1. The minutes from the 18 May 2015 meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Members introduced themselves.

3. The chair informed everyone of their subcommittee assignments and stated that new subcommittee chairs would be appointed next semester. The current subcommittee chairs have served in those positions for quite a while and other committee members need to take over those positions.

4. Course requests were reviewed by the committee.
   4.1. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for ISE 5520, Industrial Automation, and WE 4602, Welding Procedure Development, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1.1. The committee was informed that both courses are seven week courses; that for ISE, 5520 will be the first in a number of seven week courses that they are currently designing, and that 5520 has concurrences from WE, MSE, and ME.
   4.1.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
4.2. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change requests for ECE 4900, Capstone Design, ECE 4900H, Design with Honors Thesis Project, ECE 4901, Capstone Design Special, ECE 2104, Electrical and Computer Engineering II for Transfer Students Lecture A, ECE 3027, Electronics Laboratory, and FABE 4999H, Honors Undergraduate Thesis be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.2.1. The committee was informed that ECE 4900, 4900H, 4901, and 3027 are part of ECE’s curriculum change that has been approved by CAA.

4.2.2. George Valco stated that ECE 4900, 4900H, and 4901 will not be offered until autumn 2016. George also informed the committee that ECE 3027 needs to be dropped from the prerequisites for 4900, 4900H, and 4901 as it will not be offered in time, but that it will be added back to the prerequisites later. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

4.2.3. The question was asked as to what the difference was between 4900 and 4901 as their descriptions are almost identical. The response was that 4901 will be one team working with one faculty member on a special project while 4900 will be many teams being supervised by one faculty member.

4.2.4. The committee was informed that ECE 2104 was originally created as a transition course when we switched from quarters to semesters, and that ECE is changing it so that it will help students transition from the old curriculum to the new. It will be withdrawn at a later date.

4.2.5. The question was asked as to whether all of the courses designated as quarter to semester transition courses will be deleted as we were told. The response was that it has not been done as the registrar’s office does not have the ability to sort courses by that designation and they do not want to manually go through all of the courses to find the ones that are marked as transition courses.

4.2.6. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The amended motion passed.

4.3. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course withdrawal requests for ISE 2000, Introduction to ISE, ISE 2193, Individual Studies in Integrated Systems Engineering, ISE 3410, Facilities Planning, ISE 3990.01, Foundations of Production System Engineering, ISE 3990.02, Applications of Design of Experiments in Manufacturing, ISE 3990.03, Engineering Optimization, ISE 6200, Fundamentals of Optimization, and ISE 6890, Graduate Seminar in Integrated Systems Engineering, be approved. Frank Croft seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.3.1. The committee was informed that ISE went through the list of their courses that had not been offered in a while and decided that these courses were no longer needed. In some cases the course was incorporated into other courses while in other cases the course was a quarter to semester bridge course.

4.3.2. The question was asked as to why a unit should bother to withdraw a course. The response was truth-in-advertising. Some units list courses that students want to take, but then find out that the course has not been offered in years and the unit has no plans of offering it.

4.3.3. The committee was informed that a course can be put in limbo rather than be withdrawn. The difference between a course being withdrawn and going into limbo is that if a course is withdrawn that number can never be used again, but if a
course goes into limbo the number remains active. If a course goes into limbo students will not see it and only people who has access to the university’s syllabus tool will be able to view it. When a unit wants to make use of the number it can recalled from limbo. If a unit wants a course to go into limbo they will need to send the number to the committee secretary who will forward it to OAA.

4.3.4. The question was asked as to how long it would take to get a course out of limbo. The response was that this is unknown as it has never been done, but that it should not take very long and should not take as long as it would take to get a new course approved.

4.3.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4.4. The committee was shown a list of courses that had been approved by the committee secretary.

5. George Valco informed the committee that he had no update to report on the Humanitarian Engineering Minor. Ann Christy stated that when the minor was created the proposal stated that a committee would be formed to oversee the minor. That has never happened and she is wondering if the EEIC curriculum committee, that will be created when EEIC becomes a department, could oversee the minor. This suggestion will be included in a cover letter when the minor is sent to the Core Committee.

