College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs

Meeting Minutes February 20, 2018

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

Non-voting members:
Advisor       Nikki Strader
KSA           Jane Murphy for Maria Conroy
UESS          Dave Tomasko, Associate Dean
UESS          Rosie Quinzon-Bonello, Committee Secretary
1. Approval of minutes from January 23, 2018
2. Course Change/Proposal Subcommittee – Paul Sivilotti
3. Subcommittee A – Mike Sumption
   Update on ME Graduate Specialization in Automotive Systems and Mobility.
4. Subcommittee B – Mark Ruegsegger
   Update ME proposal for a Graduate Certificate Program in Mechanical Design and Simulation
5. Academic Affairs – Dave Tomasko

Pending Items
1. Concurrence from ECE and Math for BME 5170
2. NE 6751 – waiting for concurrence (from last year)
3. CBE 4764 – waiting for new title and rewritten objectives (from last year)

Future CCAA Meetings all in Hitchcock 426
Tuesday, March 20  9:30-11 am
Tuesday, April 24  9:30-11 am
Tuesday, May 15*  9:30-11 am

*In addition to wrapping up final business, during this meeting the committee will vote on the recommendations approved by the ASAP Committee regarding department enrollment management plans for the 2019-2020.

Course Proposal Subcommittee Meetings all in Dreese Lab 395N
Tuesday, March 6  9:30-10:30 am
Tuesday, April 17  9:30-10:30 am

March 12-16   Spring Break
Monday, April 23  Last day of semester classes
April 25-30   Finals
Sunday, May 6  Graduation
Thursday, May 10  ASAP meeting
A quorum was present.

1. Meeting called to order at 9:30 by the committee chair, Carolyn Sommerich
   1.1. Robert Perry moved to approve meeting minutes from January 23, 2018.
   1.2. Mike Sumption seconded the motion and the floor was opened for discussion.
   1.3. There was no further discussion and a vote was taken – 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Course Proposal Subcommittee Report – Paul Sivilotti, chair

2. A motion was made to approve CIVENG Computer Graphics for Civil Engineering.
   2.1. The motion was seconded and the floor opened for discussion.
   2.2. Paul Sivilotti informed the committee that CIVENG 2405 was created specifically for CIV engineering students and as an alternative to FABE 3171 Computer Graphics Using AutoCAD. (CIVENG 2405 is part of the CIV curriculum changes approved spring 2017).
   2.3. There was no further discussion and a vote taken - 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

3. A motion was made approve course changes for the following courses:
   - CSE 3461 – Computer Networking & Internet Technologies
   - CSE 3901 – Proj Design, Development & Documentation of Web Applications
   - CSE 3902 – Proj Design, Development & Documentation of Interactive Systems
   - CSE 3903 – Proj Design, Development & Documentation of System Software
   - CSE 5912 – Capstone Design; Game Design & Development
   - ECE 4021 – Integrated Circuits

   3.1. The motion was seconded by Mark Ruegsegger.
   3.2. Paul Sivilotti informed the committee that changes to the CSE courses were due to the new Data Analytics major. Students in this major have an alternate pathway to certain CSE courses, so changes in prerequisites were needed in order to make technical electives accessible to them. There were also minor fixes that needed to be made to the Course Bulletin.
   3.3. For ECE 4021 an exclusion was added.
   3.4. Carolyn Sommerich requested clarification on the change to the prerequisites for CSE courses.
   3.5. Paul Sivilotti confirmed that there are two paths to the same course. One is for CSE majors and one is for Data Analytics majors.
   3.6. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken - 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

4. A motion was made to approve Group Studies ECE 5194.12 Integrated Circuits
   4.1. The motion was seconded by Rebecca Dupaix
   4.2. The committee was informed that this course was a one-time transition course for students who took the old ECE 5021 and who needed the material from the revamped ECE 5021 (approved Oct 2017).
   4.3. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken - 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

5. Committees members were informed of the courses approved by the committee secretary.

6. Jeff Chalmers commented that some FABE students enrolled in ChemE courses for which they were not prepared. The prerequisites permitted them to do so, but the students were not adequately prepared. This is of concern to him.
   6.1. Dave Tomasko suggested that if there are courses like this, faculty need to have a conversation with their respective department curriculum committees. This is not an uncommon issue.
problem can be solved with more frequent communication between the two and soliciting feedback from the students.

