

FIE STEERING COMMITTEE
10 OCT 2001, 6:30 P.M.

1. In Attendance
 - a. John Orr, Mary Heberling, Ann Gates, Tim Skvarenina, Bob Hofinger, Dan Moore, Jim Roberts, Jerry Engel, Melinda Piket-May, Ted Batchman, William Oakes, James Sherman, Jim Avery, Dan Budny, Jane Prey, Joe Hughes, Steve Seidman, Russ Meier.
2. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Items 4 and 12 will be moved to Saturday.
 - b. 7f annotated: added William Oakes. Motion to approve: Budny, Prey (second), passes unanimously
3. Approval of the ASEE2001 minutes.
 - a. Dan Moore questions item 9 about computer society involvement in 2002. Asks for clarification.
 - b. Moore recommends a change to read: FIE2002 will use University of Kansas Continuing Education and IEEE Computer Society to coordinate the conference.
 - c. Joe Hughes requests a change on item 11: strike from being of first paragraph, second paragraph last two sentences: delete "if", replace "it" with "he".
 - d. Motion, Batchman (second), unanimous
4. Item moved to Saturday
5. Dasher updates
 - a. Tim Skvarenina reported that seven papers are nominated at this conference.
 - b. Four individuals will visit each of the paper presentations.
 - c. A faculty fellow paper should be included in the journal as well. Russ will get a paper to Ted Batchman if Ted requests one.
 - d. The journal will get 7 or 8 Dashers and 1 faculty fellow.
 - e. The general chair is responsible for the Journal after the conference.
 - f. Note that we may need to add a few non-Dasher papers if needed to fill the journal.
 - g. Dan Budny and Jim Roberts reviewed the process with Ted Batchman and the committee.
6. Website updates
 - a. Web has been updated with meeting minutes, etc.
 - b. Dan Budny discussed worm that brought down the Reno site the day before the close of registration and the small registrant panic that ensued.
 - c. Dan Budny recommended the clearing-house address be listed on all promotional documentation, call-for-papers, etc. The link would point to the current conference.
 - d. Melinda Piket-May requested an update on domain names. Discussion dies.
 - e. Dan Moore suggested promotional documentation also list the individual site address.

- f. Mary Heberling stated that her webmaster accesses and updates UNR website. She believes it may be in the best interest of the conference if the coordinators just maintain the site and have a “fie.edu” address or something similar.
 - g. Dan requested one-page summaries of 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the clearing-house.
 - h. Dan would like to continue to work with Soldan to get the operating manual for the conference, etc. added to the site.
 - i. Dan would also like a mission-statement section added to the clearing-house pages.
 - j. Meeting minutes are available for the past four years. Requests old hardcopies of the minutes and also steering committee members from the past if they can be rediscovered. Meier suggests asking Soldan for a summary of his meeting histories.
 - k. Dan reports that the website gets hit constantly for downloads of papers.
 - l. Dan volunteers to again check the domain names for suggestions from the committee: frontiers-in-education.org, etc.
 - m. Summary: clearing-house will be maintained by Dan and the conference site will be maintained by the host institution (regardless if the current conference page data is stored on a host machine or Dan’s machine).
7. Review of conferences
- a. 2000 Kansas City
 - i. Ongoing activity: audit should be done within the next few weeks
 - ii. Financial information remain the same as reported to this committee (reports distributed in Albuquerque)
 - iii. all loans have been repaid, surplus has been distributed, and the bank account has been zeroed
 - iv. Jim has prepared a letter to the Computer Society to close the conference out. This letter will be sent pending completion of the audit.
 - b. 2001 Reno
 - i. Registration is changing daily because of the world events.
 - ii. Registration stands at 423, 98 for awards banquet, 23 guests, tours are doing very well.
 - iii. Hotel rooms blocked is 358
 - iv. Financially: based on 414 registrants total income will be \$239,484 with expenses of \$228,899 leaving \$10,500 surplus. Of course these are estimates (meal costs, etc). More will flesh out as the registrants arrive, etc.
 - v. Several workshops were canceled. Originally 21, now have 15 or 16
 - vi. Reception is at National Automobile Museum. Busses depart the hotel and run continuously. Ted described the museum briefly.
 - vii. Keynote speaker is Paul Macready.
 - viii. Everything seems to be going smoothly.

