College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs
Meeting Minutes 12 November 2015

Attendance:
Aero – James Gregory
AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
BME – Mark Ruegsegger - Chair
CHE – Not present (Jeff Chalmers)
CIV – Not present (Frank Croft)
CSE – Not present (Ken Supowit)
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Robert Perry
ENV – John Lenhart
FAB – Ann Christy
ISE – Carolyn Sommerich (ASAP Rep)
MSE – Sheikh Akbar
ME – Not present (Rob Siston)
WLD – Dave Farson
Graduate Student – Joey McEnery & Anas Abumunshar
Undergraduate Student – Kareem Rasul & Stiphany Tieu

Non Voting:
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education – Dave Tomasko
KSA – Jane Murphy
Committee Secretary – Ed McCaul
Advisor – Nikki Strader

Guests – None

1. The minutes from the 1 October 2015 meeting were approved as written.

2. George Valco gave a report from Subcommittee A.
   2.1. The committee was informed that the Humanitarian Minor is with EED. Subcommittee A contacted EED about the minor and has given them some suggestions on changes to the administration and oversight of the minor, including the composition and chair of the oversight committee. One question that needs to be answered is who will have oversight of the minor – EED or Dave Tomasko’s office. It is not up to Subcommittee A to make these decisions on the minor, rather a final version should be given to the subcommittee for its review. The comment was made that the minor may not be ready for review until spring semester.

2.2. The committee was informed that:
   2.2.1. the Aviation Minor has been sent back to CAA after its list of technical elective courses was changed;
   2.2.2. CAA sent the Nuclear Minor back and Nuclear’s faculty are reviewing it to determine if it will still be viable without graduate courses being part of it;
   2.2.3. CAA sent the Computational Science Minor back. It appears that the issues with the minor have been resolved and that it should be given to Subcommittee A soon.
2.3. George Valco made a motion that the sentence "One member shall also be elected from the Department of Engineering Education." be added to Appendix A, Section 1.1 of the college’s Pattern of Administration which describes CCAA membership. Sheikh Akbar seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

2.3.1. The committee was given a handout outlining the rationale behind Subcommittee A’s recommendation. (Handout is attached.) The subcommittee had considered a more general wording, but decided to keep it limited to EED as they would be the only department without a representative. Other programs that offer graduate degrees and do not offer an undergraduate degree were considered for membership, but all of them are in departments which have membership in CCAA or are programs that are cross disciplinary with units outside of the college. In addition, the subcommittee did not want to increase the size of the committee where it would become unwieldy.

2.3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed. The proposed change will be sent to Rudy Buchheit so that it can be voted on at the next faculty meeting.

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

3.1. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion the new course requests ECE 2021, 2027, 2061, 2067 and 5227 and that the course change requests for ECE 2020, 2060, 2560, 3010, 3020, 3027, 3030, 3040, 3050, and 3561 be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.1.1. The committee was informed that 2021, 2027, 2061, and 2067 are designed for transfer students that have credit for part of an ECE course, but not the entire course. For 2560, 3010, 3020, 3027, 3030, 3040, 3050, and 3561 ECE is adding some of the new courses to their prerequisites. 5227 is a new course that is well within ECE’s area of interest. For 2020 and 2060 recitations are being added to them.

3.1.2. The comment was made that ECE was waiting until their curriculum changes were approved before they submitted the associated course requests.

3.1.3. The question was asked as to how many transfer students would need these new transfer courses each year. The response was about 10 per year.

3.1.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.2. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for ENGR 5901.02H, 5902.02H, and 7240 be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.2.1. The committee was informed that 5901.02H and 5902.02H will be the capstone courses for students in the Integrated Business and Engineering (IBE) Program while 7240 will be one of the courses EED will be using in their Engineering Education Graduate Program.

3.2.2. The question was asked as to what the retention rate was for the IBE Program. The response was that the first group of students started with 32, but are down to 23. The second group of students started with 36 and is down to 28 or 29. Most of the students leaving the program have been from business.
3.2.3. The question was asked as to whether there will be a new course designation for EED. The response was that this is being worked on in EED and the Core Committee. We will be able to do this administratively without it going to CAA. However, the proposed changes will be presented to CCAA.

3.2.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.3. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the new course requests for ISE 5521, MSE 6756.71, and MSE 6756.72 be approved. Sheikh Akbar seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.3.1. The committee was informed that:
   3.3.1.1. ISE 5521 is a seven week course and has concurrence from MSE and ME. ISE will be creating other seven week courses in the future;
   3.3.1.2. MSE 6756.71 and MSE 6756.72 are both seven week, one hour, graduate courses designed for graduate students in MSE.

3.3.2. The question was asked as to why MSE was using decimals for their new courses. The response was that this would allow them to create a series of courses in similar topics and that other departments have done the same thing.

3.3.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.4. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course change requests for CSE 2231, ENGR 5797.14, and ME 2850 be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.4.1. The committee was informed that
   3.4.1.1. CSE is adding Marion campus to 2231;
   3.4.1.2. The changes to ENGR 5797.14 include changing the time of the trip from spring break to May and reducing the prerequisites so that younger students will be able to take the course;
   3.4.1.3. ME is adding Math 2174 as a prerequisite to ME 2850.

3.4.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.5. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion that the course withdrawal requests for ME 8000, 8043, and 8100 be approved. Dave Farson seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.5.1. The committee was informed that there has been no interest in any of these courses and that is why ME wants to withdrawal them

3.5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.6. The committee was informed that that the committee secretary had approved ECE 3090 as the changes to its prerequisites were making it easier for students to take the course.

