Engineering Faculty Advisory Committee  Monthly Meeting

Friday 10 September 2010

Meeting with Dr. Kem Bennett*,

Vice Chancellor–Engineering, Director of TEES, Dean College of Engineering

* Executive Associate Dean Dr. N.K. Anand will be substituting for Dean Bennett, who will be on travel.

(1) Welcome to the New and Continuing EFAC Members

3 year term expires May of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AERO</td>
<td>Diego Donzis*</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donzis@tamu.edu">donzis@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMEN</td>
<td>John Criscione</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jccriscione@tamu.edu">jccriscione@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAEN</td>
<td>Sandun Fernando</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfernando@tamu.edu">sfernando@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEN</td>
<td>Carl Laird</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carl.laird@tamu.edu">carl.laird@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSC</td>
<td>Jennifer Welch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j-welch@tamu.edu">j-welch@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVEN</td>
<td>Scott Socolofsky</td>
<td><a href="mailto:socolofs@tamu.edu">socolofs@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEN</td>
<td>Laszlo Kish</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akcam@ece.tamu.edu">akcam@ece.tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETID</td>
<td>Malini Natarajarathinam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:malini@tamu.edu">malini@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEN</td>
<td>Sara McComb</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mccomb@tamu.edu">mccomb@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEEN</td>
<td>Alan Palazzolo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a-palazzolo@tamu.edu">a-palazzolo@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUEN</td>
<td>Lin Shao</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lshao@tamu.edu">lshao@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>Eduardo Gildin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:egildin@tamu.edu">egildin@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adonios Karpetis will substitute for Diego at today's mtg.
EFAC meeting schedule

September 10, 2010
October 8, 2010
November 5, 2010
December 10, 2010
January 14, 2011
February 11, 2011
March 4, 2011
April 8, 2011
May 6, 2011

(2) Review of EFAC By-Laws (Please see Appendix B)

(3) Election of New Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary

ARTICLE IV – OFFICERS

Section 1: The Officers of the Engineering Faculty Advisory Council shall be a chair, a Vice-Chair, and a Secretary. Each shall be elected for a one-year term.

Section 2: A member of the Council must have completed one year on the Council before being eligible to serve as an officer of the council.

Section 3: If for any reason the Office of Chair shall become vacant, the Vice-Chair shall succeed to this office. If a vacancy occurs in any other office a member duly elected by the Council shall fill it.
(4) Topic 1: $1,000 Scholarships and In-State Tuition Fee

From: Dr. Laszlo Kish, ECE

Presented By: Dr. Laszlo Kish, ECE

I would like to bring up the issue of "One-time $1000 scholarship policy" for the attention of EFAC. We have an ongoing discussion how to interpret the attached text.

Even though these scholarships are paid from the research grants of the respective faculty, we were told that the College is currently being audited regarding the procedures followed in the awarding of these scholarships and therefore we will need to follow the following procedures:

Step 1 – You need to advertise the scholarship. Please prepare an announcement that lists who is eligible, how (based on what criteria) the awardee(s) will be selected, how the applicants can apply, and an application deadline. Forward that announcement to ________ who will distribute it to the entire graduate student body. You may advertise through other media as well, but we want to at least send out an email to all graduate students in the department.

Step 2 – Rank the applicants. Please provide the graduate office with a spreadsheet listing all applicants received and scoring each one according to the criteria listed in your announcement from step 1. Please describe the metric used to provide your overall ranking in sufficient detail that an auditor could clearly see how you arrived at your ranking. Once the graduate office has received the above documentation, they will print out award letters, get the awardee to sign an acceptance letter, and will instruct ______ to post the award to the students account. No scholarship will be awarded without the above documentation.

Regarding what criteria is acceptable, there may not be an easy answer to, but use common sense. Would you be embarrassed if your criteria were featured in an article in The Eagle? These scholarships must be competitive. This means that you cannot use a set of criteria that are so restrictive that only one or two students are eligible. If your goal is to get a fee waiver in the hands of your student and you set up a set of criteria to accomplish that goal, then you are certainly not abiding by the “spirit of the law.”

