COE Executive Committee

Attendees: Raj Acharya, Anthony Atchley, Kultegin Aydin Sven Bilen, Amr Elnashai, Paul Griffin, Paul Heinemann, Peggy Johnson, George Lesieutre, Mark Sharer, Karen Thole, Judith Todd, Andrew Zydney

Guest: John Messner (for Chimay Anumba), Jian Yang (for Cheng Dong)

Absent: Chimay Anumba, Cheng Dong

Attachments were distributed prior to meeting.

Update College Initiatives

Anthony reviewed the progress to-date regarding the College’s initiatives and projects. He indicated that developing the initiatives and calls for proposals allow the College to institute a process where the leading applicants receive funding on a competitive basis—rather than on a case-by-case basis. Anthony advised that the most pressing initiative is the Innovation Grants. The College received 46 applications with more than 100 faculty investigators, hence the process of review became more complicated than anticipated. He is in the review process and would welcome department head volunteers to assist in apportioning percentages to the review criteria. It was noted that the guidelines were not clear that department heads could submit a proposal. Anthony advised that this would be clarified in the next round. REU for fall/spring will be forthcoming by August. There was also a request that the CoE Excellence Fellowships should be advertised earlier. Amr noted that we have created a blog for announcing initiatives and also includes a social calendar for College events. A technical calendar will be added soon.

CoE Academic Administration Committees

Amr presented a proposal for restructuring the College administrative committees. Three committees are proposed, with different frequency of meetings, as below. Amr reviewed the makeup of each committee. It was recommended that Program chairs (e.g., Acoustics, Nuclear Engineering) should be considered for Committee C.

- **Committee A**
  - Frequency: Bi-monthly (alternating with C)
  - Remit: Routine academic issues, follow-up from B and C
  - Membership: Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans

- **Committee B**
  - Frequency: Monthly
  - Remit: Strategic issues, sensitive faculty items, brainstorming, preparation for A and C
  - Membership: Dean, Associate Deans, Department Heads, School Head
• Committee C
  Frequency: Bi-monthly (alternating with A)
  Remit: Operational issues, information sharing, external business
  Membership: Committee B and,
  1. Director of Advancement
  2. Director of Communications
  3. Assistant Dean for Academic Support and Global Programs
  4. Assistant Dean for Engineering Diversity
  5. Director of the Leonhard Center
  6. Assistant Dean/Director of Global and Strategic Partnerships
  7. Assistant Dean/Director of Technology Transfer and Innovation
  8. Director of On-line and Professional Education
  9. Director of the Larson Transportation Institute
  10. Director of the Facilities Engineering Institute

There were no objections to the proposed structure which will now be initially implemented for a period of 6 months.

External Review of Departments and College
Amr advised that the College continues to benefit from IPACs, but he is not aware of a formal review of departments by non-alumni and academic leaders. He proposed forming external review teams comprising presidents, provosts, deans, and department heads -- one review committee for the College and separate committees for the departments. Three or four reviews would be conducted each year and coordinated by the Dean's Office. It was recommended the Committees should have a clearly defined charge on what they should deliver, length of report, scope, and recommendations. The heads recommended that the first round of reviews occur during fall 2015. EE/CSE can be left to the second round of reviews due to reorganization. With the agreement of the attendants, and supportive comments received after the meeting, we will proceed with the reviews.

Strategy Implementation Plan
Amr discussed briefly our new Strategy, which is derived from the strategy snapshots developed by the departments, and stated that it is significantly more compact than documents sent to the provost by other units. The implementation plan, however, will be more detailed with each goal having a champion (or portfolio holder), timeline, milestones, resources, and metrics for assessing progress. Amr asked for feedback on the strategy according to the circulated timetable, and asked that comments on the institutional thrusts take into account that we cannot include everyone’s research topic, that we have done considerable work in intersecting the departmental strategy snapshots with other units on campus and that individual initiatives are still welcomed Amr is thinking of a graphical representation that will show how our thrusts intersect with the colleges, institutes and provost's priorities. In response to a question, Amr stated that our implementation plan will have current and target
metrics associated with each goal, where possible. In response to questions on centers, Amr mentioned that one of the tasks assigned to the new Associate Dean for Research and Innovation is to lead efforts to increase the number of successful center proposals, and to establish means by which we recognize centers that fulfill agreed-upon criteria. Also, there would be a ‘center directors’ committee in the future, and the chair would join one of the new College committees.

**Progress on Retreat Recommendations**
Amr reported on progress in addressing the recommendations from the 4 retreat breakouts. The statements sent with the agenda are as brief as possible; there is more progress to report, as below.

- **Strategy Breakout** - All recommended structure and subjects were thoroughly reviewed and intersected with the strategic thrusts of the Huck, PSIEE, CoS, CoM and EMS. Review of the breakout-selected topic was undertaken in the light of the priorities in the 12 departmental strategy snapshots. A review of the 27 topics proposed by individual faculty was also undertaken. The outcome is the current strategy document, which is now subject to college-wide review and adjustment, according to a plan to be agreed upon. Estimated percentage completion 100% in terms of process and 90% in terms of outcomes.

- **Space Breakout** - The list of priority repairs is being assessed with a view for estimating the cost of undertaking 5-8 projects to improve the worst spaces in the college using a combination of campus and college funds. Also, the outcome was communicated to the provost and ongoing discussions indicate that there is some hope for the future. In the meantime, a deal has been reached with the campus for $270,000 support for renting space off-campus. The ‘space’ computer application is progressing, very slowly. Estimated percentage completion 40% in terms of process and 0% in terms of outcomes. It is important to note that our effort in raising the awareness of the space issues in the College is starting to succeed. Meetings with the president, provost and physical plant confirm that there is acceptance that the College is in dire need of new buildings. The provost stated that there are plans that are under discussion and that he will share the information in a matter of months.

- **Budget Breakout** - The effort to derive the functional budget is on track, taking into account the timeline proposed by the breakout group, and the novelty of the approach. Regarding the income and expenditure recommendations, five items from the ‘earn more’ category are underway, at different levels of progress. One item of the ‘spend less’ list is underway. A more concerted effort will follow the derivation of the functional budget. Estimated percentage completion 20% in terms of process and 0% in terms of outcomes.

- **Metrics Breakout** - The breakout group recommended a process, not a set of metrics. This process is accepted by the Dean’s team, and will be utilized in the strategy implementation phase, which will start immediately. Estimated percentage completion 10% in terms of process and 0% in terms of outcomes. We intend to benefit from the
work of the dean of the college of engineering and computer science at the University of Toronto to determine metrics for all goals in the strategy implementation plan, and confirmed that we will have current and target metrics.

The meeting concluded with agreement to send comments on the strategy, the acceptance of the new committee structure and the department and college review procedure and timeline.