

Florida International University

Engineering Faculty Council on Governance, Regular Meeting

November 4, 2005

Dean's Conference Room, 10555 West Flagler Street, Miami, FL 33174

MINUTES

Meeting started at: 12:00 PM				Officers: <i>Chair</i> Gene Farmer <i>Vice Chair</i> Cesar Levy <i>Secretary</i> Yong Tao <i>Parliamentarian</i> Walter Tang
Meeting ended at: 1:55 PM				
Next regular meeting: TBD				
Members:		Present	Absent	Guests: Vish Prasad, Exc. Dean Yi Deng, Dean of SCIS Kang Yen, Chair, ECE * Excused absence w/proxy
<i>Biomedical:</i>	Anuradha Godavarty		X*	
	Anthony McGoron	X		
<i>Civil and Environmental:</i>	Mohammed Hadi	X		
	Walter Tang	X		
<i>Construction Management:</i>	Syed Ahmed		X*	
	Gene Farmer	X		
<i>Electrical & Computer:</i>	Sakhrat Khizroev	X		
	Jean Andrian	X		
<i>Industrial & Systems:</i>	Marc Resnick	X		
	Chin-Cheng Chen	X		
<i>Mechanical & Materials:</i>	Yong Tao	X		
	Cesar Levy	X		
<i>Sch. of Comp. Info. Science</i>	Jai Navlaka	X		
	Tim Downey	X		

1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Council on Governance (FCG) Meeting was called to order by Gene Farmer, at 12:00 PM. The quorum was achieved as listed in the above table.
2. **Agenda Approval:** A motion was offered, seconded and passed unanimously to approve the meeting agenda.
3. **New officers:** The council accepted Yong Tao as the secretary and Walter Tang as the parliamentarian for the FCG.
4. **Dean's Report:**
 - 1) **Provost change:** Provost Rosenberg was selected as the next Chancellor of State University System of Florida. The Provost was picked up within ten days and was the sole candidate. The approval was made through telephone conferencing. An Interim Provost was also selected. The College of Engineering and Computing has been on a similar expansion path as the new interim provost has done for his college. Accordingly, the College should continue its growth in the future, also.
 - 2) **Wilma damage:** The EC building was seriously damaged with the Center of Diversity being the worst. 400 faculty and 1,000 students were displaced. HCET (now ARC) provided great

helps and is truly a partner with CEC. Facility management moved very fast. The full recovery might take more than four weeks.

- 3) **Move of the Computer Engineering (CE) Program:** The Dean stated that the Faculty Council should make the decision based on the interest at the College level. Both CE and EE programs had difficulties from the ABET point of view. Despite recent efforts, no results have been achieved so far for improvement. The issue here is that the situation is just sitting there. The department chair can only go so far. Before Prof. Yen, the 3-year acting chair who was of CE faced the same problem as today such as there are only about 10% differences between EE and CE programs. This is an identity issue for CE, which has not been taken care of. It has been tried and not working. The computer related field has evolved and a good balance among CS, CE and EE (basic software, hardware and circuits, etc.) is the key. The other issues are of management. Now, the move to SCIS is a better solution.

According to the Dean, there is a plan. Three CS faculties who have the CE related expertise are willing to contribute. There are four CE faculties plus a new faculty position for CE. Altogether, the eight faculty members form a significant faculty mass for the program. Dean Yi Deng agreed to hire a senior member as the CE program manager. Faculty hiring is important.

Secondly, there will be a transitional committee formed. It will consist of faculty members of CE, CS and EE. (One Council member interpreted that the transitional committee will make decision on the curriculum, program and new faculty hiring.) The process and program will be evaluated both internally and externally through an independent consultant.

There is no plan to physically move the CE program from the Engineering Center to the main campus. One thing is clear: Faculty will not be affected. For example, if a faculty member does not want to switch the department, he or she will not be forced to do so. They have their choices. Also, nothing will stop EE faculty to teach CE courses which could have a different course designation from the curriculum.

The tenure process will not be impacted either. The faculty in the T&P process will not change to a different process and the same set of rules apply.

Dr. Levy asked how the teaching credits are counted if a faculty member stays in the program A while teaching in the program B. Dean answered that there were two models: One is that whoever teaches the course gets the credit for his/her department. The other model leaves the credits to the department where the students register for the course. Both models could be used in our case depending on the investment. It may require an arrangement resulting from the equal credits over a long period of time. Whichever model that is reasonable will stand.

