



College of Engineering Dean's Office

John Hopcroft  
Joseph Silbert Dean of Engineering  
242 Carpenter Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853-2201

Telephone: (607) 255-9679  
Facsimile: (607) 255-9606  
E-mail: jeh17@cornell.edu

## Engineering College Advisory Council Meeting Notes

October 22-23, 1999

The Engineering College Advisory Council (ECAC) met in Ithaca on October 22-23, 1999. The following ECAC members were present.

John Anderson  
Thomas Armstrong  
Jay Carter  
Dale Corson  
Timothy Costello  
Robert Cowie  
Peter Giles  
John Hopcroft  
William Hudson

Michael Isaacson  
Anita Jones  
Randall Ledford  
James McCormick  
Justin Rattner  
Neil Schilke (chair)  
William Shreve  
Jan Suwinski

The ECAC wishes to thank Provost Don Randel for his presentation which gave us an over view of University priorities. We also appreciate his candid comments concerning the restructuring of Computer and Information Sciences.

### **Priorities and Vision of the College**

The ECAC was upbeat about the report from the Dean on what was going on in the College and would like to compliment the College on moving forward in multiple areas. In particular, the ECAC feels the College is doing well in its efforts to increase diversity in all areas of the College and in its progress in increasing retention rates. The ECAC endorses the idea of "intellectual theme days" and would like to see more of them to bring together the intellectual focus of the College.

The ECAC wishes to confirm its endorsement of the Dean's "Goals for the College" and eagerly awaits the President's and Provost's response to the College of Engineering Priority Report. However, in order to give the College better advice, the ECAC would like to see more financial information in future overviews of the College.

## **Business and Engineering Initiatives**

The ECAC wishes to compliment Bob Cowie on his efforts to establish the ground work for mutually beneficial opportunities between the Engineering College and the Johnson Graduate School of Management (JGSM). We recognize the differences between the two entities and hope that the Cowie Report will allow the two units to seek a common ground to satisfy individual needs and priorities.

The ECAC endorses the six steps forward suggested by Bob Cowie;

1. a Dean's level commitment to strengthen ties
2. identification of areas of cooperative interest
3. identification of faculty leaders interested in building these bridges
4. provision of a forum to explore mutual issues
5. incentives to drive this cooperation
6. follow up on this report

For the first item, the deans of the two colleges need to get together to sort out the issues, decide on the opportunities and determine how to get faculty to own the actions. The ECAC recommends a meeting including a subset of the two units' advisory boards plus the deans and selected faculty.

The ECAC would encourage the College to look at the suite of ARME courses which might be available to satisfy some of the business education needs of the engineering students. And the College should collect a list of relevant business courses for engineers including the CEE course on engineering management. The College should also look at possibilities for continuing education relevant to current business needs, particularly with regard to distance learning and look for possibilities of cooperation with the JGSM in that regard. However, the College needs to be cognizant of the fact that a major portion of the technology of interest to the JGSM is related to Computing and Information Sciences.

## **Bioengineering**

There is broad support in the ECAC regarding the College's initiatives into bioengineering. But, there is concern about how this initiative will be funded. The ECAC is worried that the College is not developing a true transition plan for re-balancing resources in the future. The College cannot do everything and needs to decide upon its priorities. The ECAC hopes that the College will develop a priority plan in its best interest and not allow the potential for Whitaker Foundation support to drive the situation.

## **Computer Science**

The ECAC understands and agrees with computing and information science drivers in terms of the centrality and universality of the technologies and their use. However, the ECAC questions the process for the extraction of Computer Science from the College of Engineering, regardless of the legitimacy of the end objective. The ECAC decided not to take any action at this time to question the process. The ECAC urges the Dean to define computing and information science

requirements for the Engineering College in order to respect the decisions which have been made and ensure that the College's needs are met. Neil Schilke will brief Sam Fleming and Dick Aubrecht (both of whom could not attend this meeting) on the discussion of this council meeting and discuss future actions.

It was noted that the faculty senate voted 30 to 10 to have the administration re-examine its decision to administratively remove CS from Engineering. The ECAC feels that it should monitor the situation and consider commenting on: 1) the process of restructuring, 2) the idea that the CS department may not be the appropriate group to drive the new thrust in computing and information sciences (CIS); 3) the fact that Engineering should have a voice in any new structure, and 4) the proposed new structure and its effectiveness.

Finally, the ECAC feels that the Engineering College should aggressively pursue building up its computer engineering resources since it feels that CIS and the driving (hardware) technology are inextricably linked.

### **Duffield Hall**

The ECAC compliments the College on its progress with Duffield Hall. The incorporation of the atrium as a meeting space represents real team work and is an example of how to work together. However, it is concerned about the projected operating costs of the facility and how those projected numbers were produced. It was suggested that the University look into the possibilities of having its own micro-turbine for reducing power costs and developing higher quality power. The ECAC suggests looking into ENRON (in Houston) regarding leasing microturbines as a way of minimizing operating costs. The ECAC would like a fuller discussion of the operating costs and are somewhat concerned that the net usable space vs. gross space seems quite low.

### **Professional Development**

The ECAC felt that the addition of Mike Kelley as the new Associate Dean for Professional Development is having a positive impact on the College. However, the ECAC felt that the complete goals of this effort have not been articulated. The ECAC is very supportive of this effort by the College, but is concerned that some issues have been put on hold. There is a nagging question of policy vs. action. A continuing discussion of development, harassment, relationships, safe haven, etc. should be scheduled for the Spring. The College is encouraged (again) to look to industry for some of the solutions to these problems.

Regarding the discussion of how Cornell salaries vs. peer institutions is affecting morale, the ECAC would also like this item presented at the spring meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

The ECAC has agreed that the next meeting will take place on April 17 and 18, 2000 (Monday and Tuesday).