College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs
Meeting Minutes 29 August 2013

Attendance:
Aero – Datta Gaitonde & Carl Hartsfield
AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
BME – Derek Hansford
CHE – Jeff Chalmers - Chair
CIV – Frank Croft
CSE – Ken Supowit
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
ENV – John Lenhart
FAB – Ann Christy
ISE – Carolyn Sommerich
MSE – Sheikh Akbar
ME – Blaine Lilly: ASAP Rep
WLD – Dave Farson
Graduate Student – Sadia Nasrin (not present Aveek Mukhopadhyay)
Undergraduate Student – Rachel Warren & Kareem Rasul

Non Voting:
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education – Dave Tomasko
KSA – Holly Griffin (for Jane Murphy)
Committee Secretary – Ed McCaul

Guests – Nikki Strader, Don Hempson

1. The minutes from the 21 May 2013 meeting were approved as written.

2. Committee members introduced themselves.

3. Subcommittee assignments were announced.
3.1. Curriculum Subcommittee A: George Valco (Chair), Derek Hansford, Sheikh Akbar, Seth Young, Sadia Nasrin
3.2. Curriculum Subcommittee B: Blaine Lilly (Chair), Dave Farson, Richard Hughes, John Lenhart, Ann Christy, Rachel Warren
3.3. Course Proposal Subcommittee: Carolyn Sommerich (Chair), Frank Croft, Datta Gaitonde, Ken Supowit, Aveek Mukhopadhyay, Kareen Rasul

4. The chair asked if anyone knew of any major proposals that will need to be reviewed by the committee this year.
4.1. The comment was made that ECE may be submitting a proposal to change their undergraduate degree requirements.
4.2. The comment was made that a new honors program proposal is being created.
5. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the changes to the college’s ASAP policy be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.1. The committee was informed that the changes clarify how students at the regional campuses are dealt with under SAP. If the changes are approved pre-majors will be under the SAP policies of the regional campus they attend, but students who have been accepted into a major will be under the SAP policies of that major.
5.2. The question was asked as to whether there are any students at the regional campuses who have been accepted into a major. The response was no.
5.3. George Valco made a comment that one detriment to this change is that, as the regional campuses use the university’s SAP policy, a student may be in academic trouble but may not be fully aware of it until they transfer to the Columbus campus or are accepted into a major.
5.4. The comment was made that the main reason for the new policy is that our advisors do not have any real contact with our students at the regional campuses and, as such, they are uncomfortable sending a dismissal letter to a student they have never met.
5.5. The comment was made that although George has a valid concern that the conversations our advisors have with students before they get a dismissal letter are crucial.
5.6. The comment was made that this change would add a process that they we do not currently have.
5.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 14 approved, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the changes to Aviation’s ASAP policy be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The committee was informed that the changes brought Aviation’s policy more in line with other programs.
6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 15 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. The ECE Graduate Curriculum Proposal was assigned to Subcommittee B.

8. Don Hempson introduced himself to the committee and briefed them on the new Global Option in Engineering.
8.1. Don is the college’s new Global Studies Manager.
8.2. The Global Option in Engineering has been approved by the university and our students are being told about it.
8.3. As part of the Global Option in Engineering students are required to take senior level courses with a strong international focus approved by their major. Don needs units to identify these courses so that a list of approved courses can be developed.
8.4. The question was asked as to whether our sophomores who are part of the STEP program could use their money for this program. The response was that
Don has been working with the Office of International Affairs and that it appears that they can use their money for international travel.

8.5. The question was asked as to how many of our students are in STEP. The response was about 200-300.

8.6. The question was asked as to how formal the education abroad requirement was. The response was that completion of the education abroad requirement was not formal but, rather, considered on a case by case basis.

9. The committee was given a list of the course change requests that the committee secretary approved over the summer.

9.1. The question was asked as to what was meant by “change graded component”. The response was that the lecture, lab, or recitation could be the graded component of a course, but that only one could be chosen. Programs have found that they picked the wrong one and wanted to change it.

10. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on various items.

10.1. Enrollment

10.1.1. We have 1750 new first semester freshmen this year and have 2300 students taking one of our Introduction to Engineering courses this semester.

10.1.2. We have a massive enrollment bubble going through the college, but our new enrollment management plans should help keep our enrollment under control.

10.1.3. All members present were given handouts that showed our retention rate in raw numbers and percentage. Our overall retention and graduation rate is 60% and that is a good number nationally. Most of our losses occur between the first and second years as about 80% of our second year students graduate.

10.1.4. The question was asked as to how an engineering student is defined. The response was that defining the cohort used in the data is challenging. Only incoming freshmen are included in the numbers and, thus, transfer students are not. We have been reporting this data to ASEE for the past few years.

10.1.5. The question was asked as to whether we have data on the other Big Ten schools. The response was not at this time.

10.1.6. The question was asked as to whether we have data on our FEH students. The response was no.

10.1.7. The comment was made that our first year losses were made up by our gains in transfer students. Thus, the number of new first semester students we get is the approximate number of students who will be looking for a major.

10.1.8. The comment was made that this is dangerous data as it could be used against us for many people will ask if a 60% graduation rate is good. The comment was that our graduation rate is a common question.
10.1.9. The comment was made that it appears that if a student is still in the college by their third year that they will graduate with an engineering degree.

10.1.10. The question was asked as to why there was such a big difference between our retention rate and our graduation rate. The response was that the retention rate is less the students who have graduated.

10.1.11. The question was asked as to whether we know if the students who leave engineering graduate from OSU. The response was that we have looked at this before and it appears that over 80% of our incoming students do graduate from OSU.

10.1.12. Dave Tomasko was asked if he could provide information on where our students go who leave engineering. Dave stated that he would.

10.2. Data Analytics

10.2.1. Work on the Data Analytics major is almost completed and it should be a new major in Arts & Science sometime next year.

10.2.2. The major will have three specializations and will be co-managed between CSE and Statistics.

10.2.3. Enrollment will be limited to 50 students the first year.

10.2.4. The major will have an Industrial Advisory Board, which is very unusual for Arts & Science.

10.2.5. The question was asked as to whether there will be a minor in Data Analytics. The response was no, but that a student can already specialize in Data Analytics in a number of majors.

10.2.6. The question was asked as to how the 50 students will be selected. The response was that this will be the responsibility of the oversight committee.

10.2.7. The question was asked as to whether there will be a pre-major associated with the major. The response was not at this time as Arts & Science’s philosophy is not to have pre-majors.

10.3. Integrated Business and Engineering (IBE) Proposal

10.3.1. IBE is an honors program and the proposal is currently with the Honors Committee. It is a course based program with a heavy load.

10.3.2. The program is similar to the national Grand Challenge, which is another potential proposal that CCAA may need to review.

10.3.3. The question was asked as to whether the college will give financial assistance to a student who is in the program who goes over 18 hours because of the program. The response was not at this time.

10.4. Center for Design and Manufacturing Excellence (CDME).

10.4.1. CDME is a center that everyone will be hearing about in the near future. It will be one of the biggest recent investments in research for the college.

10.4.2. The center will have a regional orientation and will deal with manufacturing and general engineering. The center will be large enough for an educational component to include a degree.

10.4.3. The question was asked as to whether this center will conflict with ISE as manufacturing is part of their program. The response was that a
number of departments deal with some aspect of manufacturing. This will not be a new department and, as with other centers, there will be some overlap with various departments.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 11:36.