6. The committee was informed that as of today CAA has only approved our BME and Surveying and Mapping Minor.

7. Dave Farson informed the committee about the proposed changes to CSE’s undergraduate curriculum.

7.1. The subcommittee is in the process of understanding the proposal as CSE would like to go from their current elective system to one where students have the option of choosing a track similar to what CSE had under quarters. There would be no change to the number of required hours.

7.2. Ken Supowit stated that in his opinion that it would be better if CSE kept its current system and had students talk to their faculty advisor as to what set of courses would best suit their interests.

7.3. The question was asked as to whether there is a need for more faculty feedback.

7.4. The question was asked as to whether the CSE faculty voted on the proposal. The response was yes.

8. The committee was presented with a proposed change to the college’s graduation walking policy. (Proposed change is attached and shown in red.)

8.1. The change states that only students who have applied to graduate and who are enrolled in final degree requirements for that semester can participate in the commencement ceremony. The reason for the change is that students who do not meet these requirements want to participate in the commencement ceremony. While graduate services does not allow this there is no written policy forbidding it and students have used that as an excuse to participate. Creating this will give the
advisors the ability to quote this rule and stop students from participating who should not be.

8.2. George Valco make a motion that the proposed change be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.2.1. The comment was made that the section about who cannot walk the sentence “Have a missing grade or transfer credit for any curricular requirement.” is confusing. The suggestion was made that “missing” be added before “transfer”. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
8.2.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The amended motion passed.

9. Suzanne Dantuono updated the committee on changes to the forgiveness rule, the new dash board, and the new online graduation check out system.
9.1. The new forgiveness rule (attached) is very different than the old one. First, the old one was restricted to a student’s first 29 credit hours. Under the new rule there is no credit hour limit and at any rank a student can use the forgiveness rule. Under the old rule a student needs to be below a C- to use forgiveness, but under the new rule any grade can be forgiven. Under the old rule only 15 credit hours could be forgiven, but under the new rule it is three classes. To use the new rule students must petition.
9.2. The comment was made that under the old rule students would deliberately make sure that they got lower than a C- so that they could use forgiveness. Now under the new rule that is not necessary.
9.3. The question was asked as to how many students would deliberately get a low grade. The response was probably around 50 per year throughout the college.
9.4. The comment was made that transfer students will get the most benefit out of the new rule as many of them come to OSU with more than 29 hours of transfer credit.
9.5. If a student uses forgiveness and the course they want to retake is overbooked, advisors will be able to drop them from the course so that students taking the course the first time will have space.
9.6. The question was asked as to how this will impact BS/MS students. Suzanne did not know but stated that she would find out.
9.7. The question was asked as to how this will impact students wanting to go to graduate school – will they take a course over that they got a good grade in with the idea that they may get a better grade. The response was that both grades would show up on their transcript even though only the second one would be used for their OSU GPA. Most graduate programs use all grades and will recalculate a student’s GPA with the grade that was forgiven.
9.8. The question was asked as to when the new policy will go into effect. The response was this autumn.

10. Suzanne Dantuono showed the committee the new retention dash board that Jamie Paulson created.
10.1. The site follows the retention of new first year autumn admitted students. It does not take into account transfer students or students that enroll in Engineering either spring or summer semesters. The data can be broken down a number of ways to include by program.
10.2. If anyone is interested in viewing the data they must ask Jamie for access.

11. Suzanne Dantuono informed the committee that there is a new online graduation check out site that will replace our current paper graduation check out sheet.

12. The committee was shown the proposed summer schedule. It has not been finalized, but it appears that this is the schedule the university will be using summer 2016.

