<div align="center">
Draft of Meeting Minutes
AIChE Education Division Board Teleconference
Friday, June 1, 2012
12:00 PM EDT
</div>

Participants: Don Visco, Ben Davis, Bette Lawler, Taryn Bayles, Fred Justice, John O'Connell, David Silverstein, Milo Koretsky, Gilda Barabino, Jason Keith, Christi Patton-Luks

I.   Approval of 01/31/12 and 02/09/12 Meeting Minutes (Davis)

The minutes for the previous meetings were sent out prior to this meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II.   Financial Report (Davis)

- Current balance is $3188.76 as of April 2012. All the income has been coming from dues; we brought in about $1000 in dues income in 2011. Only expenditures this year so far were for the domain name renewal for the website and for some printing/newsletter expenses.
- No budget currently, but by the end of today's meeting we should have a better idea of what different committees need for funding. The deposit for the banquet at the annual meeting will likely be $1500-$2100, which would be repaid by the attendees. Davis is working with Lawler on covering that expense with account funds.

III.   Reporting Structure for Committees/Liaison

- Barabino is the CTOC liaison to the division. At the next CTOC meeting, the proposed division bylaws change will be up for approval and will likely be approved. CTOC has a draft of "progress reports" – questions for the division to answer in reporting to CTOC – and Barabino will give that to Visco when it is finished.
- Justice adds that Patton Luks was under the impression that she was going to comment about the bylaws change at the next CTOC meeting. Barabino does not envision significant discussion.
- Visco wants to ensure that information from committees will be reported to the board at meetings. He has assigned this responsibility to the 2nd Vice-Chair (Bayles) She has agreed to interface with committee chairs in order to ensure that each one is represented when we give reports in meetings.

IV.   Programming Report (Keith)

- Keith has submitted all requests through AIChE. We have 5 workshops, 2 poster sessions, and we will be incorporating some parts of the student conference (undergraduate research forum and student paper competition).
- There will be three invited sessions – "Best Papers from ASEE and CEE", "In Honor of David Allen: 2011 W.K. Lewis Award Recipient", and "Computing and Technology In Chemical Engineering Education II. Honoring the contributions of David Himmelblau and Gary Powers."
- We will have 17 other regular sessions. As usual, we asked for all programming to occur on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday; we will see if that request is granted.
- Deadline for getting information into the program book: July 2nd
- 2012 Spring meeting: 2 sessions; everything went fine, with the exception of some no-shows.
- 2013 Spring meeting: we entered one session, which is typical.

V.   Membership Report (Justice)

- In May, we had 165 members. That's up considerably. 140 are from the U.S. We continue to have significant international support. In general, we still only have one person from a lot of schools (broad but not deep representation).
- We're not as close to the 200 member goal as we want to be, but there still seems to be growth opportunities.
- It might be useful to think about a standard format for managing membership data.
- Justice promised the board an outline of how the "sampling membership" plan will go forward.

VI.   Committee/Liaison Updates

   A. Future Faculty (Koretsky)

   - This is concerning the AIChE Education Division Future Faculty Program. Koretsky has been speaking with Rich Felder and others about this, it still needs some shaping.
   - In terms of structure: initiation should be at the Annual Meeting to get mentors/mentees together in an interactive session. Another critical part is propagation, where these pairs would regularly meet (once per month) and they would identify some goal for their partnership. Termination of partnerships and subsequent assessment would be helpful for improving the program, but we do not want it to be too burdensome.

- In terms of logistics, we need to determine how large the group can get and how large it should be to start with. Do we make pairs with like research interests or not? We also need to get the word out in terms of getting pairs interested.
- Deadline for this is July 2nd so that this can get in to the programming book.
- Visco says that this deadline is unnecessarily short. Can we pair future faculty candidates with division members at the meeting? Visco recommends matching with respect to research interests. Mentors might have similar teaching interests as well.
- Justice adds that this might be something that someone who is just finishing undergrad might take advantage of.
- Koretsky imagines more of a pyramid structure where graduate students are mentored by older faculty but are also (eventually) mentoring undergraduate students.
- O'Connell asks how much emphasis is on "future" – are we talking about actual new faculty or potential new faculty? Koretsky envisions it as for graduate students who are looking in to a faculty career and need to figure out what to do. O'Connell says that the "Meet the Faculty Candidate" session is a very good opportunity for that.
- Visco likes all these ideas; the initiation for this activity should probably be at that session. Perhaps the program can extend backwards to younger people once it has begun. Koretsky agrees but has questions – is that later than we'd want to get people involved? O'Connell says that we should start with people who can benefit immediately, then move backwards from there.
- Koretsky asks when we should solicit volunteers. Visco says that we can identify mentees during the summer well before the meeting. O'Connell says that it may be difficult to accumulate interest. Identifying 8 candidates early should be doable.

