Attendance:
Aero – Carl Hartsfield
AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
BME – Mark Ruegsegger - Chair
CHE – Jeff Chalmers
CIV – Not present (Frank Croft)
CSE – Ken Supowit
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Robert Perry
ENV – John Lenhart
FAB – Ann Christy
ISE – Carolyn Sommerich (ASAP Rep)
MSE – Sheikh Akbar
ME – Rob Siston
WLD – Not present (Dave Farson)
Graduate Student – Not present (Beenish Saba, Ankita Majumder)
Undergraduate Student – Kareem Rasul (not present Amber Harriger)

Non Voting:
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education – Dave Tomasko
KSA – Not present (Maria Conroy)
Committee Secretary – Ed McCaul
Advisor – Nikki Strader

Guests – None

1. The minutes from the 8 December 2014 meeting were approved as written.

2. George Valco made a motion that the Nuclear Engineering Minor be approved. Sheikh Akbar seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. (Proposal is attached.)
2.1. The committee was informed that Subcommittee A reviewed the Nuclear Engineering Minor and sent it back to the program for revision. The needed changes were made and the subcommittee is now recommending that it be approved.
2.2. The question was asked as to whether there was a specific format that the minors need to be in. The response was no, but that most programs were using the format developed by Arts & Science.
2.3. The comment was made that it would be good if some contact information was included on the form.
2.4. The question was asked as to what students take this minor. The response was that the vast majority are either in engineering or the sciences.
2.5. The question was asked as to whether the form has enough information for our advisors. The response was that there is. If a minor is properly inputted to DARS there are very few issues if a student follows the requirements, but, if not, an exception needs to be authorized and inputted to DARS.
2.6. The question was asked as to why Nuclear did not use the standard format. The response was that the university has not established a standard format and that, in many cases, there is excess information on the form.

2.7. A friendly amendment was made that the proposal be approved contingent upon program and advisor contact information being added to the form. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

3. George Valco informed the committee that the subcommittee has received the Environmental Engineering, Aviation, CIS, and Computational Minors and will soon be meeting and discussing them. The subcommittee has not yet received the Engineering Sciences, Technological Studies, and Humanitarian Engineering Minors. Ann Christy stated that all three of those minors are under EEIC and will be sent to the subcommittee before next month’s meeting.

4. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course request for CSE 3430 be approved. Carl Hartsfield seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The committee was informed that the course would not be taken by CSE or CIS majors as it is an overview of computer systems.

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

5. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for ISE 5220 and 5350 be approved. Carl Hartsfield seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The committee was informed that ISE is adding these courses because of two new faculty. The person teaching 5220 has a joint appointment with ECE, while 5350 fills a gap in operations research.

5.2. The question was asked as to whether any courses were being withdrawn to make room for these new courses. The response was no as the number of faculty in ISE is increasing.

5.3. The question was asked as to what complementarity means. No one knew, but the committee was informed that the instructor has written a book about it and that it deals with energy positions.

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

6. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change requests for ENGR 4902 and 4903 be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The committee was informed that:

6.1.1. 4902 would increase from one credit hour to three, become a 14 week course, and the new course number would be 5901.01, and that the new course number for 4903 would be 5902.01.
6.1.2. The purpose of the changes is to make the interdisciplinary capstone courses a full two semester sequence and to make the courses more readily available to graduate students.

6.1.3. Changing the course numbers for these capstone courses to the 5000 level would not be unprecedented as other programs already have their capstone courses at the 5000 level.

6.2. The question was asked as to whether new syllabi were submitted with the request. The response was yes.

6.3. The question was asked as to what was to stop course numbers from continually changing. The response was that the guidelines for courses was established by the university when we switched to semesters and that it is the responsibility of this committee to oversee courses and their numbers.

6.4. The question was asked as to how a senior level capstone course could also be designed for graduate students. The response was that the idea is for graduate students who do not have an undergraduate degree in engineering to take these two courses and that currently there are some business graduate students taking the courses.

6.5. The comment was made that it is difficult for graduate students to find information about 4000 level courses that might be of interest them and changing the course numbers to the 5000 level will alleviate this.

6.6. The comment was made that this is a dangerous blurring of undergraduate and graduate courses and that it will also be an administrative issue for the programs that do not want to count these courses towards their graduate students’ degrees. The comment was made that if this was true that there is no need for any 5000 level courses. The response was that there is a need for 5000 level courses, but that capstone courses should be at the 4000 level to keep them distinct from graduate courses. If this change is approved it could start a chain reaction across the college with everyone making their course numbers higher.