13. The committee were given a handout on the new College Credit Plus policy. (Handout is attached.)
   13.1. The question was asked as whether this came from the state. The response was that it probably did, but Dave Tomasko will need to confirm that.
   13.2. The question was asked as to whether programs have to accept these credits. The response was yes if they are appropriate transfer credits.
   13.3. The question was asked as to whether this will take immediately. The response was that it should be effective this autumn, but Dave Tomasko will need to confirm that.
   13.4. The comment was made that some of our students get credit for their first calculus class and then have trouble with the second calculus course. The comment was made that our advisors are aware of this and encourage students who barely received credit for the first calculus course to take the first calculus course rather than start with the second one.
   13.5. The question was asked as to whether this policy will impact courses offered by the major. The response was that Liberal Arts Courses, Math, Physics, and Chemistry will be impacted the most and that our Introduction to Engineering sequence may be slightly impact

14. The meeting was adjourned at 3:22.
14.2. Graduation “Walking” Policy Revision

Subject: Graduation “Walking” Policy for the College of Engineering, 27 February 2006

- Participation in the Commencement ceremony each semester is limited only to students who have applied to graduate, and who are enrolled in final degree requirements, for that semester. Students may not participate in Commencement ceremonies during any other terms. For example, students who are completing degree requirements during the Summer Term, including May Session, may only participate in the Summer Commencement.

- Effective Spring quarter 2006 students who have applied to graduate but are ineligible can “walk” in the graduation ceremony only if they have met the following:
  1. Have a missing grade or transfer credit for any curricular requirement.
  2. Have a failing or incomplete grade posted the final week of the current term that impacts a curricular requirement.

- Students cannot “walk” if they drop required classes anytime during the term in which they plan to graduate.

- Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services.

Dave Tomasko
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services
Advising Information and Guidelines:
Implementation of the Grade Forgiveness Rule/
Elimination of the Freshman Forgiveness Rule

Effective autumn semester 2015, Ohio State will replace its Freshman Forgiveness Rule (FFR) with a more general Grade Forgiveness Rule. The new rule permits students to petition to repeat up to three courses under an arrangement similar to that provided by the FFR: the grade in the repeated course will replace the grade for the original course in the calculation of the student's cumulative point-hour ratio. As under FFR, a notation of the original grade will remain on the student's transcript. Unlike the FFR, the new rule does not limit repetitions to courses in which the student has earned a grade of “E” or “D,” and it does not limit the repetition to a range of earned hours in which the student must have taken or repeated the course. The actual language of the new rule is immediately below. Following that is a bulleted list of associated policies, including transitional guidelines for students who already have forgiven courses under FFR.

3335-8-27.1 Grade forgiveness rule.

(A) Undergraduate students may petition the authorized representative of the dean or director of their enrollment unit to repeat a course and, after completing the course the second time, have the original course credit and grade excluded from the calculation of the student's cumulative point-hour ratio, but remain on the student's official permanent record. This action will be subject to the following conditions:

(B) Permission to apply this rule must be obtained by the second Friday of the semester or summer term (the second Friday of a session during autumn or spring semesters, or a summer session; or the first Friday of a May session) in which the repeated course is taken.

(C) The same course may be repeated only once under this rule.

(D) This rule may be applied for a maximum of three courses.

(E) The graduate school and graduate professional colleges may formulate appropriate modifications of paragraph (A) of this rule, subject to the approval of the council on academic affairs, and publish the rule in their bulletins.

Policies Related to Grade Forgiveness

- The rule goes into effect for autumn semester 2015.
- Eligibility for repetitions under this rule is limited to three courses, regardless of the number of credit hours of each course.
- Students seeking to invoke the rule should submit a petition to their college offices/enrollment units by the second Friday of the term in which they are repeating the course. College/enrollment unit/campus offices can make reasonable exceptions to the deadline based on particular circumstances.
- Transitional issues for continuing students:
  - Students who would have been eligible to repeat a fourth or fifth course under the FFR can do so for the remainder of the 2015-16 academic year. Extensions beyond that time should be considered only by petition.
  - Students who have already repeated three or more courses under the FFR and would no longer have been eligible to repeat courses under the old rule have exhausted their eligibility under the new rule.
  - A student who has repeated two courses under the FFR remains eligible to repeat one course under the new rule.
- A student who has repeated one course under the old rule remains eligible to repeat two courses under the new rule.
- Students who have never used the FFR have full eligibility under the new rule.
- For AU15, many students have already enrolled in courses they were eligible to repeat under the FFR and remain eligible to repeat under the new rule. We will identify that population of students (with occasion reiterations, to catch later adds) and send them communications asking that they notify their advisors if they do not want to use the rule.