The last paragraph is the point of concern. Suppose a faculty wants to award a student researching electrical motor control. Can he require that one of the requirements is documented experience with electrical motor measurements and another one is documented experience in robust control theory? Then, at most 1 or 2 students may be eligible, even though, we cannot be sure in advance.

At this time of serious budget cuts and firing staff, it is even more essential to be effective with using the research grants. Thus many faculty may not be interested to risk their money if they must make the requirements so wide that high-risk students will have reasonable chances to win the application.
(5) **Topic 2: Separation Program**

**From:** Anonymous Faculty Member (eligible for separation)  
**Presented by:** Dr. Sara McComb

What is the present status of program and why (in this person's opinion) has it been "mishandled and mismanaged".

---

(6) **Topic 3: Faculty Affected by Cutbacks**

**From:** Dr. Harry Jones, CVEN  
**Presented by:** Dr. Scott Socolofsky, CVEN

As a COE faculty member, I'm curious to know how many tenure track faculty were impacted by cutbacks. I saw the number 24 in the paper, but I don't know if I trust the Eagle to get it right. What's the story on these 24 - were they really tenure track? Were they retirements/resignations? Persons who failed the tenure cut that's usually announced in early spring?

---

(7) **Topic 4: New Initiatives**

**From:** Dr. Harry Jones, CVEN  
**Presented by:** Dr. Scott Socolofsky, CVEN

What will the process be for deciding what "new initiatives" are going to be funded out of this pot of money the administration seems determined to create. Dean Bennett perceptions on this topic would be welcome. If it's not primarily faculty driven, I think the president is going to sustain huge damage in his relationship with faculty.
(8) **Topic 5: Credit for faculty advising graduate students**

*From: Dr. Jorge Alvarado, ETID*

*Presented by: Dr. Malini Natarajarathinam, ETID*

During one of the EFAC meetings about 3 years ago, I brought the issue of getting credit (off-loading or some support) for advising and teaching students under MEEN 691 and MEEN 685, respectively. In MMET we have 4 faculty members with joint-appointments in MEEN, but we don't get any credit or support for advising graduate students. This has a direct impact on our overall teaching load since we still have to teach 9 hrs in ETID. We basically need to know what policy should apply in those cases, and if there is a way to compensate ETID professors for incurring an additional teaching load while advising a significant number of graduate students outside the department.

(9) **Topic 6: Permanent Residency Sponsorship for International Staff and Faculty**

*From: Dr. Malini Natarajarathinam, ETID*

*Presented by: Dr. Malini Natarajarathinam, ETID*

There are mainly 2 types of permanent residency sponsorships available for international faculty - EB-1 and EB-2. EB-1 is for outstanding professors and researchers and EB-2 is for professional holding an advanced degree. Texas A&M currently sponsors only EB-2 category for majority of the international faculty and staff who have PhDs. The problem with EB-2 category is that the wait is a minimum of 5-6 years to process permanent residency for people from countries such as India and China while it takes only 3 months for the whole process to be completed through EB-1. This hinders a lot of international travel for our faculty and increases visa processing cost for the University. This also reduces the competitiveness of Texas A&M as most schools provide EB-1 sponsorship for the faculty and researchers with PhDs. Can a more effective process be put in place?
(10) Topic 7:

From: Dr. John Junkins, AERO

Presented by: Dr. Diego Donzis AERO

I raise one concern relating to the funding of the COE vs the COS and other non-engineering programs that teach service courses for first and second year engineering students:

In Physics, Math, and Chemistry, there are numerous student credit hours of freshman and sophomore courses that are being generated with engr students, and staffed with non-tenure-track faculty. This situation apparently results in a "cash cow" whereby the department offering the service courses benefits enormously with formula budgeting, $ for GANTS, and also faculty slots, all the while exporting the workload to non-tenure-track faculty. If for example, the non-tenure-track instructors in these courses for our freshmen and sophomore students were ad-locked for the sake of "credit" to engineering, what would the $ impact be on the COE? There is a strong prima facia case that the credit and $ should at least be shared. Since there is negligible reciprocity (virtually no non COE students take service courses from the COE), the present situation is believed to very adversely affect the COE budget.

