FIE Steering Committee Meeting
Salt Palace Convention Center, Salt Lake City, UT
June 20, 2004

Minutes

Attendees: James Avery, Ted Batchman, Dan Budny, Melany M. Ciampi, Ann Gates, David Hayhurst, Mary Heberling, John Hughes, Susan Lord, Melinda Piket-May, Russ Meir, D. Moore, Bill Oakes, John Orr, Jim Roberts, Tim Skvarenina, Eric Soulsby, Charles Yokomoto
Secretary: Ann Gates (agates@cs.utep.edu)

Handouts: FIE Conference Affiliate Membership, FIE 2003 Conference Evaluation; FIE 2004 Update; Income FIE 2003

1. Welcome and Introductions. Tim Skvarenina chaired the meeting for Mike Pavelich. T. Skvarenina welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves.
2. Additions to the Agenda. R. Meier added "Software Engineering (MSOE)." A. Gates added "Memorandum of Understanding."
3. Approval of the Minutes: T. Batchman made a motion to approve the November 2003 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Conference Reports.
    a. 2003 Boulder: J. Avery circulated the final budget and evaluation. The conference cleared $40,000. The cost of the AV equipment was higher than it has been in the past. The final numbers on the budget matched what was anticipated. The amount for the New Faculty Fellows shows $8,900 instead of $10,000 because there were two fellows who were non-citizens. A decision was made to pay their expenses to avoid the extensive paperwork. FIE 2003 did not receive $5,000 from ERM.

         The "no shows" tended to be clustered. It would be helpful to have a list of "no shows" and schedule them as the last paper of a session. There was another incident in which 2 to3 people from Nigeria registered using stolen credit cards.

         The problem with overseas attendees, who need a letter of invitation to obtain a visa, continues to be an issue. M. Heberling said that, according to the IEEE-CS rules, attendees need to be registered and must pay for the conference before they can get a letter. D. Budny stated that he can generate a general form letter that sends a letter of invitation prior to registration. A comment was made that we need to be sure that the person will be registering for the conference and that they are legitimate. J. Orr noted that overseas Fed Ex is expensive.
         Action Item: M. Heberling will send T. Skvarenina the IEEE-CS letter of invitation. T. Skvarenina will draft a letter notifying authors of the acceptance of their paper, which may serve foreign authors' need for a letter of invitation.

         The attendance at the conference was 720 including everyone. Conference attendance has been roughly 500 people over the few years. J. Roberts and others suggested that analysis of the conference should include comparisons of attendance for members, non-members, and students. It would be nice to see how many come that are not authors. J. Hughes noted that there is a core group that comes whether or not they are authors. His guess is that there are probably around 50-75 non-authors. M. Piket-May said that they advertised the conference well with faculty, but there was a low turnout from U. Colorado. More attendees came from Colorado School of Mines. The HP meeting added to the attendance. There were some who attended the HP meeting and who had not attended FIE before. The HP group was involved because of their interest in education innovations. There was discussion about the cost of the conference and the problem with

travel money. Other discussions centered on the mailing lists and the cost of creating brochures ($25,000) and whether the brochures are effective at attracting new attendees. A suggestion came that e-mail be used to advertise, e.g., send the announcement to the ASEE mailing list. New engineering education conferences are emerging. It's important to elevate FIE in order to compete. Is it possible to do something like providing perks?

D. Budny commended J. Avery and M. Piket-May for a good job. Attendees agreed.

b. 2004 Savannah: J. Hughes passed out the report, brochure, and the giveaway. The technical meeting request form and the budget have been approved by the IEEE-CS. The participant numbers are estimated at 500. Lower attendance is expected because HP will not be bringing in a large group. The IEEE-CS newsletter talked about changes in publication procedures. There is some concern about the formats and compatibility. D. Budny said that with the new requirements, 90% of the papers were wrong. The issue is that the .pdf file for electronic submissions must be compliant according to the IEEE-CS specifications. The material that can be downloaded from the Society's website does not work. The files cannot be read with Acrobat 6. It requires an earlier version. D. Budny says that the new procedures require alot of time to fix because authors are not complying.

Action Item. A. Gates will talk to the Computer Society to find out the status of the latest publication procedure.

