College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes December 8, 2016

Meeting called to order at 1:35pm 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       not present 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  Alaine Wetli  
UG Rep    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 17 November. Motion seconded. The committee secretary took note of minor typographical errors. With no further discussion a vote was taken to approve the minutes as amended - 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
2. Jeff Chalmers introduced agenda item 4.1. A copy of the revised Faculty Membership proposal was distributed.
   2.1. Regarding multiples votes for departments that have more than one program - Sandra Metzler made the comment that this decision should be discussed every semester rather than at the beginning to autumn term.
   2.2. A comment was made that discussing this more than once a year could be awkward to do every semester.
   2.3. John Lenhart solicited feedback from the committee.
   2.4. Several committee members suggested one time a year.
2.5. Carolyn Sommerich asked the question if there would be a way of changing procedures if necessary, such as a petition. This would make the process more flexible.

2.6. The comment was made that this would be “having it both ways”. A decision needed to be made for one approach or the other.

2.7. Dave Tomasko made that comment that flexibility ran the risk that only those meetings deemed necessary would be attended. Programs needed to have consistent representation and to be consistently engaged. He addressed the 3-year committee membership in section 1.1 of the handout, but was not sure if it was ever enforced. He made a suggestion to the committee secretary that membership expiration dates should be noted, and that this should be done before the first meeting in the fall.

2.8. Jeff Chalmers suggested that the word “election” in section 1.3 be replaced with “appointed”, as he had never recalled an election taking place for membership to this committee.

2.9. It was noted that CCAA had already approved a change to section 1.1 in 2015, but the College did not vote on it the following spring because a quorum was not present. This particular section was inserted in the College POA currently under review and will be voted upon during the College-wide meeting in January 2017. The committee secretary will contact Rudy Buchheit with the recent changes and request that he replace what is currently in the draft POA Notice with the updated version discussed at this meeting. A copy of the approved changes will be attached to the final version of these minutes.

2.10. A motion was made to accept the document as edited. The motion was seconded and a vote taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

3. Jeff Chalmers introduced agenda item 4.2 and provided an update on the EED Ph.D. program proposal. He asked the question, “Where does this committee’s jurisdiction begin and end?” He read section 1.7 in the CCAA rules and stated that EED was a PH.D. program. CCAA dealt primarily with UG matters. Graduate programs were certified by the Graduate School. His main point was that he felt that the primary role of the committee in the review of the EED Program was to identify any issues that would delay the process or create a conflict with other COE departments. Having said that, he did not think it was the role of the committee to address overlapping courses, but more of an issue for EED and the Graduate school to deal with. In his years here he did not know of any programs in the college that would have any conflicts with the proposal. He sent an email of his feedback to subcommittee “A” members, but it was not submitted to the committee as a whole. He requested that the email be attached to the minutes of this meeting when distributed. The committee secretary took note of this.

3.1. George Valco commented that there was history with grad programs and cited MGEL as an example.

3.2. Sandra Metzler made the comment that in MECHENG there had been increased focus on putting together pedagogy in higher education and PHD Students. She cited Rob Siston’s course.

3.3. Jeff Chalmers asked the question – “What comes first, the Ph.D. program or the courses? Do we want to approved program without approving the courses, and then go through each course like we always do?”

3.4. George Valco commented that program changes and course approvals were roughly parallel.
3.5. Ann Christy commented that with regards to proposing new subject abbreviation, she would prefer not to put them into ENGR if they had to do it again when the new subject abbreviation was approved.

3.6. Robert Perry commented that if the program was approved and in the books, the EED courses would be easier to enter.

3.7. Jeff Chalmers commented that it would be better to separate program approvals from courses. If they were submitted together, the program approval and the course approval process may delay the progress of both.

3.8. Dave Tomasko commented that this discussion was good and helpful. There had already been a fair bit of open communication between EDT&L and EED. He addressed the concern about the change of course offering units. When the course offering unit is approved/changed, it will be run by Randy Smith. When he signs off on this, then EED will sit down with Jack Minor and have the changes individually entered. This way EED will be able to develop courses.

3.9. Jeff Chalmers asked “What then is the jurisdiction?”

3.10. Dave Tomasko commented that the Graduate School and CAA needed to approve the program.

4. Jeff Chalmers made the motion to send the EED Ph.D. proposal forward. The motion was seconded and a vote was taken - 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

5. Report from Subcommittee B regarding the evaluation of CAA guidelines and the proposal to adopt similar guidelines was tabled until January’s meeting due to a photocopying error which left out page 2 of the document.

6. Carolyn Sommerich acted as proxy for Paul Sivilotti, the Course Proposal Subcommittee chair. The motion was made to approve FABE 5620 as a new course. The motion was seconded and the floor open to discussion.

7. The committee was informed that the necessary concurrence documents, which were lacking for last month’s meeting had been received. With no further discussion, a vote to approve FABE 5620 was made. The motion was seconded and a vote taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

8. As an FYI the committee was informed that a one-time offering of FABE 2194 (*Solid Works*) was approved for spring 2017. This course was offered in order to accommodate FABE students who were unable to enroll in ENGR 4410.02 due to high demand.

9. Dave Tomasko provided information about the IBE (Integrated Business and Engineering) Honors program annual program review. Copies of the report were distributed. Results show that 20-40% were expected not to persist. 100% retention was never the intent.

9.1. John Lenhart made the comment that program representation was more spread out in cohort 4 than in cohort 1. He asked the question if this was a real trend or a coincidence.

9.2. Dave Tomasko commented that this was more likely a coincidence. He informed the committee about the successful study abroad opportunity when IBE student went to CERN.

10. Dave Tomasko introduced the topic of Academic Affairs. The university had started to draft a new strategic plan, but the College was a bit further ahead. He reminded the committee about the upcoming university accreditation in spring and the ABET review in fall, as well as the ASEE annual conference that would be held in Columbus this year. Ann Christy will be the campus rep for this event. There will also be a membership drive. All committee members were encouraged to bring this information back to their respective departments.

10.1. Nikki Strader asked if there was a membership discount for advisors.
10.2. Dave Tomasko responded that he would look into this.

10.3. Ann Christy responded that ASEE was more of a professional membership than a student/faculty/staff type membership.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.