- ix. Dan Moore reports a number of speaker cancellations. Reimbursement comes up for discussion based on world events. Ted reports he has sent explanatory letter to all authors discussing certain fixed costs that are critical to the success of the conference. Committee affirms no change in policy --- registrations will not be reimbursed for cancellations. We will bill after the conference for people who have not paid their fees. Discussion begins about creating a list of people that have a history of publishing and not paying. Ted suggests a letter to non-payees that states “unless you pay your current registration bill you will not be allowed to submit a paper to the next conference.” Mary discusses the process of searching the author database with the registration database and believes that will go very smoothly this year.
 - x. Copyright forms are down to one!
 - xi. Session chairs will be reminded to keep the schedule but use the cancellation times for group discussions, etc.
 - xii. Ted reports that he has lost hair organizing the conference. ☺
 - xiii. Jim Roberts commends Ted on behalf of the steering committee for his excellent coordination of the conference and especially in light of the current national and world events.
 - xiv. Mary congratulates Jim for his excellent fundraising efforts throughout the process and right to the day before the conference. This year has many corporate donations and a complete funding of the faculty fellows program. All of this in light of the economy and the world events.
 - xv. James Sherman asks about a pause of remembrance tomorrow since it is the one-month anniversary of the Sep 11 tragedy. Committee supports this request and Ted will consider.
- c. 2002 Boston : John Orr
- i. Distributed nametag stickers for 2002.
 - ii. A budget was distributed.
 - iii. The conference is on schedule.
 - iv. Website is available and abstracts have been submitted.
 - v. Mary and John have visited and toured the hotel.
 - vi. Boston will be a nice contrast to Reno. The cities are very different, hotels are very different, and the cultures are very different.
 - vii. Food will be more expensive.
 - viii. Budget is balanced with a 5% increase in fees assuming 450 registrants.
 - ix. Hotel cost is \$125 – fantastic for Boston, 400 blocked on Thursday and Friday.
 - x. Parking is \$25 per day.
 - xi. Conference is right on the Boston Common.
 - xii. Subways are available.

- xiii. Hotel does not have airport shuttle. Car rental, taxi, subway, and water shuttle are the options.
 - xiv. Program committee will meet in Boston January 25 – 26, 2002.
 - xv. Reception will probably be held on-sight at the hotel.
 - xvi. Keynote is not set yet. Jane Prey suggests Anita Jones.
- d. 2003 Boulder
- i. The conference hotel will be the Westin.
 - ii. Website is not available yet. Should be available before Thanksgiving.
 - iii. Melinda requests an update on the “long-distance coordination” provided by Mary. John Orr provides his insight since he is directly involved: “continuity is important and Mary has done a fantastic job”. Ted confirms and reiterates his support. Mary visits the hotel and establishes contact with the hotel reps, etc.
 - iv. Ted states: “if you are in a hotel that can hold multiple conferences make sure the contract requires a guarantee of a specified number of rooms, breakout session rooms, etc. They wrote it in and it has worked very well.”
 - v. Still having some difficulty locating a reception location. Two options: go to Denver to national history museum or aquarium, or to the campus to the Discovery Learning Center and Integrated Teaching labs. Committee suggests the DLC because it fits into the mission of the conference.
 - vi. John Orr redirects the discussion back to contract. Discussion begins. The discussion in June (ASEE) was to go to a three-year contract starting in 2004. Item 9 on this agenda will discuss this point.
 - vii. Boulder has no contract yet. '03 is getting nervous.
 - viii. Budget will be ready for review in Montreal (ASEE2002).
 - ix. Jim Sherman is going to be the day-to-day contact point for the conference.
 - x. Women in engineering and other student groups are excited and willing to participate in any way.
- e. 2004 Savannah
- i. The contract is in place with Hyatt Regency Savannah per the requirements enacted at the June ASEE meeting. Rate is \$139. We have a guarantee of a 325 block for a hotel that holds 348.
 - ii. Dan Moore points out that the 296 paper slot count on the update handout provided seems very low.
 - iii. Afternoon “on-your-own” has been scheduled on Friday afternoon. Breakfast will occur with focus-on-exhibits that day.
 - iv. Eight technical sessions.
 - v. Reception may be a dinner cruise.
 - vi. Joe has moved away from the Friday Dinner with second keynote. Now thinking about a panel session night with wine-and-cheese reception.

