1. The minutes from the 17 April 2013 meeting were approved as written.

2. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the revised ChBE SAP policy be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   2.1. The committee was informed that the purpose of the revisions were to bring ChBE’s policy in line with other programs’ policies and with the college’s policies.
   2.2. The committee was informed that the ChBE faculty reviewed and approved the changes.
   2.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3. The committee was given a handout showing the proposed changes to the college’s transfer student admission policy.
   3.1. The changes are reflected in the Enrollment Management Plans for Academic Year 2014-2015, but as the policy is also in the CCAA handbook it is being shown to the committee separately.
   3.2. The committee was informed that the changes allow us to differentiate between internal OSU transfers and external transfers.
3.3. The comment was made that the policy gives each program enough flexibility that they can still admit students they feel will be successful.

4. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the Enrollment Management Plans for Academic Year 2014-2015 be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The committee was informed that the policies have been approved by ASAP and that ASAP wanted to forward the policies to CCAA for its approval.

4.2. The comment was made that a summary of all of the engineering policies could be seen on the table on page 23 of the document. The ASAP Subcommittee decided that the table would be the only part of the document that would be made public although the entire document would be placed on ASAP’s Carmen site. The reason for this is that if the entire document was made public that we would start being questioned by people who are not familiar with all of the reasoning behind the policies.

4.3. The comment was made that the policies would go into effect at the start of the 2014-2015 Academic Year. The academic year begins summer term.

4.4. The question was asked as to whether the committee would also be approving KSA’s policies as they are part of the packet. The response was no as KSA is a school and thus their academic policies do not go through CCAA.

4.5. Holly Griffin pointed out that the internal transfer policy is not consistent between what is shown on page 1 and what is shown on KSA’s policy. A friendly amendment that was made that KSA’s policy be made consistent throughout the policy. The friendly amendment was accepted.

4.6. The question was asked as to what the approval path has been to create these policies. The response was that a task force met for about a year discussing the issue. The task force had wide representation and representatives were designated as liaisons to programs that did not have a representative. A tremendous amount of data was collected and analyzed. Once a college wide policy was created it was sent to Dolan Evanovich for approval by the university. The plan was approved by the university and programs were required to create their own enrollment management plan that needed to be approved by ASAP. These policies are important to Engineering as it appears that we will have about 1,800 new freshmen this coming autumn. Part of the college’s enrollment management plan is increasing the requirements for admission of transfer students.

4.7. The committee was informed that the policies will be reviewed every year by each program and that ASAP will review and approve the policies every spring.

4.8. The question was asked as to whether CCAA will want to approve these policies every year after ASAP has reviewed them. It was decided that committee will continue to review the policies every year.

4.9. The comment was made that our enrollment management policy is in reality a two tiered program. The first part is controlling enrollment and the second part is dismissing students who are performing poorly.

4.10. The comment was made that this is a very political topic as it deals with money and quality of our students.
4.11. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that there was a fair amount of negotiating with enrollment services about how many students we could accept into engineering.

4.12. The comment was made that while some faculty feel that enrollment management is not our purview it is as CCAA is responsible for ensuring the quality of our degrees.

4.13. The comment was made that the range of required GPA’s between programs was quite large.

4.14. The question was asked as to whether historical information, such as previous GPA requirements, should be included on the table. The response was that space and readability are issues, but that programs need to consider historical data when developing their new enrollment criteria.

4.15. The comment was made that it is easier for a program to set a high bar and then accept students who do not make it than to set a low bar and have too many students. The comment was made that if the bar is set too high that students may be scared away. Dave Tomasko commented that he would like for programs to have reasonable GPA requirements where they are within .1 points of what the real requirement is.

4.16. The question was asked as to why programs do not have a set numerical quota. The response was made that having a fixed GPA requirement allows students to know what is required and that if a quote is used students become very competitive as they need to beat out other students to get into a major. For example, if a program had a quota of 100 what happens if the last three people have the same GPA?

4.17. Paul Sivilotti stated that CSE’s minimum GPA requirement of 2.5 that is shown in the table is incorrect and should be 3.0. The committee was asked as to whether CSE could be given permission to update the table and its policy. A friendly amendment was made that CSE be given permission to update the table and its policy, but that that changes need to be submitted to the committee secretary with the reason behind the change not later than the 31st of May. The amendment was accepted.

4.18. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The amended motion passed.

5. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the revision to ChBE’s undergraduate program be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The committee was informed that currently ChBE requires their students to take the three hour CSE 1222 programming course, but wants to allow their students to take the two hour CSE/Engr 1221 programming course as another option. This revision would change ChBE’s hours to degree from 133 to 132-133.

5.2. The committee was informed that the ChBE faculty have voted on and approved the change.

5.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
6. Election of the 2013-2014 chair was held.
   6.1. Blaine Lilly nominated Jeff Chalmers. Frank Croft seconded the nomination.
   6.2. There being no other nominations the nominations were closed and a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. Jeff Chalmers was elected to be the 2013-2014 chair.

7. Being out of time the meeting was adjourned.