1. Approval of minutes from October 25

2. Course Change/Proposal Subcommittee – Paul Sivilotti

3. Subcommittee A – Mike Sumption
   Update on MECHENG Specialization?

4. Subcommittee B – Mark Ruegsegger

5. Change to CSE Curriculum

6. Academic Affairs – tabled until December meeting

Upcoming presentations
- BS/MS Update and review – December 13 (LaTonia Steiner Jones and Jamie Paulson)

Waiting for Godot (from last year)
- NE 6751 – waiting for concurrence
- CBE 4764 – waiting for new title and rewritten objectives

Future meetings
- November 15  9-10:30  Hitchcock 426
- December 13  9-10:30  Hitchcock 426
- Course Proposal Subcommittee – December 7 2:00-3:00pm Location TBD – This is Reading Day
Meeting called to order at 9:05am by the committee chair, Carolyn Sommerich
A quorum was present.

Voting members:
AAE/ME  Rebecca Dupaix
AVN       Seth Young
BME       Mark Ruegsegger
CBE       Jeff Chalmers
CIV/ENVR  Daniel Pradel
CSE       Paul Sivilotti
ECE       George Valco
EED       not present Deb Grzybowski
ENG PHY   Robert Perry
FABE      Ann Christy
ISE       Carolyn Sommerich (chair)
MSE       not present Mike Sumption
WELD      Dave Farson
Grad Rep  not present Abduallah, Ramzi
UG Rep    Chelsea Vretenar

Non-voting members:
Advisor         not present Nikki Strader
KSA             Maria Conroy
UESS            not present Dave Tomasko, Associate Dean
UESS            Rosie Quinzon-Bonello, Committee Secretary

Upcoming Events/Updates/Unresolved Business
•  BS/MS Update and review – December 13 (LaTonia Steiner Jones and Jamie Paulson)
Waiting for Godot
•  NE 6751 – waiting on concurrence
•  CBE 4764 – waiting for new title and rewritten objectives
Future meetings
•  December 13  9-10:30  Hitchcock 426
•  Course Proposal Subcommittee Thursday, Dec 7  2pm-3pm Location TBD

1.  The Committee reviewed the previous meeting’s minutes.  Edit requested to item 8.1.  - add the reason why Maria Conroy requested concurrence for ENGR 5797.21 Sustainable and Resilient Tanzanian Communities.  The reason being that KSA had courses and expertise in the area of community planning.
1.1. A motion to approve the October 25 minutes was made and seconded. A vote was taken 11 approved, 0 objections, 0 abstentions.

2. Paul Sivilotti, the chair of the course proposal subcommittee, presented course proposals / changes for review.
   2.1. There were no new courses to review.
   2.2. There were several course change requests. The changes were minor and amounted to correcting typos and updating pre-requisites, as CSE was making it a practice to apply prerequisites due to ABET recommendations.
   2.3. A motion was made to approve the proposed changes for the following courses:
       CSE 5433 Operating Systems Lab
       CSE 5463 Intro to Wireless Networking
       CSE 5472 Information Security Projects
       CSE 5462 Network Programming
   2.4. Robert Perry made the comment that Rosie Quinzon-Bonello, the committee secretary, could handle such minor changes.
   2.5. Paul Sivilotti responded that any course change that could limit student enrollment needed to be reviewed by CCAA.
   2.6. With no further discussion a vote was taken - 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

3. Paul Sivilotti presented FABE 2194 Engineering Service Learning in Ohio and referred the committee to the syllabus provided.
   3.1. Maria Conroy commented that there was a cross-listed higher level FABE/CRP planning course. The proposed group studies course could be a nice segue into the higher-level course.
   3.2. Ann Christy commented that the course was targeted towards students interested in the humanitarian engineering minor.
   3.3. Robert Perry asked if presentations were appropriate for student assessment.
   3.4. Paul Sivilotti responded yes.
   3.5. Seth Young asked about the engineering rigor of the course.
   3.6. Ann Christy made the comment that ABET would not care unless it was a required course.
   3.7. Carolyn Sommerich commented that ABET was interested in contemporary issues.
   3.8. Seth Young commented that internally for us covering contemporary issues was a good thing, but engineering rigor was lacking in this course.
   3.9. Maria Conroy made the comment that the course had more to do with planning.
   3.10. Daniel Pradel commented that there was more sociology in this course and would not approve it as a required course.
   3.11. George Valco commented that it was an elective course.
   3.12. Ann Christy made the comment that the proposed course was a Group Studies course. Changes could be made later. She also suggested that this group could encourage more quantitative aspects of the course.
   3.13. Seth Young commented that the ABET verbiage could be more explicit in the assignments.
   3.14. With no further discussion, a vote was taken – 10 approved, 0 objection, 1 abstention.