4. Dave Farson presented a report from Subcommittee B.

4.1. Subcommittee B has received two proposed changes to the MGEL curriculum. One deals with a new track in ECE while the other deals with using ENGR 7100 in lieu of a group studies course. These changes have been approved by the Graduate Chairs
Committee and the creation of the new track follows the procedure set out in the original proposal.

4.1.1. The question was asked as to why these two proposals have been brought before the committee. The response was that Bob Mick wants to get the changes approved by the Graduate School.

4.1.2. The comment was made that these proposals do not need to be approved by the Graduate School. The comment was made that Bob Mick is still learning the system and wants to make sure that everything is done right.

4.1.3. The question was asked as to whether there are specific course numbers that have been reserved for this program. The response was no. The question was asked as to whether Bob Mick has discussed this with EED. The response was no.

4.1.4. It was decided that the addition of the new track did not need CCAA's approval as its creation followed the procedure set out in the original proposal and that the chair will let Bob Mick know that such changes do not need to come to CCAA.

4.2. Dave Farson made a motion that the proposed course conversion from a group studies course to 7100, contingent on CCAA receiving appropriate syllabi and approving the actual course be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.2.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on various academic issues.

5.1. Making EEIC the Department of Engineering Education (EED) has been approved by the Board of Trustees.

5.2. Michelle Brown will be taking over the dual enrollment program in which a student can be in high school and at the same time be taking courses at OSU.

5.3. The Core Committee has been working on what its new mission will be with the creation of EED to include which group will have responsibility for which courses. The current thinking is that EED will have responsibility for the first year courses as well as those courses with technical content while the Core Committee will oversee all of the other undergraduate ENGR courses. In addition, we may need to create a new course designation of ENGREDU which will include all of the graduate courses that will be used for the graduate Engineering Education program.

5.4. The proposed summer schedule which has 4, 6, 8, and 12 week sessions has been endorsed by a number of committees and has gone to the faculty senate for their approval. There are still a number of issues that need to be worked out such as faculty work load. Currently the faculty’s work load begins on the first day of classes in the autumn and goes until the end of May. There has not been any thought of changing faculty and TA contacts for this year. Funding of summer international travel is another issue that needs to be resolved. One idea is to discount tuition in the summer. The proposed summer schedule does have two days between spring graduation and the start of summer classes, with summer classes beginning on a Wednesday.

5.5. Everyone was asked as to whether or not they will be offering courses during the new summer schedule.
5.5.1. The comment was made that many of our study abroad courses will be offered in May.
5.5.2. The comment was made that CSE has previously offered and is planning on offering some courses during the summer.
5.5.3. The comment was made that KSA has previously offered and is planning on offering some courses during the summer.
5.5.4. The comment was made that Welding has offered lab courses in the summer.
5.5.5. Everyone was asked to let Dave Tomasko know on whether or not their department plans on offering any courses during summer.

5.6. Everyone needs to make sure that anyone giving a final exam on the last two days, Wednesday and Thursday, of finals this semester knows that they will have very little time to submit grades for graduating seniors as grades are due at 5:00 PM on that Friday.

5.7. The university president has been invigorating the university’s teaching institute. The institute’s four key areas of interest are: faculty support, scholarship, policy development, and communications. This will be a university level institute, but, currently, they have no staff, money, or space.

5.8. Everyone was reminded that they need to get their department’s low enrollment policy, or a statement that the department does not have one, to Dave.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15.
From Appendix A of the College of Engineering Pattern of Administration

Recommendation from Subcommittee A

1.1 Faculty Membership: One member shall be elected from each undergraduate degree-granting program, including the Department of Food, Agricultural and Biological Engineering, Center for Aviation Studies and the Engineering Physics Program; but excluding the Austin E. Knowlton School of Architecture. One member shall also be elected from the Department of Engineering Education. Each College Center offering an approved undergraduate degree program will be permitted to elect a member. The term of membership shall be three years, such terms beginning at the start of autumn semester.

Rationale:
- Paragraph 1.7 of the CoE POA describes the Responsibility of Academic Policy that resides with CCAA, which includes recommendations on courses and curricula offered by the college and divisions thereof. EED’s impact on all undergraduates through the courses it will offer argues for EED having a voting representative on CCAA.
- Paragraph 1.6 of the CoE POA describes the Powers Delegated to CCAA, which includes approval or disapproval of new courses, and proposals for changes to courses and curricula. EED’s offering of courses used in all undergraduate curricula in the college argues for EED having a voting representative on CCAA.

Subcommittee A considered implementing more general wording, such as “One member shall also be elected from each department in the college that does not offer and undergraduate degree program.” But the subcommittee elected to not recommend that at the present time, since EED is currently unique in that regard. The subcommittee felt that such a broadening would be best addressed at such time that another such department were created, when the nature of the department were know.

Subcommittee A considered expanding membership to graduate degree programs that do not have a similarly named undergraduate degree program, but elected to not include such a recommendation at this time.
- Those programs are either offered from departments that already have membership on CCAA, or are interdisciplinary across colleges (e.g. CoE and Fisher College of Business).
- Subcommittee A is not aware of issues for which those programs felt they were inadequately represented on CCAA through existing departmental representatives.
- Subcommittee A was concerned about making the CCAA membership so large that operation of the committee became unwieldy.