J. Hughes has received two checks: ERM and IEEE-ED Society. IEEE-CS has not sent a check. The cost of the meals is low because there will be two lunches. There will be a riverboat dinner cruise. There is confusion over the welcome letters. Some years the program chairs write a letter and other times it has been the society presidents. Steering Committee members remarked that the letter should come from the society presidents.

Action Item. J. Hughes will request the welcome letters from the society presidents.

The tentative schedule is ready. There will be a single two-hour session on Saturday afternoon. A workshop was cancelled because the committee rejected the organizer's paper abstract. The tours are being arranged. There will be an organized meeting place for the tours. Tours have been successful in the past and are a worthwhile effort. 613 abstracts were submitted (last year 539) and 422 were accepted (439 last year). There were drop-outs—people who withdrew papers; there were fewer panel submissions and more interactive sessions. The CASEE symposium will be at the conference, which will bring in people. J. Hughes suggested that there be one person who oversees interactive sessions and panels since there is a need to make sure that there is not overlap and to possibly move submissions from one category to the next.

c. 2005 Indianapolis: C. Yokomoto and B. Oakes reported that they are working on the budget and should have it ready by the Savannah meeting. It was noted that the dates for the NSF CCLI RFP and ASEE paper submission conflict with the Jan. 10 deadline for submissions. It was suggested that the future deadline for FIE abstract submissions be shifted to the end of January. B. Oakes reported that they have been working with HP to bring in technical equipment to the conference, e.g., servers, AV, and interactive devices. They are looking at making iPAQs available for $100 rather than $400. B. Oakes asked the committee for guidance regarding the involvement of HP. HP would be recognized as a major sponsor, but HP people will not be presenting in order to not become a sales pitch. The committee felt that there are no issues.

The chairs are trying to keep the registration cost below $400. ASEE provides ways for the participants to buy things, and the chairs plan to formalize this approach with B. Hofinger. The challenge is the budgeting process with IEEE-CS regarding corporate donations, which requires commitments. Special sessions are being defined that are more of risk-taking sessions. D. Budny noted that the effectiveness of the interactive sessions is dependent on the individual who is presenting and can keep the session moving.

d. 2006 San Diego: D. Hayhurst and S. Lord reported that they and M. Heberling have been working on the location. The preferred choice is the Sheraton by airport. It has been recently renovated, and the food is superb. The dates for conference are set for Saturday, Oct. 28 to Wednesday, Nov. 1. Sunday is the first day of the conference. There will be wireless internet. The room rates are $149 and $169, depending on view. The contract has been signed.

Action Item. Each society should name a program chair for San Diego 2006.

A. Gates volunteered to be the Computer Society program chair. R. Meier volunteered to be a program chair, but he was advised not to do it.

e. 2007 Milwaukee: R. Meier reported that the hotel location has been chosen. The Hilton Hotel is an historic hotel. The rooms are the right size, but the exhibit hall will be tight. It will require signage and security. The other choice is the Hyatt, but it was not as impressive. They have been working with the Convention and Visitors Bureau and have contracted the Art Museum. The dates are Oct. 10-13. The dates were moved forward to the winter weather. The room rate is $129.

Motion. R. Meier can use the U. of Kansas (M. Heberling) for administrative assistance and M. Heberling can enter into a contract for the Milwaukee Hilton Hotel City Center for FIE 2007.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. CASEE Link. T. Batchman reported that he spoke with Anne Marie Kelly from IEEE-CS, and she suggested that an in-cooperation agreement would be better than an affiliate agreement. T. Batchman circulated a draft document. M. Piket-May commended T. Batchman on his effort to create a general document that could apply to similar requests.

J. Hughes remarked that CASEE will be running a symposium in Savannah at a different hotel on Wednesday and that Bill Wulf will be present. The structure of the symposium is that they have two or more main speakers and then have breakout sessions. There was concern that the symposium may conflict with workshops on Wednesday, although others noted that the symposium will attract a different audience. J. Hughes thought that the committee should wait until after Savannah to see the impact of the symposium on the conference. N. Fortenberry will encourage people to attend FIE, and the symposium will have open registration slots for FIE attendees.

It was noted that there are advantages to having CASEE on Sunday in terms of hotel contracts--it would help attendance and would not conflict with the workshops. M. Heberling noted that hotel space would be a problem in Milwaukee if there are 100-200 additional attendees. T. Batchman said that Anne Marie Kelley recommends two contracts: one for CASEE and one for FIE. There may be a problem with CASEE being able to plan 4 to 5 years out. It was suggested the wording of the contract should include a recommendation that the cooperating event be scheduled at the end of the conference.