- Students repeating a course in a sequence or a course that is a prerequisite to another course should complete the repetition before advancing to the next course.
- For purposes of this rule, a grade of “EN” will be considered the same as a grade of “E.”
- The repeated course must be taken for a letter grade (not as pass/non-pass).
- Once the student has invoked the rule, the second grade will be used to replace the first, even if the second grade earned is lower. Students who passed the course the first time and fail it the second, will lose credit for the course.
- A student will not be permitted to invoke the rule after
  - earning a grade in the repeated course
  - having already repeated the course once
  - having repeated three courses under the rule (except as noted under “Transitional issues for continuing students,” above)

- A student cannot invoke the rule for courses that have been
  - applied to a degree already awarded by The Ohio State University
  - applied, as transfer credit, to a degree awarded elsewhere

- When appropriate, a student can “repeat” a substitute “equivalent” course under the provisions of the rule—in cases, for example, involving a non-honors version of an honors course, an approximate equivalent to a discontinued course, or a related course more nearly suited to the program to which the student has changed. All such cases will pass through the Office of the University Registrar for processing, and OUR will consult with the Office of Academic Affairs when that seems appropriate (when, for example, credit hours vary), to confirm that the repeated course is at least as substantive as the course it will replace and to ensure reasonable flexibility when a student is changing program. Many “equivalencies have already been established under the FFR.

- Approved forms should be sent to the Academic Records area of the Office of the University Registrar, where they will be held and processed after the 11th week of the term.

- A note should be added to AdvisingConnect to record any approved petition.

- When students invoke the rule and subsequently drop the repeated course, the drop nullifies the arrangement and will not be counted against the limit of three such attempts.

- Students who enter the university with EM credit for a course, elect to repeat that course, and in so doing, perform poorly, are eligible to repeat the course under the general repeatability rule (which keeps both grades in the calculation of the GPA), but will not be eligible to apply the Grade Forgiveness Rule to the repeat: “forgiveness” of the grade does not extend to a third completion of the same course. The same policy applies to students who have repeated a course for which they had already earned transfer credit.
College Credit Plus Expectations

Engineering

Changes
- Academy based on an old model of program for students who have completed all or most of their high school requirements.
- Key change from legislation is that credit should be “dual.” Students receive credit that applies to both high school graduation and college requirements.

Ohio State Academy/College Credit Plus 2015-2016
- Students wishing to participate in College Credit Plus will apply to the Ohio State Academy.
- Students accepted (unconditional or conditional admissions) into the Academy may take courses for which they demonstrate readiness (by placement test, successful completion of prerequisite courses, etc.)
- Students throughout the state may take on-line classes, but enrollment in classes on campus is limited to students living within commuting distance.
- Academy students may register for open seats in classes according to university scheduling priority hierarchy*
- The Academy will use the state default rate of $160/semester credit hour.
- Ohio State will continue its existing “niche partnership” agreements with a narrow set of school districts (For example, 10 schools in central and northwest Ohio are part of a Straight-A funded grant that includes College Credit Plus opportunities).

University Scheduling Priorities
- 1st: University priority (students enrolled in an Ohio State honors program, disabled students, varsity athletes)
- 2nd: Graduating students (with college approval)
- 3rd: Graduate and professional students, seniors (not already covered above)
- 4th: Juniors (not already covered above)
- 5th: Sophomores (not already covered above)
- 6th: Freshmen (not already covered above)
- 7th: College Credit Plus/Academy students

Course-Specific Expectations
Ohio State will use holistic admissions process and advise students who demonstrate preparedness for specific courses. To help advisors advise students
- English: 18 ACT
- History: successful completion of English 1110.01
- Psychology:
  - 3 English Units
  - 3 Math Units – Successful Completion of Algebra 2
  - Science Unit – Successful Completion of Biology

Engineering 1181
University Pre-Req or concur: Math 1150 or above.