All this is evidenced in a number of ways, for example:
- Excluding the COE, I recently learned that all DP faculty in other colleges are on 10 or 12 month appointments, how can these depts afford this luxury (not to mention, how do they justify it even if they can afford it?!)? {this alone amounts to > $1M/year).

- The fraction of graduate students supported as GANTs in Physics, Chemistry, and Math are vastly higher than in any COE department, presumably justified as a consequence of the need to support 1st and 2nd yr service teaching?

An institutional study is needed to provide the data that would permit a detailed evaluation of the above issues - they are especially important in view of

- the budget squeeze that is presently under way, and
- the possibility that the freshman engineering program could be revised in ways that would in part rectify this situation.
(11) Topic 8: Faculty Profitability Rating

From: Anonymous, CPSC

Presented by: Dr. Jennifer Welch CPSC

The System's faculty profitability rating of:
(teaching + research revenue generated) - salary

"What is the college's position on this? Also, it seems this cannot be accurately computed with current information since they do not have a proper way to attribute research funding credit. Rumor has it the first analysis give 100% credit to PI and none to co-PIs; is this true?"

(12) Topic 9: Savings Generated by retirements

From: Anonymous, CPSC

Presented by: Dr. Jennifer Welch CPSC

"If a faculty member participates in the voluntary separation program, will the budget savings be given back to their department? If not, how will it be determined how these savings will be used?"

(13) Topic 10: The Reallocation Process

From: Anonymous, CPSC

Presented by: Dr. Jennifer Welch CPSC

"Could the Dean provide an update on what he feels are the areas in the college that would be candidates for further investment as part of the budget reallocation?"

(14) Topic 11: RASS report

From: Anonymous, CPSC

Presented by: Dr. Jennifer Welch CPSC

The RASS report by the consultant hired by the Regents to analyze research administration. "Could the Dean provide an update on this and what it means for TEES?"
Topic 12: COE Electronics Design and Fabrication Shop

From: Dr. Steve Liu, CPSC

Presented by: Dr. Jennifer Welch CPSC

I saw the discussion of this topic. At this current difficult budget situation, this may not be considered a top concern for COE, but I do see its high values. I worked with ENTC faculty and they have very good facility (equipment and space) to build mechanical and even electronic prototypes in their lab. I think it will not be that expensive (400k) to let ENTC run such a facility, and enable interdisciplinary research and education projects. As far as I know, EE, CS, Aero and ME will all benefit from such a facility. So, if the agenda permits, I would suggest that we revisit this issue to see if it is doable at the current time. If not, definitely at later time when the time is not as difficult. 

Any Additional Items from the Floor??

Adjourn Meeting
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

3 year term
Expires May of

AERO Diego Donzis              donzis@tamu.edu               2013
BMEN John Criscione  jccriscione@tamu.edu        2011
BAEN Sandun Fernando sfernando@tamu.edu         2013
CHEN Carl Laird carl.laird@tamu.edu               2012
CPSC Jennifer Welch j-welch@tamu.edu              2013
CVEN Scott Socolofsky socolofs@tamu.edu           2013
ECEN Laszlo Kish akcam@ece.tamu.edu         2012
ETID Malini Natarajarathinam malini@tamu.edu        2013
ISEN Sara McComb mccomb@tamu.edu            2013
MEEN Alan Palazzolo a-palazzolo@tamu.edu         2011
NUEN Lin Shao lshao@tamu.edu                 2013
PETE Eduardo Gildin egildin@tamu.edu             2013

EFAC meeting schedule

    September 10, 2010
    October 8, 2010
    November 5, 2010
    December 10, 2010
    January 14, 2011
    February 11, 2011
    March 4, 2011
    April 8, 2011
    May 6, 2011
APPENDIX B

-----BYLAWS of the ENGINEERING FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL-----

November 1979 (Revised July 1989)

ARTICLE I – PURPOSE

Section 1: To generate and develop broad ideas for the improvement and ultimate development of the College of Engineering and to suggest policies that will enable the College of Engineering to better serve the educational needs of the people of Texas.

