

Minutes for the Meeting of the Engineering Physics Advisory Board

Attendees: Frank Addressio, Jon Haas, James McNeil, John Schaub, Vincent Salazar, Ronald Tafoya, Gary Kyle, Stephen Pate, Heinz Nakotte, Tom Hearn, Michael DeAntonio, Elena Fernandez, Don Birx

Friday, March 10, 2006 2:30-3:30

I have separated the notes below into points made by the board and/or committee during the meeting.

- The overall package is a good one. There seems to be good buy-in, even from the deans this time.
- Good evidence of closed loops should be provided (or at least the way in which they are closed should be well defined).
- We are waiting on Me for some of the tables to be finished.
- John Haas and Jim McNeil have agreed to review the Self-Study document in more detail.
- Jim will trade final the CSM document with us for our final document.
- Outcomes Assessment matrix looks good.
- Changes in curriculum cannot be made now. We will make any changes after the accreditation.
- The definition of constituencies is much better than last year.
- Support from faculty and deans is much better.
- The structure of the EP program needs to be institutionalized. (The deans seem to be receptive to this.
- Dean Castillo told the board that he is willing to contribute to facilities.
- Using a-k outcomes is safe (maybe too safe) but we will wait until after the accreditation to add to them.
- We need to contextualize the a-k outcomes within the Self-Study Document.
- Tables 2.2, 3 and 4 are measurements. (Gary – you said you would add to these notes what was said in the morning meeting.)
- We should combine program outcomes 2 and 4.
- We should expand outcome 5 to emphasize c and h(k?) outcomes.
- Students need an appreciation of program outcomes and need to know where to find them.
- EP students need activities of their own to create a greater bond between them.
- We need to have more design within the physics part of the program.
- Physics should get more involved in the CAPSTONES.
- Physics could get more involved if there were not the restriction of a 10 person minimum on Arts and Science courses. We cannot meet this kind of minimum until we are a larger program.
- Outcomes are reflected well in physics.
- Good growth of objectives and outcomes since the last board visit.

- Need to have more faculty buy-in. Most of the notebooks are not yet ready. Seems to be only certain members of the committee who have completed theirs.
- The board will write a letter of support to the Provost to handle two issues. 1) Cross-college difficulties, 2) greater understanding of the program by the administration. (The committee commented that this impediment must be fixed within the next year –faster than the rest of the university. This is one of the best examples of lack of unity within the university. They also point out that the outside perspective of the board has immeasurable value.)
- The committee recommends that cross-discipline work should be rewarded with premiums.
- Students made good comments to the board about teaching in physics.
- The website and university catalog should have the program outcomes prominently displayed.
- Marketing of the program is needed at the high-school level. (Open houses would go a long way toward this.)
- We need to get admissions buy-in for this marketing.
- Two slogans that were suggested are “The Universal Donor Degree” and “You can take more science classes in EP.”
- We should give local employers a list of skills and qualifications attained by a graduate in EP.