6. Plants Award. E. Soublsy reported for D. Culver. He said that the participants were positive about the award, and it should be continued in the future. Since D. Culver is quasi-retired, he will not serve in future conferences. There is a desire to continue the special sessions format and to broaden the scope to include workshops run by amateurs. ERM needs someone to run the award.

7. Dasher Award. E. Sousby reported that approximately 40 papers are considered for the Dasher Award. D. Budny has created a special website that lists the papers for the reviewers. The award is based on best paper and presentation. D. Litynzki had to cancel at the last minute. The committee received 6-10 recommendations; the Dasher committee members accessed the papers and sent their results to A. Sobel, who organized a telecom to discuss the papers. The committee came to a consensus on the selected papers, and members rated the presentations. A. Sobel determined the winner by averaging the scores. A decision needs to be made about whether to award innovative research or tools as well as what the criteria

should be and how it should be weighted. The posting of the award and the evaluation process should be posted for authors on the website. There was discussion about the following: whether to evaluate the final submission; whether to select papers from each of the categories; whether to get session chairs to recommend best presentations of the conference and then have the committee read the papers over the year and select the best paper; and whether to use attendees responses to determine the presentations that were the best.
Motion. The FIE 2004 committee and the Dasher 2003 committee will refine the process for the Dasher committee and report the results to the Steering Committee.

   The motion passed unanimously.
Action item. The Steering Committee chair will review the charter for the Dasher committee to determine if there are terms defined for the society representatives that serve on the committee. The chair will request that the society assign a representative as needed.

8. Exhibits. B. Hofinger was not present.
9. Website, paper reviews. D. Budny reported that he had to keep the site open an extra week for review submissions. In addition, it is necessary to constantly bug the reviewers. FIE has a reputation that deadlines don't mean anything. He also noted that it is important to be hard on deadlines; otherwise, there will always be problems with late submissions. If the 2004 committee was hard on deadlines, then they would be short 50 papers. There were problems with notification of accepted abstracts because of spam filters. One way to address this is to advertise that authors check the website to determine the status of their submission. Another approach is to have authors reply when they receive notification. A question was asked whether the search engine for the CD-ROM has the ability to search for keywords. D. Budny said that a full search on the web will be a tremendous amount of work. J. Hughes asked whether it makes sense to have a Jan. 10 abstract submission for WIP or to have a May 1 paper deadline.
Action Item. The steering committee will look at the submission abstract requirements for WIPs.
10. Management: M. Heberling said that everyone should look at the website to see if it meets our needs. The format is different. She needs information from the 2005 committee. There is a booth at ASEE. It's an opportunity to make contact with vendors. There are new signage and posters that tells people what FIE does. M. Heberling asked that requests for statistics be made early so that she has time to research it. She will have the requested numbers (see item 4a) ready for the October meeting.
11. Software Engineering. R. Meier said that a group of software engineering faculty from MSOE approached ASEE to become a division of ASEE. This group wants to form a relationship with FIE. A. Gates suggested that the group contact the SE Working Group since they have a similar interest in creating a strong software engineering track at FIE. B. Oakes said that the group should talk to his program committee about this. It would be a good idea if the mailing list includes the IEEE SE list. There was agreement that it is good to find subfields that FIE can target and that can be associated with a particular track.
12. MOU. A. Gates reported that the MOU has not been approved by ERM or IEEE-Ed Society.
Action item. The ERM and IEEE-Ed Society representatives should contact the appropriate person to sign the MOU.
Action item. M. Pavelich should send D. Budny the final MOU so that it can be posted to the website as a recommendation to the Societies.
13. CASEE Link. J. Orr noted that the relationship with CASEE will promote scholarship and create symbiosis. T. Batchman and the committee will continue to work with Norman. The committee will refine the cooperative agreement based on feedback from the committee and draft an MOU for further discussions with Norman.
Motion. The committee should proceed with discussions that explore the relationship with CASEE and keep the discussions positive.

The motion passed unanimously.

14. Vision Committee. The committee is not ready to report. M. Heberling would like the committee to consider having one conference bill the other for the New Faculty Fellows as long as there is a surplus.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15.