1. The minutes from the 13 January 2014 meeting were approved as written.

2. Mindy Wright was introduced to the committee and briefed the committee about the College Credit Plus program. She has two goals for this meeting. First, to give the committee an overview of the College Credit Plus program as it today. Second, she wants to get feedback on the program and find out what questions people have about it.

2.1. College Credit Plus is a program in which students take non-remedial educational coursework while in high school that automatically results in high school and college credit at the successful conclusion of the course.

2.2. Courses used in the program must be existing college courses.

2.3. Instructors must be approved by the Institute of Higher Education with 18 hours or a master's degree in the content area.

2.4. The proposed funding model sets a minimum of $40/credit hour and a maximum of $160/credit hour. This is based on the funds school districts receive per student from the state.

2.5. The state legislature will create the law authorizing the College Credit Plus program and it is unknown if they will follow the chancellor’s recommendations.

2.6. Ohio State will need to decide how much it will charge per credit hour. We will probably not go with the maximum if we want to be competitive.
2.7. The question was asked as to whether OSU will use one rate for a credit hour or multiple ones as engineering courses are more expensive than liberal arts courses. The response was that this is unlikely. In addition, we will not be allowed to charge lab fees.

2.8. The question was asked as to whether the program will only work with Ohio colleges. Mindy stated that she did not know, but that the rules would only apply to Ohio public schools and colleges.

2.9. The question was asked as to what option students who attend private high schools have. Mindy stated that she would have to check on this.

2.10. The question was asked as to who will approve the instructors assuming they meet the requirements. The response was that approval will probably be done by the departments.

2.11. The question was asked as to how this is different than an AP class and why is the new program necessary. The response was that some high schools do not have enough of a demand to offer many, if any, AP courses and that this will give students another option. The purpose of the program is to reduce the time to degree and lower the cost of a college education.

2.12. The question was asked as to whether these courses will be marked differently on a student’s transcript. The response was that this will be part of a future recommendation.

2.13. More and more students are coming to OSU with college credit and this program may increase that number.

3. George Valco informed the committee that Subcommittee A has been assigned the task of revising the college’s minor policy in consideration of the new University policy on minors. However, it is currently a moving target, as CAA considered revisions to the policy approved in November 2013 at its meeting last week, after Subcommittee A’s meeting earlier that day. Until the final policy is published we cannot revise our policy or minors.

3.1. One issue the subcommittee has been working on is how to define an Engineering major. The subcommittee has been considering four different definitions, one of which is all required courses numbered 2000 or above, allowing technical electives to double count toward a minor.

3.2. Another issue is the definition of the term “subject” in the version of the CAA policy we have seen. We have informally heard that it is intentionally left somewhat vague so that offering programs can propose that a minor that uses courses with the same subject code as major courses be available to students in that major, with the proposal based on the different focuses of the major and minor. There are many examples of this across the University, including the Surveying and Computational Science minors in Engineering.

3.3. The comment was made that CAA wants students to take 12 hours beyond their major to get a minor and, thus, wants to discourage double counting.

3.4. Blaine Lilly informed the committee that CAA regards the engineering “major” to consist of required courses only. Technical electives can therefore be double counted with minor courses.

3.5. The comment was made that it appears that CAA will want all minors to be in compliance with the new policy by autumn 2015.
3.6. The proposed policy will be discussed by Randy Smith at the upcoming curricular deans meeting.

3.7. The comment was made that the Math minor is a minor outside of Engineering that we have had issues with as some of our programs require Math courses that are part of the minor and Math will not allow those courses to count towards the minor.

4. Carolyn Sommerich presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations.

4.1. Carolyn made a motion that the new course request for ENGR 1196, Minority Engineering Program Seminar, be approved. Derek Hansford seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1.1. The committee was informed that this course is modeled after the Women in Engineering Seminar course.

