College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes 15 November 2012

Attendance:
Aero – Datta Gaitonde
AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
BME – Derek Hansford
CHE – Dave Tomasko (for Jeff Chalmers)
CIV – Frank Croft
CSE – Paul Sivilotti
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
ENV – John Lenhart
FAB – Not present (Ann Christy)
ISE – Carolyn Sommerich
MSE – Sheikh Akbar
ME – Blaine Lilly: ASAP Rep & Acting Chair
WLD – Not present (Dave Farson)
Graduate Student – Kailyn Cage and Jatin Gupta
Undergraduate Student – Rachel Warren (not present Chelsea Setterlin)

None Voting:
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education – Dave Tomasko (acted as ChBE representative)
KSA – Not present (Jane Murphy)
Committee Secretary – Ed McCaul

Guests – Nikki Strader

1. The minutes from the 18 October 2012 meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Dave Tomasko updated the committee.

2.1. A college level interest group is currently studying on line courses. This is a grass roots effort being led by individuals who are interested in offering on line courses. Currently, there are two tracks for on line courses – professional/graduate programs and undergraduate. Welding Engineering is our main program for graduate on line courses. The group is investigating adding additional courses and incorporating new technology.

2.2. We have submitted two proposals for money from Ohio Means Internships & Co-ops, OMIC, but have not heard anything from the state. Even though the proposal was completed in a short period of time we did not have any problems getting companies to volunteer to participate.

2.3. The university did a test run on the subsidy level we will be requesting from the state for the year and discovered that there would be a substantial increase from last year. The reason for the increase was that the subsidy level and CIP code was changed for a large number of courses across the university. The college has received a spreadsheet showing all of our courses along with their
subsidy level and CIP code. The college will make any necessary changes to
the spreadsheet and contact the departments if there are any questions.

2.4. A small group met to discuss the college’s syllabus tool. The group is
considering revising the work flow on our system and how it interacts with the
university’s system.

2.5. The question was asked as to the status of the proposed Data Analytics degree.
The response was that Dave will be able to give a full update on that proposal at
the committee’s next meeting as he will have some additional information by
then. Dave asked the committee to send him the names of any faculty who may
be interested in being part of a planning group for this degree proposal.

3. The committee was shown the list of course change requests that have been
approved by the committee secretary since the committee’s last meeting. There
were no comments or concerns about the courses on the list.

4. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that the new course requests for ENGR 1110.01
through 1110.09, 1110.11 through 1110.14, Introduction to Ohio State and (name of
program) I and ENGR 1120.01 through 1120.09, 1120.11 through 1120.14,
Introduction to Ohio State and (name of program) II be approved. Frank Croft
seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The committee was informed that the purpose of these two courses was to allow
programs the option of dividing their freshman survey courses into two seven
week courses with the first part being offered autumn semester and the second
part being offered spring semester.

4.2. The committee was informed that the one semester survey course will not be
withdrawn and that it will be up to each program to decide which version to use.

4.3. The question was asked as to what will happen when students see both
versions in the course catalog, which one will they know to sign up for. The
response was that they will be told during summer orientation which version to
take.

4.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed,
and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that the new course request for ISE 5461,
Manufacturing of Micro and Nano Systems, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the
motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The committee was informed that the course emphasizes the manufacturing
aspects of micro and nano systems.

5.2. The representatives for BME, ECE, ChBE, MSE, and ME all stated that they
wanted to review the syllabus and have the option of concurring or not
concurring on the course.

5.3. Paul Sivilotti withdrew his motion and the course request was tabled until BME,
ECE, ChBE, MSE, and ME have reviewed the syllabus.
6. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that the new course request for ISE 7882, Interdepartmental Seminar for MBLE Program, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The committee was informed that the course will be used as part of the Masters in Business Logistics Engineering program.
6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that the new course request for MSE 6700, Essentials of Materials Science for High School Educators, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.1. The committee was informed that the course is a distance learning course offered to teachers. The course has concurrence from Education.
7.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that the new course requests for MSE 5321, WE 4121, and WE 7121, Computational Thermodynamics and Kinetics, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1. The committee was informed that the two Welding courses are cross listed with the MSE course. Welding has two separate courses due to how their undergraduate and graduate programs are arranged. Welding graduate students who take WE 7121 will have extra requirements.
8.2. Dave Tomasko stated that Chemical Engineering would like to review the syllabus before it is approved by the committee.
8.3. Paul Sivilotti amended his motion that approval be contingent upon concurrence being received from ChBE. Frank Croft seconded the amendment.
8.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion, as amended, passed.

9. The committee was informed that ECE has withdrawn their new course request for ECE 7779. This was the course request that was discussed at the last committee meeting and tabled due to issues with it.

