

ASEE DELOS Business Meeting Minutes
 2012 ASEE Annual Conference in San Antonio TX
 2:15 PM, Tuesday 12 June 2012

Attendance, in alphabetical order

Hosni Abu-Mulawch, Andrew Bubensing, Maddelena Fanelli, Aleks Franz, Larry Genalo, Georgia Harris, Nebojsa Jaksic, Glen Longhurst, Greg Mason, Kathleen Meeham, Gerry Recktenwald, Tom Schubert

Welcome and Introduction

The current chair and past chair were not able to attend the meeting, so the meeting was called to order by the Program Chair Gerry Recktenwald. Those present in the room introduced themselves
 Meeting minutes from the 2011 meeting were approved by unanimous vote

Officer Reports

Web/news editor: Greg Mason

Site has been updated with thank to US Didactic for their contribution to DELOS. Site has latest meeting minutes

Treasurer: Greg Mason

	DELOS	10/1/11 to 6/12/12
		Membership: 489
	BASS	Division
Beginning		
Fund Balance	\$ 5,796.38	\$ 523.00
Total	\$ 5,796.38	\$ 523.00
Revenue		
Dues	\$ 789.00	\$ -
Contributions	\$ -	\$ -
Other Revenue	\$ 14.10	\$ -
Total	\$ 803.10	\$ -
Expense		
Awards	\$ 600.00	\$ -
Total	\$ 600.00	\$ -
Ending Balance	\$ 5,999.48	\$ 523.00

Program Chair: Gerry Recktenwald

42 abstracts
28 accepted
47 reviewers
4 best paper

7 technical sessions

1 workshop – reported from a member as being “great”

1 panel discussion – preparing students for industry via low-cost robotics labs

Typically had 17-19 in audience at each session

Discussion on review process for best paper awards

The review criteria used this year was as follows

- a. Readability: Is the paper well written? Is it free of grammatical and spelling errors? Is the paper easy to read? Are the key findings made obvious to the reader?
- b. Technical merit: Is the analysis sound and well documented? Are the measurement techniques carefully defined and appropriate to the quantities being measured? Do the discussion and conclusions follow from the data and analysis presented in the paper? Are assertions of improvements in education supported by rigorous assessment?
- c. Use of Figures and Graphics: Are the figures and graphics clear and effective at illustrating the equipment and data? Do the figures and graphics support the discussion and conclusions? Are the figures and graphics sufficiently explained by discussion in the text of the paper?
- d. Innovation in Education: Does the paper describe an innovative approach to laboratory-based instruction? Does the paper contribute to the advancement of laboratory-based instruction?
- e. Broad Interest: Is the paper of interest outside of a narrowly targeted audience? Is there potential for crossover of interest to other subject areas or audiences?
- f. Significance and impact: Is the paper of significant relative to other papers in the same field of interest? Will other researchers in the same field cite the paper? Is the paper likely to have an impact on the practice of engineering education, or on future research in engineering education?

There was discussion about whether this criteria was appropriate and complete.

The discussion focused on what type of assessment is necessary and where that description appeared in the review criteria. Gerald noted that a discussion on use of appropriate assessment methods is in the “technical Merit” section. Georgia commented that academics may have different measures than those from industry. We don't bias the type of required assessments.

Georgia said that the criteria should emphasize the importance of having clear and consistent units in graphs and figures.

After a brief discussion those in attendance were satisfied with the basic criteria.

Gerry noted that division had a very short time to select best paper and submit them to their PIC. Response from DELOS member asked to help judge the best papers was poor. Only two members responded in time for their input to be used for the best paper selection. Gerry has discussed this short time frame with the PIC leadership and asked them to change timing of the process.

