College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes 24 October 2013

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

1. The minutes from the 19 September 2013 meeting were approved as written.

2. Dave Tomasko introduced Nikki Modlich. Nikki works in the College of Business and is responsible for The Ohio State Business Plan Competition. Recently a team from BME was very successful and Nikki is interested in broadening the majors that enter the contest. (The flyer about the competition is attached to the minutes.)
2.1. The name of the competition was only recently changed to The Ohio State Business Plan Competition.
2.2. The competition has started for this year, but it will be changing this spring. The change will be that students will be able to submit a proposal in the spring that will be judged on whether the proposal has potential. Students will be given feedback and will be able to revise their proposal in preparation for the formal submission in the autumn.
2.3. Currently many of the participants are from Engineering with heavy participation from the sciences.
2.4. If anyone is interested in using the competition as part of a course or as a course Michael Camp has a grading rubric that he is willing to share.
2.5. The competition provides an experiential learning opportunity for students.
2.6. The competition is looking for judges from Engineering and if anyone is interested please have them contact Nikki Modlich or Michael Camp.

2.7. The question was asked as to what the deadlines were. The response was that the application deadline is in late October and that the teams are scored on five criteria for the first round. All proposals are judged by five people and the selections are announced in early November. The proposals that make it to the second round are required to submit a more complete business plan in January. The individuals whose proposals make it to the third round are required to do an in-person presentation. Normally six teams make it to the third round and the presentations are conducted in early April. Early April was chosen so that teams could also compete in national competitions.

2.8. The competition would like to see colleges start giving their own awards to projects within their college in addition to the overall awards offered by the competition. These specialty awards should encourage more participation from students in each college.

2.9. The question was asked as to how many proposals are submitted by undergraduates and how many are submitted by graduate students. The response was that this year the ratio is about three undergraduate proposals for each graduate proposal. They have seen a 50% increase in undergraduate proposals this year.

2.10. The question was asked as to whether they had coordinated with any of our capstone courses. The response was not yet. The comment was made that since our capstone courses are taken by seniors that, for most of them, once they get organized the submission deadline has passed. However, if they started in the spring of the junior year they could submit a preliminary proposal and be ready for the competition in the autumn.

2.11. The question was asked as to whether the product had to actually be produced. The response was no.

3. George Valco informed the committee that the Humanitarian Engineering Minor proposal had been reviewed by Subcommittee A and returned with comments to Bob Gustafson, but the subcommittee has not yet received a revised proposal.

3.1. The committee was informed that a subcommittee of CAA has been working on a university wide minor policy, but it has not yet been voted on by CAA.

3.2. Blaine Lilly, who is on CAA, was asked as to whether he had heard anything about such a policy. Blaine stated that it has been mentioned but he has not seen anything yet.

3.3. The comment was made that we may need to revise our minor policy and some of our minors if and when the university minor policy is approved.

4. Blaine Lilly informed the committee that Subcommittee B had reviewed the ECE Graduate Curriculum Proposal again, but that there are still issues with how they want to count the ethics course.

5. Blaine Lilly informed the committee that Subcommittee B had reviewed the Joint Honors Proposal and that they had some concerns with it. The proposal was also
presented to the university’s Honors Committee and they also had some concerns with it. The proposal is in the process of being revised.

5.1. The question was asked as to what concerns the subcommittee had with the proposal. The response was that it is a very rigorous program that students will have to sign up for as freshmen; the proposal assumes that the participants will come to OSU with considerable AP credit; the bingo sheets that are part of the proposal show the students taking 21 credit hours some semesters; this proposal differs from other honor programs in that there is no research component at all; there is also very little flexibility with the program, especially with the senior capstone sequence; and students are being recruited into the program before it has been approved.

5.2. The question was asked as to who was pushing the proposal. The response was that is appears to be a priority of the deans of engineering and business.

5.3. The question was asked as to whether the students are being told that the program has not yet been approved. The response was yes, that such a statement is at the bottom of the e-mail each student received.

5.4. The question was asked as to what the academic benefit would be for the students. The response was no one on the subcommittee could see one although, they are asking that students who complete the program get either a Business or Engineering Science Minor.

5.5. The comment was made that AP credit is not rigorous enough especially for calculus. Freshmen who are put into the 3rd calculus course normally do not do well and their grade hurts their GPA.

5.6. The comment was made that AP credit is presumptive and unfair as the tests are very expensive, are not the equivalent of a college level course and the students who do get AP credit often get hurt when the start out in higher level courses.

5.7. The question was asked as to what the attrition rate for FEH was. The comment was made that the work load is very heavy for FEH especially compared to regular engineering courses. The committee secretary was asked to contact Rick Freuler to find out if he had any data on FEH attrition.

6. Course proposals were presented to the committee.

6.1. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for ENGR 7200 and ECE 7080 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1.1. The committee was informed that the subcommittee had some questions about these courses, but found out that they are aimed at two different audiences.

6.1.2. The question was asked as to why the two courses could not be cross listed. The response was that the courses have different prerequisites.

6.1.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.2. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for MSE 3193.01, 3193.02, 4193.01, and 4193.02, as well as WE 3193.01, and 3193.02
be approved. Dave Farson seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.2.1. The committee was informed that these courses were discussed at the committee’s last meeting with the issue being that the hours for each course went from 0-6. The problem with 0 credit hours is that students still have to pay for 0.5 credit hours. At that meeting MSE and WE stated that they wanted to reconsider these courses. The hours for each of the courses is now 0.5-6.0.