- vii. Dan Budny reviews how he handled afternoon off – no plenary and no focus-on-exhibits. States “you cannot run this conference with only 296 paper slots so you will have to make up the paper times somewhere. Discussion begins on how Joe can tweak the current tentative schedule to accommodate more papers.
 - viii. Committee recommends to Joe that he modify his schedule so that all the session tracks start at the same time every day and that he not have any really formal Friday night activities (maybe birds-of-a-feather, etc.)
 - ix. Joe asks about removing focus on exhibits. Bob states that all exhibitors depend on that time. Bob also recommends moving start time for daily exhibits later (from 8:00 to 9:00). Bob also states that he is doing some evaluation metrics with the exhibitors about if they would be willing to do wine-and-cheese, happy hours, etc. as sponsored activities.
 - f. 2005 Indianapolis
 - i. They are at the stage of contracting with the hotel.
8. Future Sites
 - a. International sites are still showing interest.
 - b. The committee discussed international site requests in June and was hesitant.
 - c. Dan Budny wants to chair Palm Springs or Honolulu in 2006.
 - d. Committee requests that Ted and society related boards put out the word for conference proposals so that they can be reviewed at ASEE in Montreal.
9. IEEE Computer Society MOU
 - a. Mary Kate Rada needs feedback on this MOU to go forward.
 - b. Basically says: the three societies will take a rotating three-year lead sponsorship of this conference
 - c. Discussion begins and is heated!
 - d. John Orr points out that the Management clause of the MOU covers management contracting, while the Administrative clause handles hotel contracts, etc.
 - e. John Orr points out that the rotating basis loses corporate memory.
 - f. Item 1 is basically done currently. Item 1B (four month report) is too tight and not possible because of how billing is done.
 - g. Item 2: adding ASEE as copyright holder: committee recommends removing this and staying with IEEE
 - h. Item 4: done currently
 - i. The committee reviewed that the June meeting requested that our current understanding be modified. This MOU is the result. See Item 9 of the ASEE meeting minutes.
 - j. Joe points out the final sentence of the June ASEE Item 9. Two separate things: MOU and contracting process.
 - k. Committee is concerned with the linkage of the MOU Item 3 Management and Administration clauses.

1. John Orr suggests rewording the first sentence of the Administrative clause to say “responsible for signing” or “responsible for completing the negotiation by signing”.

Oct 13, 2001 : second meeting to finish agenda discussion.

1. Attendance: Shera Kerns, Jerry Engel, Steve Seidman, Ann Gates, Jim Sherman, Mary Heberling, John Orr, Tim Skv, Bob Hofinger, Ted Batchman, Russ Meier, Daniel Moore, Melinda Piket-May, James Avery, Claudio Brito (Brazil 2007 proposal), Melany Ciampi (Brazil 2007 proposal), David Kerns
2. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
3. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
4. Organization Issues and Archival Materials
 - a. Progress was noted.
 - b. Deferred to Item 12
5. Dasher Policies
 - a. Steve Seidman updates the committee of the process of paper nomination and review.
 - b. Shera Kerns motions an adhoc committee to address critical communication points and a relative timeline keyed on the conference date between the three societies – a timeline to be used from year to year: Ann Gates, Jim Roberts, Mike Pavelich, David Kerns, Melinda Piket-May (chair). Second Seidman. Unanimous.
6. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
7. Review of Conferences
 - a. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
 - b. Reno update: 412 registrations, 463 with exhibitors, 497 with guests, 105 for banquet, tours were received greatly, still anticipate no problem with the budget.
8. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
9. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
10. Agenda item completed at first meeting.
11. International projects
 - a. Oslo '01: It was well attended and successful. They also had a post-conference technical tour that was well received and allowed people to see a bit of Norway.
 - b. UK Manchester '02: no update
 - c. Valencia '03: no update
12. Awards – David Kerns
 - a. Did not run as smoothly as it could have this year.
 - b. David convened a meeting at the EdSoc meeting this year.
 - c. Melinda Piket-May reported on this meeting. David found it nearly impossible to get the information from the societies. Some hard deadlines will be set. If award information is not in by that deadline it will not be included in the banquet brochure.