Section 2: To advise the Dean of Engineering on matters of basic importance to the Engineering Faculty as a body.

ARTICLE II – MEETINGS

Section 1: No business can be conducted without a quorum of 7 members present.

Section 2: New members will be provided with a copy of the current Bylaws at the first meeting that they attend.

Section 3: At the first meeting of each September, Rules of Procedure will be adopted by the council.

Section 4: The Council shall regularly meet monthly on a specified date September through May inclusive.

Section 5: Special meetings will be held at the call of the Chair or upon petition of three members of the Council.

Section 6: Minutes of the Council meeting shall be promptly delivered to all EFAC members.

Section 7: All meetings of the Council shall be open to all faculty members as visitors. A faculty member wishing to present a matter for consideration of the Council shall do so through the Council Chair or their Departmental Representative.
ARTICLE III – MEMBERS

Section 1: The Council shall consist of one member from each academic department in the College of Engineering including one member from the Agricultural Engineering Department. Administrative officers are ineligible for membership on the Council.

Section 2: Members shall serve a term of three years. One third of the members’ term on the Council will expire each year.

Section 3: The current Departmental Representative shall hold the election of each Departmental Representative through a vote of all department faculty and administration. Any one member of the Department in which the election is being held may request oversight of the election by the Council. In the event of such a request, the Council as a whole will determine the procedure for the election.

Section 4: Newly elected members shall take office at the first meeting in May.

Section 5: Council members unable to attend shall send a substitute to act in their place.

ARTICLE IV – OFFICERS

Section 1: The Officers of the Engineering Faculty Advisory Council shall be a chair, a Vice-Chair, and a Secretary. Each shall be elected for a one-year term.

Section 2: A member of the Council must have completed one year on the Council before being eligible to serve as an officer of the council.

Section 3: If for any reason the Office of Chair shall become vacant, the Vice-Chair shall succeed to this office. If a vacancy occurs in any other office a member duly elected by the Council shall fill it.

ARTICLE V – VOTING

Section 1: Determination of the method of voting on matters presented to the Council shall be at the discretion of the Chair, unless a member of the Council requests a secret ballot.

Section 2: A simple majority vote of the members in attendance, provided that a quorum is present, shall be required to approve an ITEM FOR INVESTIGATION by the Council.
Section 3: A TWO-THIRDS majority vote of the members in attendance, provided that a quorum is present, shall be required to establish approval of the FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE COUNCIL on any item.

ARTICLE VI – COMMITTEES

Section 1: There shall be no standing committee on the Engineering Faculty Advisory Council.

Section 2: Special committees shall be appointed and instructed by the Chair as needed.

Section 3: With the authorization of the majority of the Council, the chair may appoint faculty members not serving on the Council to special committees with specific charges.

ARTICLE VII – AMENDMENTS

Section 1: The Rules of Procedure may be suspended by a three-fourths majority vote.

Section 2: These by-laws may be amended or repealed by a two-thirds majority vote of the members in attendance.

Section 3: Proposed alterations, amendments or repeals shall first be read at a regular meeting of the Council and voted upon at the next meeting of the Council.
APPENDIX C

Agenda and Minutes Procedures

From Hope Mireles  01 July 2009

Important Things to Remember

- Call for Agenda Items – Send email out to all EFAC members at least 2 weeks prior to next meeting. Include a deadline in your message for agenda items.

