College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs
Meeting Minutes October 6, 2016

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm by committee chair, John Lenhart
A quorum was present

Voting members present:

AAE  Sandra Metzler
AVN  Seth Young
BME  Derek Hansford
CBE  Jeff Chalmers
CIV  Fabian Tan
CSE  Paul Sivilotti
ECE  George Valco
ENG PHY  Robert Perry
ENV  John Lenhart
FAB  Ann Christy
ISE  Carolyn Sommerich
ME  Sandra Metzler
MSE  Mike Sumption
WELD  Dave Farson
Grad Rep  Sheena Marston
UG Rep  Not present CJ Ha

Non-voting members present:

Advisor  Nikki Strader
COE  Dave Tomasko, Associate Dean
COE  Rosie Quinzon-Bonello, Committee Secretary
EED  Deb Grzybowski
KSA  Jane Murphy

1. Motion to approve meeting minutes from 8 September 2016. Motion seconded. There being no discussion, a vote was taken - Vote taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. (1 vote for both ME and AERO; CIV and FAB not present for the vote);

2. Paul Sivilotti made a motion to approve 7 new course requests. The motion was seconded, and the floor open to discussion.

   2.1. After closer examination of the list it was determined that 4 courses were erroneously entered on the list, and that in fact only three courses should be considered.

   2.1.1. ENV 5140 Air Quality Engineering received concurrence from CBE as long as CBE’s course (5771 – Air Pollution) was still required in the curriculum. ENV assured that CBE’s course remains in the ENV curriculum. There are no additional air pollution related courses, and the faculty member teaching 5140 is a new assistant professor, Andy May, whose expertise is in this area.
2.1.2. ENV 5195 – The title of the course listed on the Excel sheet read incorrectly. The correct title is *Engineering Design for Environmental Health*. Initially the term “Public Health” was included in the title, but Public Health asked that it be changed. This course will also be cross-listed with a course that will also be added to the Public Health program. Both syllabi have to go up through OAA together, and they must be identical. Karen Dannemiller will follow up with this.

2.1.3. MECHENG 5030 *Intermediate Dynamics*. This course is different in kind to an existing 7000 course in MECHENG.

2.1.4. Robert Perry made the comment that there was an almost identical course in Physics.

2.1.5. The committee chair asked if Physics wanted to weigh in on the MECHENG course, and the answer was, “No.”

3. A motion to amended the number of recommended courses from 7 to 3 was made and seconded.

4. The motion was made to approve the new course recommendations for ENV 5140, 5195, and MECHENG 5030. The motion was seconded. With no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

5. Paul Sivilotti moved to approve the Course Change requests recommendations as written. The move was seconded and the floor open to discussion.

5.1. CBE 4760 – Title change to *Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Process and Product Design Principles I* was made in order to better reflect the content of the course.

5.2. CBE 4764 – *Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Process Design and Development* - Dave Tomasko requested that this course be sent back to the department to rewrite the extensive and detailed topics/goals/outcomes in a more manageable format. He also made the comment that the course title will be changed.

5.3. ENV 5217 – *Applied Mathematical Ecology* – The change from a 7000 level to 5000 level course and removal of a lab component was made in order to address the lack of technical electives in the ENVENG program. Restriction to major students or graduate students added.

5.4. ENV 5218 - Title change to *Measurement and Modeling of Climate Change, the Atmospheric Boundary Layer and Ecosystem Fluxes* - The change from a 7000 level to 5000 level course and removal of a lab component was made in order to address the lack of technical electives in the ENVENG program. The restriction to major students or graduate students was added.

5.5. ISE 3210 – Non Linear and Dynamic Optimization – Added MECHENG 2850 to the prerequisite string in order that students are better prepared for the course.

5.6. With no further discussion a vote was taken to approve course change recommendations for CBE 4750, ENVENG 5217, 5218, and ISE 3210. 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

6. Paul Sivilotti moved to approve the course withdrawal of MECHENG 4578. The motion was seconded and discussion open to the floor. Whilst a 0 credit hour course, students were charged for ½ a credit. The Senior Exit interview in MECHENG has an on-line survey, which is a graduation check-out item, and conducts focus groups that accomplish the same things that MECHENG 4578 Senior Exit Interview did in the past. With no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

7. Paul Sivilotti informed the committee of the courses that were approved by the committee secretary, Rosie Quinzon-Bonello – ISE 3600 (added ISE 2040 as a prerequisite), MECHENG 5682.01 (added in the course description that section is restricted to engineering major students), BME
5194.03 (second offering), 2 CBE 5194 courses, ME 5194 (third offering if permanent course not approved in time.)