4. George Valco asked if BME provided concurrence for the MEMS course.
   4.1. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello responded yes.
5. The committee was informed that Mike Sumption, the chair of subcommittee A, was not able to attend the meeting, but Rosie Quinzon-Bonello informed the committee that he had nothing to report and that he had not received any updates from MAE regarding the proposed Graduate Specialization that his subcommittee reviewed.

6. Mark Ruegsegger asked the committee secretary if the Humanitarian Engineering minor edits had been made.

7. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello replied yes.

8. Paul Sivilotti presented the following curriculum change to the CSE curriculum in response to the recent ABET program audit that stated that the CSE core program did not include programming languages.

8.1. Current curriculum included CSE 3341 *Principles of Programming Languages* and CSE 3321 *Automata and Formal Languages*. These two courses were on a “pick-list” of Computer Science Core Choices, among which CSE 3341 or CSE 3321 were an option. Students could choose one course between the two, and if they took the second course, it would count as a TE elective.

8.2. CSE proposed to make CSE 3341 *Principles of Programming Languages* a required course and 3321 as a technical elective. There would be no increase or decrease in the total number of major credit hours and no change to the core required classes, but there would be a decrease in flexibility. CIS in A&S had already made these changes to their curriculum.

8.3. George Valco observed that timing was important, so that the change could be implemented before the 30-day response, which had yet to be received.

8.4. Carolyn Sommerich read an email sent to her by Neelam Soundarajan that stated feedback was solicited from juniors and seniors. Faculty feedback indicated concern for the reduced flexibility. However, ABET findings and student feedback showed agreement in making CSE 3341 a required course and CSE 3321 a technical elective.

8.5. CSE faculty approved to make CSE 3341 a required course for all future students during the October CSE faculty meeting.

8.6. Mark Ruegsegger asked how many additional sections of CSE 3341 would be needed.

8.7. Paul Sivilotti responded that perhaps one section. The course was already very popular and was offered every semester.

8.8. Carolyn Sommerich, again reading from Neelam’s email to her, that if needed, CSE 3321 sections could be reduced to accommodate the requirement for more sections in CSE 3341.

8.9. Mark Ruegsegger asked if these changes would affect a student’s progress.

8.10. Paul Sivilotti responded that the change would not affect capstone.

8.11. Mark Ruegsegger asked when students normally took this course.

8.12. Paul Sivilotti responded that students took these courses in their junior or senior year, but perhaps more seniors than juniors.

8.13. Robert Perry asked what happened next in the process. Did the request go to CAA?

8.14. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello informed the committee that since the changes in question involved only CSE courses, and that there was no credit hour change, it was not necessary to send the request to CAA, but they would want to be informed of the decision.

8.15. The committee members expressed feelings of disbelief and surprise, and questioned whether certain CAA requests in the past need not have been sent to CAA for review. They could have saved a lot of time.
8.16. Seth Young made the comment that it sounded like students wanted to learn computer languages.
8.17. Paul Sivilotti commented that students coming in as freshman would be required to take this course. Everyone else would be grandfathered in.
8.18. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello made the comment that these students would be grandfathered in by Nikki Strader and the advisors.
8.19. Jeff Chalmers moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded and a vote taken – 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

9. George Valco, who is a member of the Council of Enrollment and Student Progress (of the University Senate), reported back to the committee on the topic of incremental tuition surcharge for students enrolled in more than 18 credit hours. This policy had been in place for several years. Last year UG student representatives in the Senate put forth a motion to start incremental tuition at 20 enrolled credit hours. This motion went to fiscal and the response from fiscal was to propose to do away with it entirely. There was a marked decrease in >18 credit hour enrollment and the budget was so small that it was not worth it.