Announcement of Awards:

AC 2011-3242: Teaching Adaptive Filters and Applications in Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology Program, Jean Jiang and Li Tan (Purdue University, North Central)

AC 2011-4486: A Mobile Laboratory as a Venue for Education and Outreach Emphasizing Sustainable Transportation Jeremy John Worm, John E. Beard, Wayne Weaver and Carl L. Anderson (Michigan Technological University)

AC 2011-3412: Implementation and Assessment of a Virtual Reality Experiment in the Undergraduate Thermo-fluids Laboratory, Sushil K. Chaturvedi, Jaewan Yoon, Rick McKenzie, Petros J. Katsioloudis, Hector M. Garcia and Shuo Ren (Old Dominion University)

AC 2011-3864: Science and Engineering Active Learning (SEAL) System: A Novel Approach to Controls Laboratories, Per Henrik Borgstrom, William J. Kaiser, Gregory Chung, Zachary Nelson, Manda Paul, Stoytcho Marinov Stoytchev, and Jackson Tek Kon Ding (Marvell Technology Group, Ltd.)

Officer Elections

Gerry and Greg explained the duties of each position.

Gerry explained the rules of succession used in DELOS

Andrew expressed interest in secretary and treasurer and webmaster

Kathleen expressed interest for any position = secretary treasurer

Andrew was nominated for webmaster

Kathleen was nominated for secretary and treasurer

Greg was nominated for Program Chair

Gerry was nominated for Division Chair

Motion moved and seconded. Motion was carried by unanimous oral vote.

New Business

Andrew presented an overview of lab manager web community web site labeled.org The goal of Labeled.org is to become a collective resource for how to manage lab equipment. It includes discussion forums for various topics about lab equipment and managing lab resources.

Gerry posed the question – what is the mission of DELOS. Should we be more than a group that simply organizes technical sessions for the ASEE annual conference? There is a fair amount of overlap with other divisions. Should we collaborate with other divisions?

Several ideas were posed for DELOS activities, including:

1. Sponsorship of joint sessions with other divisions
2. Creation of a Journal for Laboratory Research
3. Providing a session on SI units and the effect of upcoming changes in their definitions
4. A session for micro-scale experiments
5. Hosting an a session to show off hardware used in laboratory experiments

The group settled on sponsoring a session next conference where presenters could show lab experiments (BYOE Bring Your Own Experiment). The session would be organized as a panel discussion so there would not be a requirement to publish.

Andrew and Kathleen agreed to organize the BYOE session next year. There was a motion to give Andrew and Kathleen permission to spend up to \$1000 to promote the BYOE event. Most of the discussion on this expenditure focused on providing reimbursement for shipping of experimental apparatus. The motion carried by a vote of 5 to 2. The objecting members were concerned that the money would be seen as awards. There was no consensus on how the money would be used, but general agreement was that the money would be used to offset the costs of participating in the event.

Other comments:

It would be helpful if the chairs of the divisions would suggest what division or if there was a better way for you to find which division

Gerry reported that DELOS was not present at the ASEE Mixer. There was not enough time to prepare a poster for the event.

Report from PIC 4 Chair

PK Embry (for Bev Walker)

1. Special Pic grants are available for divisions who are creatively trying to engaging people in their division. The grant provides matching funds. Our BYOE idea is a perfect candidate for a grant. Gerry will be receiving an official announcement.
2. ASEE is in the red. After comparison with other professional societies, ASEE will has decided they may increase their dues. There may be a 2 tier system for those who want printed material vs web only material
3. Conference registration fees will be going up.
4. ASEE no longer does session evaluations. This was for cost savings. Divisions are free to do their own evaluations.
5. The best papers process is being revised. Each division will forward a nomination to sit on best paper committee to choose from the best papers. Division will only be able to submit one nomination for best paper.
6. Division mixer - the PIC chair asked for feedback from the group on the success of the division mixer.

7. Papers - may make policy that papers must have one author who paid full registration. Some student paper were circumventing registration costs.

Suggestion to the PIC representative

1. Get papers form the conference in to a better search database
2. Vendor hours outside of session times was limited. There is not enough time to attend session and visit the exposition.
3. Monolith doesn't allow you to do things in bulk. You also can't see what email is going out. It needs an update.

Meeting a journed