B. Course Survey (Silverstein)

30 or 40 responses so far on design course. What should we do next year? Transport has been suggested, but that may take a while. Daniel Lepek has volunteered to help with Transport. Control has been suggested for next year because it has been some time since we last did it.

C. International (Visco)

- This committee has not been very responsive. They have submitted a plan, but they haven't really made much progress. We should probably look in to new leadership on that committee.
- Barabino asks if this group is involved with the International Committee of AIChE. Visco will put the next chair in touch with that committee.

D. K-12 (Bayles)

- Dick Zollars (chair), Davis, and Bayles are on this committee.
- Davis talked with Lawler about other entities in AIChE who are involved in outreach and contacted the chairs of CTOC and CEOC; the conclusion was that the only significant entity in this area is the SIOC Outreach Coalition chaired by Frank Petrocelli.
- Bayles has sent out a survey of K-12 activities out to Education Division members. She is in the process of receiving and collecting the data.
- Davis is working with others on getting a list of chemical engineering themed K-12 lessons/activities on the division website.
- Dick Zollars and Davis will be working with Petrocelli and others on an outreach event at Annual Meeting; this group will meet again soon.

E. SAChE (Visco)

Chip Howat has not been able to get any contact with SAChE. Visco has asked for the contacts there, hopefully Lawler can help with that. Howat has tried to contact people and has not gotten any response. Lawler will get them in touch with Visco.

F. CAChE (Visco)

Eric Maase has stepped down as CAChE liaison. Visco recommended Clare McCabe (a Division member and CAChE Secretary). Keith, who is a CAChE Trustee, agreed. McCabe has been contacted and Visco is awaiting her response.

G. Student Chapters Committee (Visco)

The student chapters committee is led by Chuck Coronella. They are working on the undergraduate student research session at the Annual Meeting; this is already part of Group 4 programming.

H. Awards (O'Connell)

- Since we put awards in the bylaws, we have to do it. The idea was to have three awards to start with; an award for Excellence in Chemical Engineering Education Research, for Service to Chemical Engineering Education, and for Adoption and Implementation in Chemical Engineering Education.
- The idea is to identify awards for faculty who are not covered by other ASEE awards in order to fill that gap.
- Current issues are: when the deadline for nominations should be, how we would advertize the awards, and how should we raise awareness for these awards.
- What is our opinion of the descriptions and the ideas? Silverstein asks for an example for the adoption and implementation award. O'Connell says that these could be novel student projects or significant and documented impacts on teaching and learning at the publication level. Is this a "best paper" award? O'Connell says that this would be the best way for that to be documented. Silverstein wants to know if this award will cover those who will be missed. O'Connell says the first two awards would involve multiple events and that all awards would not be necessarily be given out every year. Visco says that a paper should not be necessary, as long as the impact or idea is formalized or documented. O'Connell points out that there are very different levels of formalization; the important thing would be the impact of the particular idea.
- Visco says we can move forward with these award ideas. O'Connell will send out a final proposal for voting. Afterwards we will solicit nominations, etc.

I. Membership (Justice)

This item will be pushed to the next meeting.

VII. Other Business

A. RFP Response (Lawler)

This item will be pushed to the next meeting.

B. Book of Knowledge Update (Lawler/Visco)

This item will be pushed to the next meeting.

C. By-Laws Approval (Davis/Visco)

Patton Luks doesn't have any questions about this change in preparation for the CTOC vote. Barabino doesn't envision a lot of discussion. The results of the voting for the bylaws change and the division logo were completed on 3/23/12. Thank you to David Silverstein for organizing the poll through the website. 74 members voted and the results were:

> 65 approved of the change to the bylaws
> 6 did not approve
> 3 gave no response
> 55 members voted for logo A
> 17 voted for logo B
> 2 gave no response

Since more than 2/3 of the members who voted approved the bylaws change, the change has passed. The new proposed bylaws have been sent by Visco to CTOC for approval. The new logo (now up on the website) is logo A:

D. Other items (Lawler)

This item will be pushed to the next meeting.

VIII. New Business

Not everyone could attend a meeting next week Friday at noon. Visco will put together a new poll for the next meeting. Visco thanked everyone for their time. Justice will rewrite the mentorship language to indicate its service impact, not just a programming impact.