College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes November 17, 2016

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

Voting members:

AAE         Sandra Metzler  
AVN         Not present - Seth Young  
BME         Mark Ruegsegger  
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        not present - Dave Farson  
Grad Rep    not present - Sheena Marston / Alaine Wetli  
UG Rep      CJ Ha / Chelsea Vretenar

Non-voting members:

Advisor      Nikki Strader  
COE          Dave Tomasko, Associate Dean  
COE          Rosie Quinzon-Bonello, Committee Secretary  
EED          not present Deb Grzybowski  
KSA          Jane Murphy

1. Motion to approve meeting minutes from 16 October. Motion seconded. There being no discussion,  
a vote was taken - Vote taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

2. Paul Sivilotti made a motion to approve all New Course requests. Motion was seconded and the  
floor was open to discussion

2.1. AEROENG 5194 Group Studies – AEROENG did not have a XX94 at the 5000 level  

2.2. AVN 3600 Business and Corporate Aviation Management would not only be a TE for AVN  
students but also an alternative course for students who are not pursuing a pilots license.

2.3. FABE 5520 Phytotechnology and Phytoremediation – Approval for this course was tabled  
during October’s meeting in order that FABE request concurrence from ENV. This was received,  
and the title of the course was changed after consultation with ENV.

2.4. A motion to approve all new course requests was made and seconded and a vote taken: Vote  
taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions
3. Paul Sivilotti sought feedback regarding course change and XX94 requests that the committee secretary routinely approved. Generally speaking, if a course change request opened options for students, the committee secretary approved them. If course change requests dealt with a change of prerequisites, or requests that would restrict or substantially change the conditions for a student to take a course, these requests would be discussed by the committee. Since XX94s were one-time offerings these requests are generally approved immediately upon receipt and are not brought to CCAA unless the request is to assign a permanent number to the course.

3.1. How strict should the course proposal committee be with concurrences for Group Studies requests? Careful review can cause delays if multiple departments are asked to review. Should we slow down Group Studies requests and have the subcommittee look at every single one? Or should the subcommittee continue with the current model? The suggestion was made to keep with the model recognizing that a concurrence does not automatically approve the request for a permanent number and vice versa.

3.2. The example of MECHENG 6194 Intro to Energy Storage and Conversion was mentioned. This request was received with concurrences from ECE MSE, and CBE. The subcommittee does not want to impede someone from trying something out as long as the subcommittee is careful about concurrences. Seeking concurrence provides the opportunity to discuss the course, and this should be encouraged.

3.3. Mike Sumption was not aware of the MSE concurrence, as it dealt with a graduate course. If the request to make this particular course a permanent course in MECHENG was submitted, concurrence would be up for serious discussion on the MSE side.

3.4. Mark Ruegsegger made the comments that xx94s are usually taught by new faculty who are in the process of developing “their space”. Departments should encourage and shield new faculty wanting to develop new courses.

3.5. Dave Tomasko made the comment that CCAA needs to provide information regarding the process.

3.6. Carolyn Sommerich provided a counterpoint to the xx94 approvals and concurrence discussion using the example of its own request/approval of an ISE xx94, which was developed with the intent of the course eventually becoming a permanent course. All concurrences were obtained, and a lot of time was spent in developing the course. The idea of the possibility of a course not being approved as a permanent course after all the work had already been done is not good. It is better to have things worked out prior, unless it is known that a course is truly a one-time offering.

3.7. Sandra Metzler commented that she went through the same process for a course that she developed in order to make sure there were no future issues. She would be dismayed if down the road the course would be denied. There should be a process.

3.8. The comment was made that perhaps a better idea would be not to make concurrence a requirement in order to make the offering, but just require the start of requesting it.

3.9. Dave Tomasko made the comment that faculty are often notified but do not get to their email in time.

3.10. The comment was made that there should be a norm to receive concurrences in order to avoid delays, such as 3 weeks.