6.7. George Valco commented that, although it has not been discussed recently, ECE previously decided to keep capstone design undergraduate only.

6.8. The comment was made that if the course number is changed that there is the possibility that the majority of the students in a section may be graduate students. The response was that this was very unlikely as students must apply and be vetted before they are allowed to sign up for one of the interdisciplinary capstone courses. Robert Perry commented that Engineering Physics capstone course only has a few graduate students in it, and it is a 5000 level course.

6.9. The question was asked as to which programs have their capstone course at the 5000 level. The response was CSE and Engineering Physics.

6.10. The comment was made that the level an undergraduate capstone course should be at is a philosophical question.

6.11. The committee was informed that Bob Rhoads informed the subcommittee that not enough graduate students take the interdisciplinary capstone courses to justify a separate section in a higher level course.

6.12. The comment was made that there could be two courses, one undergraduate and one graduate, that would meet at the same time and location, but with the graduate section needing to do extra work.
6.13. The committee was informed that the interdisciplinary capstone courses are very expensive and do not make money. The question was asked that if companies pay to have their program worked on by the students, doesn’t that pay for the courses. The response was no as that money is used for materials.

6.14. The suggestion was made that we keep the courses at the 4000 level and create a graduate version at the 6000 level. The comment was made that if we do that we will just be creating a facade and might as well make a combined 5000 level course. The comment was made the only a limited number of graduate students will be taking these courses and programs do not have to allow their graduate students to count these courses towards their degree.

6.15. The discussion being closed a vote was taken: 10 approved, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change requests for ISE 5502 and MSE 5451 be approved. Carl Hartsfield seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   7.1. The committee was informed that the purpose of the changes was to cross list the two courses as a new faculty member wants to teach both of them.
   7.2. The comment was made that the prerequisite of MSE 2151 should be MSE 2251. The committee secretary stated that he would correct this error.
   7.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that course change requests for MSE 3141, 3151, 3331, 3333, 4181, 4381, 4382, 5431, 5441, 5531, 5532, 5551, 5572, 5605, 5641, and WE 3601, 4001, 4012, 4102, 4112, 4303, and 4612 be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   8.1. The committee was informed that MSE and WE are changing the prerequisites for these courses to fix mistakes that were made when the courses were first proposed under semesters.
   8.2. All members were given an opportunity to review all of the changes.
   8.3. The comment was made that there was a typographical error in the proposed prerequisites for MSE 3333. The committee secretary stated that he would fix the error.
   8.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

9. All members present were given extracts from CSE’s and Physics' Promotion and Tenure rules as they apply to faculty at the regional campuses (attached).
   9.1. The committee was informed that Physics has a long history of faculty at the regional campuses. Some years ago the Physics faculty at the regionals felt disconnected and like a second class citizen. That has changed and the promotion and tenure of faculty at the regional campuses is almost the same as at the Columbus campus with the only real difference being that there is a greater emphasis on teaching at the regional campuses. Consequently, Physics’ P&T policy has been copied by a number of other departments. Physics indirectly controls the hiring of new faculty at the regional
campuses by approving the person they pick. If Physics does not approve their pick, then that person is not hired. The key to having successful faculty at the regional campuses is that from the beginning the department must think of them as being a full member of the department.

9.2. The question was asked as to whether the search committees at the regional campuses are multidisciplinary. The response was yes, due to the limited number of faculty in any one discipline at the regionals.

9.3. The question was asked as to what happens if a person gets tenured at a regional campuses and that campus decides to no longer offer that program. The response was that Physics has never had that happen. The comment was made that the individual would still be tenured to that department. The comment was made that the provost would probably not allow a regional campus to stop offering selected courses and expect the main campus department to take the individual. If the provost did allow it, he would probably require the regional campus to lose the appropriate salary base and give it to the department on main campus.

9.4. The comment was made that a department needs to carefully weigh the pros and cons before deciding on agreeing to have a tenure track position at a regional campus.

10. Dave Tomasko asked all members to be thinking about how their department is using the May term as the university is reviewing the cost and effectiveness of it.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 2:07.
Undergraduate Minor in Nuclear Engineering

The undergraduate minor in Nuclear Engineering requires 2 core courses and 2 additional courses selected from a list of specializations. The courses offered in the Nuclear Engineering minor and prerequisites are listed below.