6.2. Jeff Chalmers commented that it is easy to go through pre-requisites, and that we need to think more deeply and consider the subtleties in courses.

6.3. Daniel Pradel commented that exams have the same issues. Students from outside of the program can only do ½ of the problems.

6.4. Carolyn Sommerich commented that in ISE, there are classes that rely heavily on linear algebra.
   6.4.1.1. Faculty communicate this and give students a list of things they need to know.
   6.4.1.2. One faculty member gives a quiz at the beginning of the term, so students are reminded that they need to know this stuff.
   6.4.1.3. Dave Phillips asked if the quiz is ungraded.
   6.4.1.4. Carolyn Sommerich responded yes.

Subcommittee A Report – Mike Sumption, chair
7. The committee was informed that there was not much to report. He had forwarded the committee’s comments regarding MechEng’s Graduate Specialization in Automotive Systems and Mobility proposal to Marcello Canova. He is waiting for a response.

Subcommittee B Report – Mark Ruegsegger, chair
8. The committee was informed that there was nothing new to report on the Graduate Certificate Program in Mechanical Design and Simulation.
   8.1. Rebecca Dupaix informed the committee that she spoke with Jeffrey Bons (MAE Graduate Studies Chair). Jeffrey contacted Jamie Shah, but there has been no response.
   8.2. Carolyn Sommerich asked if someone else could own it.
   8.3. Rebecca Dupaix responded that only Jamie Shah could own it.
   8.4. Dave Tomasko commented that he informed Vish Subramanian, the chair of MAE, that if Jamie did not want to address the committee’s concerns, then this committee would drop the proposal.
   8.5. Rebecca Dupaix commented that Jaime wants to address the concerns, but wants someone else to do it.
   8.6. Dave Tomasko commented that he had the impression that he is not interested, and suggested to Rebecca Dupaix that we get permission from Vish to drop it. The committee can always reconsider proposal later if needed.

9. Mark Ruegsegger informed the committee that it is no longer necessary to seek concurrence from ECE and Math for BME 5170, so the course can be removed from the course change request list for discussion. This course will remain as is.

Academic Affairs - Dave Tomasko, chair
10. The committee was updated on the progress of the Task Force for Admit to Major. There have been good discussions, but it will take time.
11. There are no signs yet of the final GE Revision Committee Report, but there have been several meetings of a separate committee that discusses GE implementation issues.
   11.1.1.1. Randy Smith is trying to make sure that he does not put something out there that will have implementation problems; however, it has become apparent that the program implementation is becoming more and more challenging for Engineering. The GE revision is now up to 43 credit hours.
11.2. GE learning outcomes are finally out. This is a huge milestone. Now we can have legitimate conversations on how to address our issues.

11.3. We really need to be creative and think about TE programs in the majors. Do we want to open these programs up? No argument is off the table.

11.4. The Foundations section of the GE program is heavy on liberal arts and humanities, so to make it work for COE, the themes would have to be well over weighted in the math and sciences.

11.5. There is a lack of dedication to the sciences. The Dean mentioned this in the Senate. The response outside of engineering includes comments that technology is included, as students will receive iPads next year.

11.5.1.1. The conversation about technology needs to be elevated beyond the use of iPads. However, we will not be heard by telling people that they need to take more math and science (even though they should). Mention of technology is thin in the outcomes.

11.5.1.2. Jeff Chalmers asked why is there more of an emphasis on Liberal Arts and Humanities. Should not our voice be similar to their voice?

11.5.1.3. Our voices are there. We have the freedom to have these kinds of intellectual discussions, but in Arts and Sciences, this conversation is one of survival.

11.5.1.4. George Valco commented that technology equals computer technology for those in A&S. This is narrow. There is so much more to it than computers.