- Send Draft Agenda to Dean – Draft agenda needs to be emailed 1 week prior to meeting. Please send draft agenda to Hope Mireles. Also, copy Karen Barfield & Deena Wallace.

- Minutes – After meeting, minutes will be reviewed by Deena Wallace before posting on the EFAC website. But, until that happens, they are still in draft form and they shouldn’t be distributed outside the EFAC members.

- Confirm meeting dates/changes to Dr. Bennett’s schedule – ex: travel schedules, TAMU holidays or Board of Regents meetings.

- Past chairs – Lessard, Jennings, Maxwell, Schechter
APPENDIX D

Attendance List For EFAC Monthly Meeting on

Friday 07 May 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AERO</td>
<td>Diego Donzis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMEN</td>
<td>John Criscione</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAEN</td>
<td>Sandn Fernando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEN</td>
<td>Carl Laird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSC</td>
<td>Jennifer Welch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVEN</td>
<td>Scott Socolofsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEN</td>
<td>Laszlo Kish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETID</td>
<td>Malini Natarajarathinam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEN</td>
<td>Sara McComb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEEN</td>
<td>Alan Palazzolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUEN</td>
<td>Lin Shao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>Eduardo Gildin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Engineering Faculty Advisory Committee Monthly Meeting

Friday, 16 April 2010

Meeting with Dr. Kem Bennett,
Vice Chancellor—Engineering, Director of TEES, Dean College of Engineering

MINUTES

Engineering Faculty Advisory Council

Meeting: April 16, 2010, 12:30 to 1:30, WERC Room 201

Attendance:

Members: Adonios Karpetis (AERO), Rosana Moreira (BAEN), Carl Laird (CHEN), Mark Burris (CVEN), John Keyser (CSEN), Xing Cheng (ECEN), Jeorge Alvarado (ETID), Georgia Ann Klutke (ISEN), Alan Palazzolo (MEEN).

Deans: Kem Bennett and Robin Autenrieth

Minutes:

Agenda Item 1: COE Guidelines for Acute Family Care

Last year, the EFAC discussed the issue of temporary duty reassignment for faculty who need to care for family members. It was mentioned that treatment was often inconsistent across departments and that both faculty members and department heads were unsure of what may or may not be appropriate. Dean Bennett requested that guidelines be drafted for his consideration. Over the summer, a group of senior women in the college drafted a proposal. The Dean commented on the proposal at the 18 September EFAC mtg. and an EFAC subcommittee consisting of Georgia-Ann Klutke, Nancy Amato, Deepa Kundur (non-EFAC committee member from Electrical Engineering) and David Schechter was formed to finalize a draft proposal to the Dean and the full EFAC committee. Drs. Amato, Schechter and Palazzolo will present the work of the subcommittee in the form of an overview of the Draft Guidelines for Workload Adjustment for Acute Family Care at the monthly Dept. Heads Mtg. on 15 April, 2010. They will discuss the outcome of this mtg. at the EFAC mtg.
Discussion: The draft proposal was presented to the Department heads meeting on April 15, 2010 by Nancy Amato. It was well received by that group. The department heads will return suggested edits to EFAC Acute Care Subcommittee by Friday April 23. Some suggested changes already received were to remove the requirement that the dean approve each one. The dean would only be involved if required by TAMU policy. Dr. Klutke indicated a desire to have a repository of cases so that future faculty/staff could see how these cases are handled. Dean Bennett indicated that would be available at the department level.

Agenda Item 2: Cost of ABET and other Accreditations

Is there a more cost efficient way to handle accreditation? (ABET) It is here to stay, but it would be nice to put pen to paper to obtain the direct cost. In the MEEN case, it has removed a faculty member from the classroom for at least a solid year (salary ~$120K), and then there is the cost of support staff, etc. Multiply that by 14 programs in the college, add in the direct charges made by ABET, the cost of individual faculty to prepare resumes, example course notes, mid-semester surveys, etc. and we are talking some serious money and effort. Then, add in the renewed and added effect of SACS, which accredits the whole university and is coming in 2012.