- d. The AdHoc timeline committee formed in this agenda item 5b should be connecting with the Awards chair to help place awards into the timeline.
- e. The committee recognized that the committee has previously passed policy that award registrations are paid for by the awarder. Question of travel is unresolved.

13. Publications

- a. "Interface" is doing very well. The ASEE ECE division, the IEEE EAB, and the IEEE EdSoc sponsor this newsletter. Bill Sayle has plenty of pages! Shera Kerns commends Bill Sayle for his excellent work with the newsletter.

14. Agenda item completed at first meeting.

15. Other

16. Old Business

17. New business

- a. FIE 2007 Proposal
 - i. San Paolo
 - ii. Propose conference in Brazil
 - iii. \$800 plane ticket to San Paolo
 - iv. \$150 projected for hotels
 - v. ICEC2000 was organized by this group.
 - vi. InterTech2002 is organized by this group.
 - vii. Financial support is in place: private and state.
 - viii. The date would be set to match normal FIE dates.
 - ix. Shera notes that ICEC was very successful and commended that conference.
 - x. Steve Seidman questions foreign travel restrictions at universities.
 - xi. Other discussion regarding foreign conferences.
 - xii. Shera Kerns thanked the proposal presenters and advised that the committee would consider the proposal.

18. Time and place of next meeting – ASEE Montreal, June 16-19, 2002

Executive Session

Dan Moore --- serving for Bill Oakes

Russ Meier --- serving for Mike

Dan Budny is no longer a member of the steering committee

David Kerns

Shera Kerns

Ann Gates

Steve Seidman

Ron Miller

Ted Bathman

Jerry Engel

1. Ad Hoc Timeline committee

- a. David Kerns was brought up to date on the adhoc committee formed in the general session item 5b.
 - b. David reports that he had a timeline that was lost when it passed to one general chair in the early 90s.
 - c. David proposes an archival repository for all of the general chair information.
 - d. Dan Moore states that the appropriate information should be the FIE clearinghouse. Ted Batchman confirms how useful that would have been for him.
 - e. The site would be a secured part of the clearinghouse.
 - f. John Orr stated that he'd like to also see a brief description of responsibilities for each person.
 - g. Policies and procedures manual should be a high priority.
 - h. David Kerns notes that we also need a physical archive.
 - i. Committee officially acknowledges Ed Jones offer to search the past conference proceedings for committee members (steering, conference, etc) for the historical records.
 - j. Dan Moore proposes mirror sites: ASEE, IEEE. Question is if they would be willing to mirror us.
2. MOU – contract
- a. Jerry Engel
 - i. Two issues: management issues of the societies, and contracting for services for the conference
 - ii. The problem this year was transition within the IEEE computer society : stronger management and thus significant personnel changes, etc. He foresees this as a continuing trend. Thus, some of the materials regarding FIE got forgotten and the new person was not informed of some of the deals that had been struck with conferences and this one in particular.
 - iii. Three-year contract for services is also an issue to be discussed. He believes that these must be competitively bid.
 - iv. Three-year speaks to stability. One-year speaks to flexibility.
 - v. We need to **identify** what we need contracts for: financial services, web archival, conference services, publications, and other (exhibits).
 - vi. We need to **identify** the administrative responsibility of the societies for the conference.
 - b. Ron Miller
 - i. Copyrights are also an issue that must be addressed in this MOU
 - c. Shera Kerns presenting comments from Jim Roberts
 - i. We need to agree on a common list of things for contract: hotel, negotiations, contract management, negotiations, others.
 - ii. MOU contains the fact that the three entities agree to sponsor jointly. He suggests: any of the three may enter in agreements

on behalf of the conference that the other societies agree to honor.