6.2.2. The question was asked as to why MSE needs individual study courses at both the 3000 and 4000 level. The response was that this is common across the college and students take the individual study course that is most appropriate for their level.

6.2.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.3. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change requests for CSE 1221 and ME 2010 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.3.1. The committee was informed that the only change was to allow these courses to be taught at the Newark Campus.

6.3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.4. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change request for AV 5300 and the new course request for CE 5300 be approved. Carl Hartsfield seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.4.1. The committee was informed that Civil is adding the course and it is the same course as AV 5300, thus the cross listing.

6.4.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.5. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change request for CHBE 5755 and 5790 be approved. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.5.1. The committee was informed that the change consists of changing the department acronym from CHBE to CBE as CBE is the new acronym for their courses.

6.5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.6. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change request for ENGR 4191 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.6.1. The committee was informed that change consists of being able to offer the course during a 7 or 4 week term so that our students will have more options and to make sure that student’s financial issues are taken care of when they are on co-op.

6.6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
6.7. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course request for ECE 6070 and the course change requests for ECE 7850 and 7858 be approved. Carl Hartsfield seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.7.1. The committee was informed that 6070 has concurrences from EEIC, CRP, ISE, ME, the Glen School, and Business.

6.7.2. The committee was informed that the change to 7850 is to make the course description shorter and the change to 7858 is to update the prerequisites.

6.7.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6.8. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course request for ISE 6290 and the course change request for ISE 5300 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.8.1. The committee was informed that ISE has a new faculty member whose specialty is stochastic optimization and she wants to offer a course on that topic. ECE has concurred on the request.

6.8.2. ISE wants to change the course number for 5300 to 6300 and make it a graduate only course.

6.8.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 11:35.
The Ohio State University Business Plan Competition: A One University Collaborative

General Background

In the spring of 2001, the first Ohio State University (OSU) Business Plan Competition was launched. Over the past 12 years, the competition has grown into a cross-disciplinary program that involves students at all levels in many colleges on campus.

- Over 450 student teams (undergraduate, graduate and professional) have participated.
- Sixty executives from the surrounding business community participate as judges and team mentors each year.
- Over $240,000 in cash awards and $1 million in in-kind services have been awarded since 2001.
- Over $40 million in various forms of follow-on funding has been raised by just the winning teams.
- Immeasurable entrepreneurship educational value to the participating students across disciplines.

Distinct Contribution of the OSU BPC

Due in part to the success of the annual business plan competition, the entrepreneurial ecosystem at Ohio State has seen an explosion in activity, participation, resources, and program options. As a result, we are transitioning the official Ohio State Business Plan Competition to a cross-campus innovation platform that offers a unique educational opportunity to student teams and a unique collaboration opportunity for colleges and departments. The new collaborative model will:

- attract greater student participation from across the campus by offering special instructional exercises and programs for students and faculty within specific colleges and departments;
- work with faculty to design customized exercises, grading rubrics and lecture material to seamlessly integrate the in-class exercises with the comprehensive business plan competition;
- align more closely with the increased number of feeder programs (i.e., accelerators, idea pitches, hackathons, internship programs, and classroom exercises) on campus and in the local and regional community;
- enhance the experiential learning value of Ohio State’s entrepreneurship education programs;
- more fully integrate the competition with the new and existing entrepreneurship courses at Ohio State;
- responsibly and reliably transition these young entrepreneurs into the professional business community;
- provide a more interactive model for mentors and sponsors, including pre-emptive access to young entrepreneurial talent and new venture investment opportunities, to add greater value for sponsors and to encourage their direct participation; and
- create a sustainable financial model going forward that leverages Ohio State’s expansive alumni network and key industry contacts.

The Collegiate Venture Challenge: A One University Collaborative
The Technology Entrepreneurship and Commercialization (TEC) Institute at Fisher College proposes a unique One University Collaborative to further transform the annual OSU Business Plan Competition into a cross-campus educational and innovation platform. Under the proposed model, the annual competition will be integrated into the entrepreneurship educational program to harness the innovative energy of the students and alumni, to advance their ideas from concept to market, and to capture real and substantial value from successful ventures. The foundational pillars of the platform are identified in the table below.

**Integration with Entrepreneurship Curriculum**
The entrepreneurship curriculum at Ohio State is rapidly expanding at all levels.
- The TEC Institute is now building out a formal graduate technology entrepreneurship commercialization specialization named the Langdale TEC Academy after long-time supporter and local venture capitalist, Rich Langdale.
- In addition, the undergraduate entrepreneurship program is being expanded to include a special track in technology entrepreneurship thanks to a generous curriculum support grant from the Keenan Family Foundation.
- The TEC Institute proposes to design and manage the OSU Business Plan competition as a platform for experiential learning on behalf of these individual educational programs, their faculty and their sponsoring academic units. Course materials will be provided to faculty specifically designed for their curriculum.

**College Collaborators**
- College of Engineering
- College of FAES
- College of Medicine
- College of Pharmacy
- Colleges of Arts and Sciences
- Fisher College of Business

**Other Campus Partners**
- School of Design
- Moritz College of Law
- Office of Energy and Environment
- Engineering Education Innovation Center
- Center for Innovative Based Enterprise
- Office of Technology Licensing and Knowledge Transfer

Next steps:
1. Introduction to faculty interested in utilizing custom instructional exercises.
2. Endorse the BPC among your students as a One University collaborative experiential learning platform.
3. Establish a special award for the top team in a college specific area or technology to encourage student participation.