4.1.2. The question was asked as whether course was letter graded or pass/fail. The response was pass/fail.

4.1.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4.2. Carolyn made a motion that the new course requests for ENGR 2797.01-.10, 2797.11, 5795.01-.10, 5797.11, and 5797.13 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.2.1. The committee was informed that 2797.01-.10 and 5797.01-.10 are the generic study abroad courses while 2797.11, 5797.11, and 5797.13 are specific study abroad courses.

4.2.2. We need to create these courses due to changes in how the Office of International Affairs will be operating. The large number of courses is because we want to give our students a lot of options.

4.2.3. The question was asked as to why Asia was broken down into a number of different courses. The response was that we needed to do this to track where our students are going and to allow the specific region of Asia to shown on a student’s transcript.

4.2.4. George Valco stated that some ECE students who have taken courses in China for credit as OSU courses have a letter grade show on their transcript, not a grade of K, but the letter grade is not calculated as part of their GPA. The comment was made that this may be due to how the agreement was written. The comment was made that transfer credit from overseas universities should be discussed at a future meeting.

4.2.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

4.3. Carolyn made a motion that the new course requests for ENGR 6210, 6220, and 6230 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.3.1. The committee was informed that these courses are part of the MGEL degree program and can only be taken by students in that program.

4.3.2. The question was asked as to who will be teaching the courses. The response was that faculty from the business school will be.

4.3.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
4.4. Carolyn made a motion that the new course requests for BME 5105, 5205, 5305, 5505, and 5605 be approved contingent upon rewording the description for 5105 and 5505, creating a new title for 5305 and 5405, getting concurrences for 5205, 5405, and 5606. Derek Hansford seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.4.1. The committee was informed that since the subcommittee met it had received a message from Mark Ruegsegger stating that these courses are designed to complement the same courses at the 4000 level. The courses are designed for graduate students who come to BME without a BME undergraduate degree and need some addition work in specific areas.

4.4.2. The question was asked as to why BME does not just move their 4000 level courses to a 5000 level. The response was that there are specific prerequisites for the 4000 level courses that the graduate students may not have and that if this was done some 4000 level courses would have a 5000 level prerequisite. The prerequisite for each of the proposed courses is permission of instructor.

4.4.3. The question was asked as to why BME does not add “or graduate standing” to their 4000 courses. The response was that if a BME graduate student takes a 4000 level BME course they cannot receive graduate credit for it.

4.4.4. The comment was made that as these are copies of existing courses that have previously received concurrences that this should not be a contingency. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

4.4.5. The comment was made that as the titles and descriptions are the same as the 4000 level courses that changing them should not be a contingency. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

4.4.6. The question was asked as to whether the courses have an exclusion clause for their 4000 equivalents. The response was yes.

4.4.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed with no contingencies.

4.5. Carolyn made a motion that the new course requests for ISE 3500 and 7883 be approved. Derek Hansford seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.5.1. The committee was informed that 3500 has concurrence from ME and that 7883 will provide their graduate students another seminar option.

4.5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4.6. Carolyn made a motion that the course change request for ME 3501; NE 4701, 4506, 5610, 5735, 5776, 6708, 6881, and 8999 be approved. Derek Hansford seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.6.1. The committee was informed that all of the changes are very minor and mainly deal with prerequisites.

4.6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4.7. Carolyn made a motion that the course withdrawal request for ENGR 5797E be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.7.1. The committee was informed that this course needs to be withdrawn so that the decimal versions can be created.
4.7.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Dave Tomasko informed the committee about some upcoming visits.
   5.1. Steve Isakowitz will be visiting the college on the 20th of February and will be giving a talk that evening. Dave hopes that the talk will be well attended. The question was asked as whether Isakowitz is part of Branson’s company. The response was yes, that he is the president of Virgin Galactic.
   5.2. Rick Miller, President of Olin College, will be visiting the college the week of 30 March. He is considered to be an expert on engineering education and will be giving a talk on that topic.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 11:13.