Look College of Engineering has made and will continue to make a major financial investment in accreditation and there is some interest in being aware of that cost. I am not asking the question to embarrass or cast a bad light on assessments or the college. But the world changed with ABET 2000, as it has in so many other ways, and the college is investing and is going to continue to invest a great deal of resources, particularly effort and money, in assessment activities in the foreseeable future.

Not only does ABET need more effort and money, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) is demanding more. SACS accredits the whole university, and engineering must participate in that assessment as well. The SACS assessment is coming in 2012. Then ABET again in 2016 and a SACS mid-term report in 2017.

Right now, MEEN is addressing SACS via an on-line system called WEAVEonline, sponsored by the Office of Institutional Assessment (OIA). That takes a few hours every so often, and would take more if I were not already doing ABET.

Fortunately for us, ABET leads on continuous improvement and other agencies (SACS for example) look to ABET's leadership in that regard. Another way to say it is that what we do for ABET generally serves to provide input for SACS via WEAVEonline. However, ABET totally missed the boat with regard to online resources, and other groups lead there.

There is a great opportunity, I think, for a tenured faculty member to do several things in this position: Interdisciplinary work with the College of Education. Our surveys are rudimentary. Engineers do not know well how to write such survey questions, and graduate students from education could both help and learn, as perhaps could some MEEN graduate students.
Pursuit of NSF-type grants to develop assessment material that even better builds the program than our present (rudimentary) system. Development and possible commercialization of software (vis-a-vis WEAVEonline).

**Discussion:** Several EFAC members discussed the workloads and compensation for ABET preparation in their departments. The larger the department the more onerous the job – and hopefully the greater the compensation for the person in charge of preparing for ABET. In CHEN, a person was hired to take care of ABET and this is a large proportion of their job. At the college level:

- Walt Haisler spends 75% of his time helping coordinate ABET for the departments.
- The college pays for mock external reviews
- The college has centralized the required surveys of former students

SACS is now also a requirement and has to be taken care of. Dr. Bennett again noted that the person responsible for these tasks is assigned by the department head and should receive adequate compensation – such as reduced teaching load.

**Agenda Item 3: Under-represented Student Recruiting**

How can faculty members be more involved in the recruiting of under-represented groups of engineering students at the graduate level?

**Discussion:** EFAC members noted some difficulties in recruiting and retaining well-qualified minorities – which at the PhD level – includes U.S. citizens. Dr. Robin Autenrieth provided information on what efforts are ongoing at the College level:

- They have a list of private and/or small universities which they visit for recruiting
- They visit several large recruiting conferences on an annual basis
- They have some presentation slides that faculty members can use when they recruit
- REU projects in AERO, CSEN, CVEN/MEEN, and ECEN
- Undergraduate Summer Research Grants (USRG) is being expended once again, this summer up to 42 students will be participating. The College doubles what the university provides for this program as it has been very successful in recruiting graduate students
- The Graduate Invitational brought in 70 students for a Campus visit this March – up from 50 the year before.
- Dr. Bennett is actively fund raising for graduate fellowships
- The Dean’s Chair and TEES funds support the College’s National Excellence Fellowships for the past 3 years. The program has 4 to 5 students now, but hoping to expand to somewhere between 12 to 24.
- 12 high schools in Texas that contained a high percentage of underrepresented groups were targeted for recruiting.
- High school teachers have been invited into our labs and has proven to be a successful recruiting tool.
It was noted that the most important aspect is one-on-one contact with faculty.

Dr. Autenrieth is available and willing to come to faculty/departments to discuss ideas with them.

Agenda Item 4: Worldwide Ranking of TAMU & Agenda Item 5: 1st Year Engineering Plan

These two items were tabled for the May meeting as time ran out.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35.