean Udpa  
Cc: Shanker Balasubramaniam  
From: Shanker Balasubramaniam  
Subject: Annual Report (2007-2008) from Engineering College Advisory Committee

This document summarizes the activities of the Engineering College Advisory Committee (ECAC) for the past academic year. During the year, several routine issues were dealt with, as well as those with significant import. While most of the proceedings of the ECAC are reflected in the minutes, the following highlights some of the more significant activities that we embarked upon during the last year:

1. Strategic planning committee has been formed, and regular meetings have been scheduled. This will be facilitated by Tom Sipila and chaired by Shanker Balasubramaniam
2. Extensive work has been done on mentoring. The committee arrived at a set of recommendations. The chairs have been impressed upon on the need to establish a mentoring program within their Departments, and formal guidelines have been provided.
3. We tried taking getting involved in the Residential College. Extensive discussion and informational meetings were held with Dean Wolff. However, due to paucity of time Committee could not sink our teeth into the issue.
4. As usual, a brownbag lunch session was held to discuss T&P procedures, how to prepare packages, etc. This was led by Rick Lyles.
5. Same issues resurface in the T&P process; (i) the packages are not uniform; (ii) Departmental letter are still not uniform, in terms of the people who are asked for letter as well as the questions they are asked to answer; (iii) the faculty sentiment regarding a candidate is not reflected in the package; (iv) packages are updated in an ad-hoc manner and a procedure for doing so needs to be established. A memo address these concerns has been drafted and circulated amongst the ECAC members. It is recommended that this memo flow down to the Chairs and the Departmental T&P committees.
6. Feedback from the College T&P committee have been codified and a set of recommendations have been prepared.
7. Automated package for developing faculty annual report has been developed. The team met with ECAC as a whole once during the year and with myself during the summer (a couple of times) to iron out issues. The package is going to be released to a select faculty for testing.

# MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

8. There has been a continuous discussion on the number of M.S. and Ph.D students, their role in influencing ranking, the effect of the joint B.S.-M.S. program, etc.
9. A packaging engineering program was discussed and approved.
10. There were some college committees that have not met in a while. There was a discussion regarding dissolving these committees.
11. A college space committee is being set up. Each department will have a representative on the committee.
12. The ECAC discussed, at length, steps that can be taken to help Graduate student to look beyond their tenure as a student. The goal was to prepare students for possible faculty positions. It was decided that these issues fall under the purview of EGRSC, and while I tried getting some time with the committee, it did not pan out. The issues/ideas are as follows:
  - (a) Students should be prepared for faculty positions if this is their desired career direction.
  - (b) Involve students in writing a proposal.
  - (c) Perhaps, morph the comprehensive exam so that it is more in a proposal format.
  - (d) Offer a course to prepare students for an academic career (that would be of more interest than the National Science Course that was supported by the College of Engineering).
  - (e) Provide teaching experience for Ph.D. candidates.
  - (f) Require the preparation of manuscripts.
  - (g) Increase graduate student's visibility by encouraging presentations at national meetings.
13. Similar comments are applicable to the undergraduate education as well. While some ideas were presented at the the fall faculty meeting, these ideas need to be pursued more vigorously. While contentious, the main feedback that I gleaned from the faculty meeting was that this is an issue that should be presented and delegated to appropriate undergraduate committee.

Finally, it is important for ECAC members to inform their Chairs and faculty of the proceeding of these meetings. It is important to note that some of the activities that we pursued have not been brought to a conclusion, and that I recommend that the next ECAC pursue these.