8. Ann Christy from EED informed the committee about the Ph.D. program in EED. Whilst the document is 114 pages, she gave her reassurance that the actual proposal is 18 pages, and it is not as big as it seems. Much time was spent with UCAT over the summer and the curriculum was built from the ground up, which resulted in an 80 credit hour Ph.D. Program. A pdf of the proposal is available to CCAA members in BuckeyeBox.

8.1. There will be a need to create course titles with ENGR Ed, but in the meantime Group Studies numbers will be used.

9. Jeff Chalmers provided an update on Subcommittee A’s task of reviewing committee membership and voting rights. From his experience there have only been 3 or 4 instances when a vote on this committee has been close, so from a practical point of view, whilst infrequent, it can happen.

10. George Valco made the comment that when he first started, multiple programs could have multiple people, but they had to caucus and submit one vote.

11. Dave Tomasko made the comment that CCAA is the most deliberative committee in the college. The history of membership and voting are probably in the minutes. Committee members need to get a feel from their departments about the politics involved, and then the committee can come up with a proposal. This is something that should not be neglected. These are legitimate political battles.

12. A comment was made summarizing the question: “How many voting members should be on CCAA and what is the criteria by which that individual is empowered to represent a program?” Right now a vote is determined by UG program. EED should have a vote.

13. The comment was made that this committee recommended approval last November (2015), but apparently it was not voted upon by the college.

14. Dave Tomasko commented that during the last college-wide meeting (spring 2016) a quorum was not present.

15. The question was asked if there are other entities that should have a vote.

16. George Valco made the comment that sending one person for two programs puts the smaller program at a disadvantage.

17. Dave Tomasko made the comment that this is the reason why this issue must be addressed and articulated. The idea that independent graduate programs have a say can be considered.

18. George Valco commented that Subcommittee A looked at graduate participation last year, but no changes were made.

19. The comment was made that EED technically does not have a vote in CCAA.

20. Dave Farson provided an update on the BS in CIVENG proposal for curriculum changes. He confirmed despite the changes, credit neutrality of the program will remain, and that there is nothing out of order and that the changes should be put to a vote.

20.1. A motion was made to approve the proposed changes to the BS in CIVENG curriculum. Fabian Tan seconded the motion. With no additional discussion a vote was taken: 12 (CIV and FAB present for the vote) approved, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions.

21. Reference was made to the draft document prepared by CAA, which listed guidelines for the operation of CAA. Subcommittee B was tasked to review these guidelines and recommend how these guidelines may be adapted by CCAA. The timing to do this is right, and establishing a formal process is needed. Discussion of this was tabled until the next meeting.
22. Updates from the Associate Dean - Dave Tomasko informed the committee about the 15th day enrollment numbers. The college has now eclipsed 10K students with a total of 8171 students on the Columbus campus and 481 at KSA. Enrollments of students in underrepresented groups have taken a hit. This is a continuing concern for the recruitment team at the college level. In the past, losses after the first year were made up with students transferring from the regional campuses and transfer students. The new incoming freshman are academically stronger. The university overshot enrollment targets this year, so they had to scale back on transfer students which also affected the underrepresented groups. Historically the college goal for new freshman has been 1600-1650. This year we are at 1728. For the past two years we have been 50 under of what we asked for. With a rolling average we are at 1600-1650 and inching up. This puts pressure on departments, and therefore, admission to major policies, and how students are maneuvering into the major. There is still a distribution problem. Incoming students mainly aim for 3 engineering disciplines: BME, CSE, and ME. The college is trying to develop an admission to major application. An on-line form exists, but we don’t have any manipulation on the backside to share information between departments.

23. The American Society for Engineering Education conference will be hosted in Columbus next year. COE is coordinating this. Department participation is encouraged. A membership drive for ASEE will be created. There are currently 17-18K members nationwide. An estimated 4-5K will attend the conference.

24. The Ohio Department of Higher Education is the oversight body for higher education and transfer articulation guides. Transfer articulation is pretty well coordinated. TAGed courses must receive credit. There have been serious concerns with transfer credit coming in. There are issues with College Credit Plus. The university has to accept this type of transfer credit earned. On the positive side, this is more beneficial for incoming students. We have to be aware of these things, and we need to think about how we are going to adjust to this.

25. Engineering is insulated. ME and CSE have a good number of TAGed course. Out administrative advantage is that we do not have to accept these courses into the engineering curriculum. The university is positioning itself with these matters. We are happy to offer courses, but the courses have to be offered at OSU through academy. This way we can monitor quality rather than sending people out into the field to train teachers. We are moving into a new era with students coming in from all different areas. Changes are being made. For example, Math is permitting students who received AP math scores of 3 to repeat classes. International students are now required to take a math placement test.

26. A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55pm