3.11. The comment was made that concurrences do not have veto power. Requests can move forward without them.
4. Dave Tomasko asked George Valco if ECE had made any progress on the creation of a permanent course number for FIRST.
   4.1. George Valco responded that he did not know.
   4.2. Dave Tomasko explained to the committee that FIRST is for those students who want to coach and mentor high school robotics teams.
   4.3. George Valco asked if FIRST should really be an ECE specific course.
   4.4. Dave Tomasko replied that it can be made a College course if desired.
5. Jeff Chalmers reported Subcommittee A’s task on voting issues discussed in the past two CCAA meetings. A proposal was sent out for feedback, and the subcommittee is looking at it; however, on this voting issue, nobody has said anything on voting rights with respect to this committee and how members should have voting rights. Voting procedure has evolved from caucus to one-program-one vote. It is fuzzy. CCAA should just formalize it as a group. The recommendation is to let every UG degree granting entity have a vote and making EED an exception. There is precedence for accepting a non-degree granting program.
   5.1. George Valco made the comment that there are departments with two degree programs. The suggestion was to send one representative
   5.2. Jeff Chalmers suggested that EED should have one vote and be called out specifically that it is a non-degree granting entity. For two programs in one department, there should be a caucus or one-vote-one program – But if a department wants only want one vote, the department must declare as such at the beginning of the year.
   5.3. Mike Sumption suggested the insertion of a clause for flexibility such as “as deemed necessary.”
   5.4. Jeff Chalmers commented that there is precedent for “stuff happening”.
   5.5. George Valco asked how this information would be received.
   5.6. The question was asked “What is a definition of a quorum?”
   5.7. George Valco suggested that perhaps it is in the College POA.
   5.8. Jane Murphy made the comment that it is defined under SAP rules as 50% plus 1.
   5.9. MSE/WE, ME/AAE, CIV/ENV were mentioned as UG degree granting programs that are housed in one department.
   5.10. The suggestion was made that there should be 1 vote per department.
   5.11. The suggestion was made that programs must declare in writing at the beginning of the semester how votes should be counted. That way programs are all protected.
   5.12. Jeff Chalmers made the comment that he does not anticipate any new UG programs.
   5.13. Sandra Metzler suggested every semester rather every year.
   5.14. Dave Tomasko made the comment that the POA quorum only regards faculty voting.
   5.15. Jeff Chalmers stated that the subcommittee will look into this further.
6. Mark Ruegsegger reported on Subcommittee B’s task of reviewing the CAA guidelines template. He is still waiting for feedback and will be ready for December.
7. Dave Tomasko announced to the committee that Ann Christy received a National Teaching Award at the APOU meeting. Many leaders in higher education attended this meeting. The Committee offered its congratulations.
8. Ann Christy commented that the APLU conference was not a typical conference for faculty. Secretary John King Jr. was in attendance and spoke about what Department of Education was going to do. There is a lot of speculation with new administration.
8.1. She attended 3 sessions
- Entrepreneurship Education which included discussion of creating more space for invention/creation, technical literacy, business literacy and applying this to project-based learning.
- Hunger on Campus (A handout will be distributed at a later date). Financial Aid underestimate the cost of living and students go hungry. There is a food bank on campus. Hunger on campus is something we should look further into. The rhetoric hides a much deeper problem.
- Association of College and University Educators (ACUE) talk on a course on effective teaching. This is an on-line program for faculty development which consists of 30 modules. This program is offered in a cohort setting facilitated by a faculty member (e.g. UCAT). Homework is trying these techniques taught in this class. The list of references and literature cited is impressive. What is the incentive piece? Perhaps as a course release /a substitution for a journal article/ annual review/ monetary pieces/ lecturer/ ranks determination/. Go to ACUE. Org for more information.

8.2. Dave Tomasko commented that the committee has to have a better discussion of this. Ann and he will engage the Core Committee to delve into this deeper and find opportunities in which to participate.

9. Dave Tomasko continued by providing an update on academic affairs.
9.1. A lot of activity has been put into Distance Education and anything we offer out of state. We do not have not great impact because we are small players. Bob Mick will be point person regarding distance learning opportunities. Make sure to get in touch with Bob Mick if there are ideas/ proposals to be made. There is a process to follow for distance learning courses offered out-of-state. The Office of Distance Education and eLearning (ODEE), manages compliance with fed law and state authorizations). The point people at the college level regarding DL issues/questions are either Dave Tomasko or Bob Mick. Budget allocation for distance education is still an issue (e.g., regional campuses have different fees). Right now this determination is done through one-on-one negotiations.
9.2. Mike Boehm, the Vice Provost for Academic and Strategic Planning is leaving.
9.3. ATI (whose status is now a regional campus) is looking for new director of ATI. ATI is the only place at OSU that offers an associates degree, but it does not offer courses in engineering technology. This may include COE over time.
9.4. CAA approved a review of the General Education Program. COE needs representation in this endeavor. Mark Ruegsegger and Carolyn Sommerich were names forwarded. This would be a good opportunity for university level involvement.
9.5. Paul Sivilotti asked “What is the scope of the review?”
9.6. Dave Tomasko responded that the GE program will be stripped down and redesigned from scratch – a bottom-up review. The question to be addressed is “What does it mean to do GE.”
9.7. The university accreditation process will take place 19-21 March – A 7-member team for the whole university will conduct the review. COE will get heads up. Programs need to enter as much information into TRAC DAT by the middle of December!! Reports are going out in January. This will include every degree program – UG/G (no minors).
9.8. The state is embarking on an increased emphasis on the 2 plus 2 programs. This will be a challenge for ENG. We need to figure out “how to play ball”. We are not immune to this. Stay
tuned, as this is preliminary information. General trends (from CSCC) indicate that ENG transfer students on average spend 3 years at OSU and graduate at rates as new freshman but with lower GPAs.

9.9. The comment was made that we need to push back. We are setting them up for failure.

9.10. Dave Tomasko responded that this trend is seen in the campus change programs and regional campuses, too. The trends are similar to that of transfer students.

9.11. College credit plus initiative replaced the PSEO option. In 2015 the vast majority who participated were enrolled in these courses at the high school.

9.12. The comment was made that the dean in Arts and Sciences is asking the Physics Department to go in and train teachers to teach Physics 1250.

9.13. Dave Tomasko responded that he did not know where this approach is coming from. Students participating in OSU’s Academy Program not only must apply to participate in Academy, but they also take courses on the OSU campus. This differs from College Credit Plus. Students come to classes on campus. The College of Arts and Sciences is offering select GE courses on-line. This is an interesting challenge for us. If we put courses out there the state law says we cannot offer a course that has a pre-requisite that requires that students have to have graduated from high school. However, the Academy Program requires admission. Students have to have exhausted all the courses at high school. Michelle Brown is the point person on College Credit Plus. We are seeing effects already with students who have taken Chemistry in their junior year and struggle when taking Chemistry at the college level.

9.14. The comment was made that students who take college credit courses during high school are not prepared. This college credit plus will exacerbate the problem.

9.15. Dave Tomasko replied that we need to have more data on the students.

9.16. Coming up is a new online system to verify attendance, which will be implemented during the first week of class. This is for federal reporting purposes.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:53.