Prof. Farmer asked if Prof. Levy meant FTE or just teaching load assignment. Dr. Levy said FTE. Dean replied that in this case, FTE should stay the department who teaches the course.

Levy added that there was no decision made on this issue (the move) because a detailed plan was not available. Dean replied that it would not be resolved until the problem was identified and the curriculum developed. It is not possible to have a detailed plan unless the move is made and the program is in place.

Prof. Resnick asked if it would be better to establish the committee and have the independent consultant first before the move of the program. Dean replied that it has been proved that that idea was not working. Resnick then clarified the Dean's statement, i.e., that this meant that the move-first, then-having-committee would be a better choice and a lower risk scenario. Dean said yes, it would be a better solution, although still having a risk, but a lower one as long as picking a committee that would lead to the right direction.

Prof. Downey stated the clarification that the Faculty Council would not approve the committee, curriculum and similar program details. The Council only approves the direction and principles.

Dean added that the curriculum committee would decide the curriculum matter.

Prof. Tang asked that from the ABET point of view, what is the advantage of moving the program to SCIS. Dean replied that a significant improvement based on the last ABET visit and their review statement must be made. The existing struggling of the program cannot be resolved under the current situation. It has been tried and not working, and we have only two years left before the next ABET visit. The move of the program will enhance the ABET process because SCIS did very well for their ABET review. Dean stated that he would be very concerned if SCIS does not have the ABET experience. But they do.

Prof. Yen, Chair of ECE, expressed his concern on current deadlock of ECE faculty opinions on this issue with 10 out of 20 faculty members wanting a plan ahead of move. He stated that he did not want a hanging situation. It must move forward. Two years are short for the ABET process; therefore, the issues have to be resolved. It must change. His personal view was that he supported the move if the changes could be made by SCIS.

Dean added that 10-10 votes indicated that at least 5 EE faculty members supported the move. This is not an easy decision, always having risks. It is just a better solution. We have to minimize the risks.

Dean Deng of SCIS stated that it was not necessary to have a detailed plan first rather we should have a principle decision first. A detailed plan then follows. A plan could always be changed, and is usually in a working condition. But the principles have to be approved first. He said that he was committed to enhance the CE program.

Dean Prasad finally requested that these discussions about the plan be on the record, including his commitment to helping EE move forward in terms of it having more focused research. He also requested the Council pass a resolution to thank the Provost Rosenberg for his contribution to FIU and College of Engineering and Computing.

5. **Council meeting** continues after Deans left. The Chair asked if anyone offers a motion on this issue. The following motion is then offered by Jai Navlaka and seconded by Tim Downey:

“The Faculty Council on Governance of the College of Engineering and Computing supports the move of the Computer Engineering programs from the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department to the School of Computer and Information Science.”

Discussion went on. Prof. Andrian stated that there was no new information given by Dean Prasad and didn't see any reason to review the previous vote. Walter Tang mentioned that the three faculty members from SCIS would be added to the program, there were a plan and a better chance for ABET. Prof. Khizroev mentioned that the existing CE faculty did have concerns. It seemed that the department was changing in the direction beneficial to the CE program and there was no reason to split at this time. Prof. Levy presented a piece of information which was the motion passed by the Steering Committee of the FIU Faculty Senate on their October 18 meeting, stating that the Steering Committee strongly urge that the action regarding the proposal to move the degrees be deferred until the proposed study has been completed, etc. A copy was passed among the FCG members. Prof. Navlaka went on saying that from all the academic points of view, the move will help improve the communication better. There is actually no split; the program is still in the same college. Teaching will be better. It seems a perfect academic solution.

Prof. Tao mentioned that the Faculty Council had opportunities to hear the presentation and discussions from all the related parties on the issues and FCG members should have sufficient information to make a principle-based decision on this issue.

The chair called for the voting of the motion. The council approved that it would be a secret ballot voting. There were twelve (12) members in presence and two absentee votes. The final voting results are twelve (12) votes for approving the motion and two (2) votes against the motion.

6. **Resolution for Provost Rosenberg:** The following resolution was offered, seconded and passed unanimously:

“The College of Engineering and Computing wishes to thank Provost Mark Rosenberg for his continuous support of the College in its advancement.”

7. **Adjourned Meeting:** The Faculty Council of Governance meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.

Minutes subscribed and prepared by: Yong Tao, Secretary of FCG