9.1. George Valco, Russell Marzette (MAE), an engineering UG rep, and an A&S faculty member formed a subcommittee to discuss the matter and offer recommendations/guidelines in the event that the credit hour limit were eliminated. The subcommittee met recently. The University Registrar, Jack Miner, also was in attendance. The subcommittee provided the following recommendations:

- There would be no incremental tuition, but a student would need permission from advisor face-to-face to enroll in more than 18 credit hours.
- There would be guidelines for types of situations that would warrant approval – E.g. taking a course for credit for internship or co-op; taking courses that engage students in research; formally declaring a double major or dual degree, or minor (emphasis on formally, i.e. showing up on SIS). This would encourage students to inform minor departments.
- Other situations would be students enrolled in ROTC, Scholars Programs, or students who needed to enroll >18 in order to graduate on time.

9.2. The subcommittee considered the possibility of incremental tuition for students enrolled in >21 credit hours, but Jack Miner, the Registrar, did not want to do this. It was decided that situations like this would require faculty approval from the department chair, associate dean, or faculty designee.

9.3. It was also recommended that students on Academic Probation (AP) or Special Action Probation (SAP) not be permitted to enroll in >18 credit hours without permission.

9.4. Advisors should also be reminded to exercise caution during the summer terms due to the compressed schedule, where workload was more intense. CCA was also working in recommendations in parallel.

9.5. Mark Ruegsegger asked if pre-professional programs were mentioned.

9.6. George Valco commented that there needed to be a demonstrated capacity to handle the overload.

9.7. Rebecca Dupaix entered at 9:42.

9.8. Jeff Chalmers asked if incremental tuition was introduced as a money making thing.

9.9. Robert Perry made the comment that ENGR students were graduating with too many credit hours.
9.10. Jeff Chalmers did not see the problem in this as long as students wanted to learn.
9.11. Paul Sivilotti asked if historical data and historical trends were examined.
9.12. George Valco responded that the fiscal committee studied that, and the finding was that there was a significant decrease with the incremental tuition. In addition, the caliber of students kept improving.

10. Carolyn Sommerich distributed a draft document that summarized the discussions regarding changing the admit-to-major process.
10.1. Committee members were reminded that if they had specific concerns they should address them here.
10.2. Members were also asked to review the document and provide feedback to Dave by Nov. 22.
10.3. Various committee members voiced concern regarding the holistic review processes: workload inherent in the holistic review process, resources, risk of turning away high-ability students who have a clear idea of what they want to study; loss of program control over the process, and eliminating GPA-determined automatic admission.
10.4. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello made the comment that this document was in answer to the university mission of diversity and inclusion.
10.5. George Valco and Carolyn Sommerich commented that this was not explicitly stated in the document.
10.6. George Valco suggested a hybrid model with an automatic admission for those who meet the GPA requirement set by the program, and a holistic review process for the rest.
10.7. Jeff Chalmers shared his experience with OSU recruitment for his son and felt that there was a truth in advertising issue. Information was vague and unclear. Other schools had direct admission to the major, and we did not. This was problematic for him.
10.8. Robert Perry commented that his department had discussed eliminating Engineering Physics altogether.
10.9. Carolyn Sommerich commented that most incoming students wanted to study ME, BME, CSE, and EE, and that the college needed to do a better job in educating students about the other options.
10.10. Several committee members took issue with the view that employers hired by function and not by discipline.
10.11. Rebecca Dupaix made the comment that Honda would not agree to this. ME was turning away 200 qualified students. If the department received the funds to double enrollment, the problem would be solved.
10.12. The question was asked if COE had an enrollment cap.
10.13. George Valco responded that yes, and this year it was about 1600.
10.14. Seth Young made the comment that Honda would not just hire MEs, but that he could make a case for students who study Aviation to be hired by different engineering environments including Honda.
10.15. Ann Christy commented that the current model had resulted in FABE enjoying a good budgetary time because FABE was often the second choice for those not admitted to ME, CIV, or BME etc. Since their budget model was based on enrollment, they had reaped benefits.
10.16. Chelsea Vretenar, the UG Student Rep, who initially earned a Math degree and was currently pursuing second degree in CIV engineering, shared her UG experience as a Math
major. While pursuing her math degree, certain topics had her questioning if the field of study was suited for her. Nevertheless, she obtained her math degree, and then decided to pursue an engineering degree. She was now very happy but commented that if there was some sort of cut-off while studying Math, she would not have lost so much time.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35.