**Prerequisites**
Math 2173, 2177, 2255 (255), or 2415 (415), and Physics 1251 (133)

**Core**
NUCLREN 4505 Nuclear Science and Engineering (3 credit hours) – AU and SP
NUCLREN 4536 Nuclear Reactor Systems (3 credit hours) - SP

**Options** (select a minimum of 6 credit hours from the following courses)
NUCLREN 4506 Undergraduate Nuclear Engineering Laboratory (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 4701 Introduction to Nuclear Power Engineering (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 5606 Radiation Protection and Shielding (3 credit hours)- AU and SP
NUCLREN 5610 Reactor Safety (3 credit hours)- SP
NUCLREN 5716 Probabilistic Risk Assessment (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 5717 Human Reliability Analysis (3 credit hours)- SP
NUCLREN 5776 Radioactive Waste Management/Nuclear Fuel Cycles (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 5742 Nuclear Radiations and Their Measurements (3 credit hours)- SP
NUCLREN 5735 Nuclear Power Plant Operations (3 credit hours)- SP
NUCLREN 6537 Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics* (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 6708 Reactor Theory* (3 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 6725 Reactor Dynamics* (2 credit hours)- AU
NUCLREN 6726 Reactor Dynamics Laboratory* (2 credit hours)- SP

*With permission of instructor. If NUCLREN 6725 and 6726 are selected and approved, the student needs to take a total of five courses to satisfy the minimum requirement of 12 cr. hr.

**Grades Required**
- Minimum C- for a course to be listed on the minor
- Minimum 2.00 cumulative point-hour ratio in the minor course work
3. Appointments

3.1. Criteria

3.1.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-02.
In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, for regional campus faculty appointments relatively less weight will be placed on the quantity of an applicant’s research compared to main campus appointments and more emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence. The quality of research of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments. The length of probationary period for regional campus faculty is the same as that for Columbus faculty.

3.2. Procedures

3.2.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

The hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since funding for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search, but it should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the Department chair. The search committee for a regional campus position will include at least one member of the CSE Faculty Search Committee. Part of the interview process will be conducted on main campus. The CSE Faculty Search Committee will consider recommendations of the regional campus faculty search committee and make a recommendation to the Department chair.
A regional campus appointment will be made jointly by the Department chair and the dean of the regional campus, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer at the associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure, or an offer of prior service credit, will require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.
No tenure-track appointment to a regional campus faculty position in CSE will be made if it would result in the total number of FTE tenure-track faculty in CSE on all regional campuses exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track faculty in the Department on main campus.

4. Annual Reviews

4.1. Procedures

4.1.3. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

For untenured regional campus faculty, annual reviews (except for the fourth year review and reviews for promotion and tenure) will be conducted by the regional campus, in consultation with the Department chair who will provide feedback on research performance. The fourth year review will be conducted following the procedure described above for faculty on the main campus, except that the dean of the regional campus will provide an evaluation on the candidate’s teaching and service
activities. Reviews for promotion and tenure will be conducted according to criteria and procedures described later in this document.
For tenured regional campus faculty, annual reviews (except for promotion reviews) will be conducted by the regional campus, in consultation with the Department chair who provides feedback on research performance. Reviews for promotion will follow criteria and procedures described later in this document.

6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

6.1. Criteria

6.1.3. Regional Campus Faculty

Background: Faculty Rule 3335-6-07. Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the main campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate education and serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, the relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will typically be greater. While the Department expects regional campus faculty to achieve a record of high-quality scholarship and publications, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In general, regional campus faculty are not expected to have a research output that is as high as that for main campus faculty, but the overall quality of this research is expected to be comparable.

6.4. Regional Campus Faculty

The procedures and documentation for regional campus faculty will conform to those for main campus faculty with the following differences. Regional campus faculty will be evaluated by the faculty and dean on the relevant campus using procedures established on that campus; this review should include peer evaluation of teaching required of main campus faculty. This review will occur first and focus primarily on the candidate’s contributions in teaching and internal service. The dean will forward the evaluation report of the regional campus faculty and his or her recommendation to the Department chair and inform the candidate of his or her recommendation.
Regional Faculty in Physics
Physics Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (excerpts)

Appointments:

2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

Procedures:

2 Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the Chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, Chair, department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A short list of not more than five candidates will be chosen by the committee, in consultation with faculty with appropriate expertise from the Columbus campus. Those candidates will be invited to Ohio to meet faculty and make presentations both at the regional campus and the Columbus campus. The committee will present a rank-ordered list of candidates to the faculty of the Physics department at the Columbus campus, which will then recommend a rank-ordered list of candidates to the deans of the
College of Arts and Sciences and the regional campus. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the Chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Chair and the regional campus dean.

**Annual Review:**

**1 Regional Campus Faculty**

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

**C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus**

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

**Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews:**

**3 Regional Campus Faculty**

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality
undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship, and look for evidence of sustained excellence in those areas. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the Chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.