10. George Valco made a motion that the proposed changes to the college's minor policy be approved. Derek Hansford seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. (A copy of the proposal and the appropriate changes to the CCAA Handbook are attached.)
10.1. The proposal has been reviewed by Subcommittee B and they are recommending its approval.
10.2. The committee was informed that in the past all minors were done with paper forms, but, now, many of them are verified through the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) and that many minor offering programs do not use the paper form anymore.
10.3. The question was asked as to whether this will usurp any power from the offering units. The response was no, as the offering unit is responsible for
programming DARS for their minor. If the unit does not want DARS to verify their minor they all they need to do is not program it into DARS.

10.4. The question was asked as to whether it would be possible for a minor to be verified by DARS but the verification not be valid. The response was that programming what is acceptable into DARS is the offering unit’s responsibility and that they are responsible for making sure that the verification is correct.

10.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

11. George Valco informed the committee that Subcommittee A has reviewed the proposed Master of Global Engineering Leadership (MGEL) degree. This is a substantial proposal that was done in conjunction with Business and the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. A list of questions has been sent to Robert Rojas and he will be meeting with the subcommittee to discuss the proposal. The proposal should be ready to be presented to the committee sometime spring semester.

11.1. The question was asked as what courses are the core courses for this degree. The response was that three are in Fisher, two in John Glenn, and one in EEIC. After the core courses are completed the student will then take courses in a specialization.

11.2. The question was asked as to who in EEIC will be teaching their course as Bob Gustafson is the only person in EEIC who can teach a graduate level. The response was that this will need to be checked.

12. Blaine Lilly presented some options to the committee for creating a policy for course requirements for transfer students (attached).

12.1. Currently the college does not have a policy on this, although ECE does. Consequently, there is the possibility of a student transferring to OSU, taking the university’s required 30 hours, and then getting a degree in engineering without having taken any courses in engineering.

12.2. The comment was made that we do need a policy outlining the minimum number of hours a student needs from engineering.

12.3. The comment was made that different units will have different requirements so, we cannot be too prescriptive.

12.4. The comment was made that we could just default to the university’s rule. The comment was made that doing that would not be a good idea.

12.5. The comment was made that what will we do if we get an international student who has met all of the requirements for one of our degrees.

12.6. The question was asked as to whether such a policy will need to be approved by CAA. The response that having it approved by them would probably be a good idea.

12.7. It was decided that the committee secretary would draft a policy and send it to Subcommittee B for their review.

13. Being out of time the meeting was adjourned.
Proposal to Change Minor Program Form Policy

Proposal

To change the paperwork policy for Minor Program Forms for graduating students to the following:

*Minor Program Forms will only be required if a student’s DARS does not certify the courses for the minor as prescribed by the offering program.*

Reason for Proposal

Students are currently required to complete a signed Minor Program Form and submit it in conjunction with their Application to Graduate. There are over 100 minors across campus from which to choose. Technological advancements and use of the DARS (Degree Audit Requirements System) have progressed across campus to a point where the paperwork system can be simplified without jeopardizing the degree requirement certification for graduating students.

All OSU minors are now programmed into the DARS system, and for most students, DARS runs “green” already, making the signed Minor Program Form unnecessary. Thus, asking students to pursue a signed form and monitoring the paperwork is an unnecessary use of both student and staff time. Students are always encouraged to seek advice from the respective program before choosing courses to satisfy minor requirements.

Current Policy (from CCAA Handbook)

3.2.2. ACTIONS REQUIRED OF STUDENTS

Minors pursued by students with Majors in the College of Engineering are administered as follows:

1. *Minor Program Forms must be signed by an advisor in the Offering Program and by the student’s advisor in their Major Program prior to the student being accepted into the Minor program. Copies of this form will be retained by the Offering Program and the Major Program.*

2. *Students typically file Minor Program Forms with the College of Engineering when they file applications to graduate. However, approval of some minors is managed entirely through the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). Students are advised to check with the Offering Program in advance of the deadline for filing applications to graduate.*

3. *To change a Minor after submitting a Minor Program Form, a student must re-file a new Minor Program Form with all the appropriate signatures.*

Current Content on ENG Website

If you plan on completing a minor, you will also need to submit a *Minor Program Form* with your graduation application to finalize minor certification.

(Note: The following minors do NOT require a Minor Program Form, if the student is not requesting any course exceptions to the minor curriculum: Business, Economics, Entrepreneurship, Geography, Spanish and Life Sciences. All other minors require a completed Minor Program Form for certification.)