11.6. Paul Sivilotti asked if the bookend courses could be considered for double counting.

11.7. Dave Tomasko commented that everything is on the table. We need a minimum overlap of 12 credit hours. The freshman seminar went from 1 to 3 credit hours. Let us have the philosophical conversation first and then have the mechanistic conversation - i.e. how to make this work, later. We have more time.

11.8. Mike Sumption commented that if changes are happening to help survival, double counting does not serve anyone and does not help A&S.

11.8.1.1. Dave Tomasko commented that we are not the 80% solution. We are the exception to the rule. We will bring Randy Smith back in, but we need to figure out where we are, first. How can we carve out something to make it work?

11.9. Daniel Pradel commented that the Themes category is vague. We need to insist that we keep it vague.

11.10. Denver Tang commented the learning outcomes are being force-fed.

11.11. The structure is still unknown. This is a conversation for Core.

12. The committee was informed about Guaranteed Pathways, which would allow a student to take two years of coursework at a community college and complete the degree in two years at OSU. It is not so straightforward for engineering, but progress was made with the Higher Education Administration.

12.1. The subjects of Engineering Technology and Engineering were separated. The engineering group mostly already have an established pathway but the Higher Education Administration wants us to articulate 60 credit hours. Graduation after AA degree is not a 2+2 but rather a 2+3. The state legislature wants us to go 2+2, but engineering not such a program.

12.2. We are moving towards a more formal articulation agreement with Columbus State. We need to figure out if KSA needs to be a part of this.
12.3. The comment was made that these schools do not offer engineering courses.
12.4. Daniel Pradel made the comment that a course in Statistical Data is available.

13. The question was asked how transfer students performed.
14. Transfer students graduate at the same rate. Their grades are lower but they still succeed.
15. Transfer admission to major needs to be addressed. We need to discuss perhaps constraining some of the inputs into the college (e.g. from University Exploration, Regionals), but perhaps a focus on external transfers would be more appropriate.
15.1. The committee was asked to discuss quietly this topic with chairs and department curriculum committees. We can do this by discipline. Every program is different, and admissions has allowed us to put this on the table.
15.2. Robert Perry commented that this would relieve enrollment pressure entirely.
15.3. Mike Sumption commented that Dave’s first thought is a better i.e. through Exploration.
15.4. International transfer students are included in this discussion, as well.
15.5. Nikki Strader commented that University Exploration students who were eligible for enrollment in ENGR, but did not meet the early admission deadline, were admitted to University Exploration. This approach would exclude them.
15.6. Dave Tomasko suggested then that it was the committee’s view that transfer admission preference be focused on admitted OSU students.

16. Paul Sivilotti asked if there was a way to reduce University Exploration numbers.
16.1. Dave Tomasko replied that this was difficult. March is when COE rounds out its incoming class, but the university continues to admit students. Under the Workday project (the revision of Fiscal, HR, and SIS) SIS student matters will be addressed at the end.
16.1.1. George Valco commented that the SIS 5000 level career courses may go away and departments would be required to decide whether a course is graduate or undergrad.
16.1.1.2. Dave Tomasko commented that departments have not been asked for a lot of input other than asking if the system can use this or that. When we get to the SIS portion of the project, we will need volunteers.

17. The committee was informed of the Summer Enrollment push.
17.1. Robert Perry commented that his department could not afford to offer higher-level courses during the summer. Lecturers teach the lower level courses. Faculty do not teach these courses in the summer.
17.2. CSE courses are taught by lecturers and adjuncts during the summer.
17.3. MechEng teaches Statics, Dynamics, Strengths.
17.4. Carolyn Sommerich commented that MechEng would not be offering 2040 this summer, which was affecting at least one ISE student who had planned to take it, since it has been offered in prior summers.
17.5. EED teaches the second writing course.
17.6. COE is not actively promoting this. It does not fit our model, but it is rather a marketing effort for utilizing space.
17.7. There is no recognition of faculty 9-month appointments. If the university wants to incentivize summer, this needs to be recognized.
17.8. What is the return for the college?

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55.