- iii. He suggests: general chair has the authority, subject to approval of steering committee, to propose their preferred solution to conference management and the sponsor which will serve as the oversight society. They can demonstrate what the competitive process has been and discuss its outcome or explain their sole-source selection.
- d. Shera notes that if we have a successful relationship with a long-term vendor that has done an excellent job that it is a hollow task to go through the bidding process.
- e. Dan Moore comments that if we are too quick to allow sole-sourcing we may not find an interesting new solution.
- f. John Orr suggests RFP from the steering committee.
- g. Ted Batchman notes that if the steering committee calls for RFP then they may have to award the contract with the societies.
- h. Dan Moore states that he believes RFP can be given to Joe, for example, and that Joe must present the results of the RFP to the committee by a set date --- maybe the 2002 FIE, etc.
- i. Jerry Engel: may want to do each contract RFP differently. Pubs and archive web screen out for long term.
- j. Shera: we don't want to make the contracts so tight that the general chair cannot get out if they need to in event of emergency.
- k. Shera: we need recognition in the contracts that we may have to switch chairs, etc. because of an emergency that occurs, etc. This has happened in the past.
- l. David Kerns: notes that awarding of contracts every year may result in the need for full-time staff. Notes that continuity is always a good thing.
- m. Ted Batchman: operational things need corporate memory. Bidding with RFP won't work for those "things that come up." Example: Reno was within 12 on estimating the numbers at the reception on Thursday night. That didn't come from using IEEE figures. That came from our corporate memory of reception attendance. If we change vendors every year we have so much opportunity to lose the corporate memory.
- n. Shera: advantages of long term contracts
 - i. Continuity
 - ii. Implicit and explicit guidance to future chairs
 - iii. Budgets for FIE is an animal of its own and doesn't fit the databases of ASEE, IEEE.
- o. Dan Moore
 - i. Agrees on the archival impact of continuity.
 - ii. IEEE did the management of Pittsburgh and Tempe. It didn't have corporate memory because everybody involved in it had

changed! Thus, long term contracts do not necessarily mean continuity.

- p. John Orr:
 - i. Doesn't think we should make the conclusion that continuity implies long-term contract.
 - q. Shera Kerns
 - i. Stated that she is involved in other organizations that have been extremely successful when they turned over management to a vendor.
 - r. Shera Kerns summary
 - i. We have decided today then that we want to emphasize **quality**.
 - ii. Allow **adaptability** to situations for general chairs.
 - iii. Prefer to have long-term relationships for **continuity** (corporate history) based on FIE not IEEE or ASEE.
 - s. Ted Batchman
 - i. Jerry notes that we are getting insurance and signatures from IEEE for free when that should really be a signed expense. Does IEEE wish to continue in this way?
 - ii. Jerry responds that he is not really sure.
 - t. Jerry Engel
 - i. This committee cannot approve a contract.
 - ii. Either IEEE or ASEE must approve the contracts.
 - u. Shera Kerns
 - i. Looking for an MOU that provide guidance to which areas are amenable to long-term contracts, which areas have more or less discretion for general chair.
 - ii. Chain-of-command: general chair → steering committee recommends variances and requests the society of responsibility → signed by the society
 - iii. Creates **ad hoc committee to refine the MOU**, design sample RFPs, and discusses an ideal not-later-than-date for signatory decisions on conferences. Members: Jerry Engel, Ted Batchman, Joe Hughes (2004 general chair), Ron Miller, Marion Hagler (chair). To provide an initial report in Montreal.
 - iv. Mike Pavelich (future chair) – should communicate this charge to the committee, confirm willingness to serve, and start the committee working.
 - v. Ron Miller
 - i. ERM has no interest in ½ of the copyright (item 2 of MOU).
 - ii. Suggests the wording revert to the way it is currently: IEEE holds the copyright.
3. Publishing best papers
- a. Authors are invited to expand and submit to the Journal of Engineering Education.

- b. JEE peer reviews the new papers.
 - c. IEEE TransOnEd is interested in being considered.
 - d. Jerry Engel states that there are many models to consider: perhaps the editors should work together to decide which papers will go to which journal, create a joint special issue, etc.
 - e. Shera adds transaction publishing to the publications agenda of the next meeting. First, make an intentional decision on how to direct best papers to the appropriate journals. Second, consider how to encourage people making substantial contributions to FIE to submit to the journals on related topics.
- 4. Shera Kerns closes executive sessions
 - 5. Meeting adjourns