DARS Input
The DARS coordinators are constantly updating DARS as curricular changes are made or issues surface. This applies to all academic programs and minors, and these efforts are on-going on a daily basis. To date, there are a handful of minors that still need updated, but this process should be completed this fall. (Contact: DARS liaison to ENG, Karen Sondrini)

Input from other Colleges

BUS: Currently require that all students turn in a Minor Program Form during the transition to semesters, but would like to move to a policy where a form is only required if the DARS is not running correctly. (Contact: Graduation Coordinator, Terri Hoying)

AGR: Does not require the form if the student has met the minor as it was approved. Should the student take something different from what was approved, the form is required. (Contact: Assistant Dean, Jill Pfister)

ASC: Does not require a form unless DARS does not run correctly or the student has multiple majors/minors and they strictly monitor course overlap as part of the graduation requirements. (Contact: Assistant Dean, Mary Ellen Jenkins)
3.2 Undergraduate Minor Program Policy
College Of Engineering
Approved by CCAA on 10 November 1999
Revised for semester calendar 10 March 2010
Revised 31 May 2012

3.2.1 Minor Programs At The Ohio State University

1. Minor programs (“Minors”) are established by an “Offering Program” and are
taken by students majoring in programs other than the Offering Program.* For a
student to complete a Minor, the criteria for a Minor established by the Offering
Program must be fulfilled. These criteria (usually a set of classes or choice of
classes) are established by the Offering Program. Satisfaction of these criteria is
verified by the Home College (i.e., the college which contains the Major Program)
prior to awarding of the Minor.

3.2.2 ACTIONS REQUIRED OF STUDENTS

Minors pursued by students with Majors in the College of Engineering are administered
as follows:
1. Approval of many minors is managed entirely through the Degree Audit
Reporting System (DARS).
2. Minor Program Forms will only be required if a student’s DARS does not certify
the courses for the minor as prescribed by the Offering Program.
   a. Minor Program Forms must be signed by an advisor in the Offering
      Program and by the student’s advisor in their Major Program prior to the
      student being accepted into the Minor program. Copies of this form will
      be retained by the Offering Program and the Major Program.
   b. Students typically file Minor Program Forms with the College of
      Engineering when they file applications to graduate. However, approval of
      some minors is managed entirely through the Degree Audit Reporting
      System (DARS). Students are advised to check with the Offering
      Program in advance of the deadline for filing applications to graduate.
   c. To change a Minor after submitting a Minor Program Form, a student
      must re-file a new Minor Program Form with all the appropriate signatures.

3.2.3 INFORMATION FOR ENGINEERING STUDENTS

The College of Engineering encourages the pursuit of Minors as enriching experiences
for students and thus minimizes the obstacles to its students pursuing Minors in any
area. A Minor signifies meeting certain standards established by the Offering Program.
The following statements apply:
1. A Minor consists of course work, as determined by the sponsoring program.
2. A Minor is not required for graduation.
3. Minors are awarded only at the time that the student receives a bachelor’s
degree.
4. Engineering Minors will be listed on the College’s web page.
5. Minors will appear on a student’s transcript.
6. There is no College of Engineering rule barring double counting of courses taken as part of a Major and Minor, including GE courses. Any double counting must be approved by the student’s Major Program as it may have rules affecting this practice.
7. A minimum aggregate PHR of 2.00 in the Minor is required.

3.2.4 MINOR PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

The College of Engineering has rules governing Minors offered by Offering Programs within the College:
1. A Minor must meet the following criteria:
   a. Minors require a minimum of 12 semester credit hours with no maximum
   b. Courses numbered less than 2000 may not count toward the 12 credit hour minimum.
   c. Letter graded courses taken on a Pass/Non-Pass basis may not be applied to the minor.
   d. Courses graded S/U may count for no more than 25% of the credit hours in the minor.

3.2.5 INITIATION OF A MINOR IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

The procedure for establishing a Minor in the College of Engineering is as follows:
1. An Offering Program may apply for permission to have a Minor by submitting a package to CCAA. After approval, CCAA will forward it to the Council on Academic Affairs. The packet must have the following minimum information:
   a. Name of the Minor, rationale for its development, a description of its purpose, and its anticipated benefits for the students.
   b. Description of the proposed curriculum along with a list of required courses, electives, and their prerequisites that constitute that curriculum.
   c. Statement of the Offering Program’s policy on applicability of transfer credit courses toward the required curriculum of the minor.

* CCAA voted on 18 May 2009 that students majoring in Computer Science and Engineering may take the Minor in Computational Science.
Proposed Policy on “30 Hour Rule” for Transfer Students

The issue:
The University requires transfer students to take a minimum of 30 semester credit hours at Ohio State in order to graduate. Some departments, e.g., ECE, require that transfer students enroll in 30 hours of ECE courses. Other departments have no specific policy at all on the issue. Transfer students can currently complete their core degree requirements at another school, come to Ohio State and enroll in thirty credit hours of courses and graduate with a degree in engineering. This policy does not seem desirable.

We basically have three options:

Option 1: CCAA decides to take no action, leaving the decision regarding the minimum number of hours taken at OSU by transfer students up to each department. This requires that each department writes a policy.

Assuming Option 1 is not acceptable, we have two other options:

Option 2: CCAA requires a minimum number of semester credit hours of courses and leaves the details to the departments. This would not affect existing policies, such as ECE’s, that require all 30 credit hours within the department.

This option would allow departments to require more than 30 hours at OSU, and would also allow departments to permit courses outside the department.

Option 3: CCAA establishes a fixed number of semester credit hours for transfer students, but leaves the details to the departments. This policy would prevent departments from requiring more than the specified number of hours.