College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs

Meeting Minutes March 20, 2018

Voting members:
AAE/ME not present 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 not present Robert Perry
FABE Ann Christy
ISE Carolyn Sommerich (chair)
MSE not present Mike Sumption
WELD not present Dave Phillips
Grad Rep 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
CCAA AGENDA
March 20, 2018
426 Hitchcock Hall
9:30-11:00am

1. Approval of minutes from February 20, 2018
2. Course Change/Proposal Subcommittee – Paul Sivilotti
3. Subcommittee A – Mike Sumption
4. Subcommittee B – Mark Ruegsegger
5. Academic Affairs – Dave Tomasko
   • COAM Annual Meeting – Rosie Quinzon-Bonello

Pending Items
1. NE 6751 – waiting for concurrence (from last year)
2. CBE 4764 – waiting for new title and rewritten objectives (from last year)

Future CCAA Meetings all in Hitchcock 426
Tuesday, April 24  9:30-11 am – We need to elect a new committee chair on this date.
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, April 17  9:30-10:30 am

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. Carolyn Sommerich made a motion to approve meeting minutes from February 20, 2018
   1.1. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion and the floor was opened for discussion.
   1.2. There was no further discussion and a vote was taken – 8 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**Course Proposal Subcommittee Report – Paul Sivilotti**

2. Paul Sivilotti moved to recommend for approval the following new course proposals -
   - Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering 5210 *Petroleum Reservoir Engineering*, and
   - Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering 5260 *Petroleum Project Evaluation*

2.1. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion and the floor was opened for discussion.

2.2. The committee was informed that both courses were developed for the new Petroleum Engineering minor. There was some question regarding the prerequisites, but they have been resolved. Concurrence from FCOB was received for CBE 5260.

2.3. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken - 8 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

3. Paul Sivilotti moved to recommend for approval the following new course proposals
   - Civil Engineering 4996 Internship in Civil Engineering I
   - Civil Engineering 4997 Internship in Civil Engineering II

3.1. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion, and the floor was opened for discussion.

3.2. These courses were initially reviewed by the Course Proposal Subcommittee in February, but were sent back to CIV with questions regarding the syllabus and the vetting of companies. A response was not received in time for the subcommittee meeting on March 6th, but edits were submitted shortly thereafter. Rather than delaying the review another month, Paul Sivilotti decided it was worthwhile to bring the courses before the full committee for discussion.

3.3. It was noted that there were last minute corrections to the credit hours required. Internship I is one credit hour and Internship II is two credit hours (rather than one). Both are internship experiences, and there is no difference in the deliverables.

3.3.1. The question arose why the difference in credit hours if the deliverables are the same.

3.3.1.2. There was also confusion about the repeatability of CIV Internship I three times and the repeatability of Internship II two times.

3.3.1.3. The reason for offering Internship I as a part-time / full time option for autumn and spring and offering Internship II as a full time option during summer was unclear.

3.3.1.4. Nikki Strader commented that with ENGR 4191 students were enrolled in 0 credit hours but paid for ½ a credit. This was common practice during the Autumn/Spring semesters for financial aid and other practical reasons, but it was less common during the summer because students on internships were not enrolled in classes.

3.4. Ann Christy entered the meeting at 9:45.

3.5. Dave Tomasko assumed that departments would still operate through ECS.

3.6. Paul Sivilotti asked Daniel Pradel (CIV) how companies would be vetted.

3.6.1. Daniel Pradel responded that there is a close connection between these companies and the faculty. Students are also finding internships without the help of ECS. They are mostly local, but some are located outside of the state.

3.6.1.2. Dave Tomasko informed that departments could not be running shadow internships. There are legalities involving equal opportunity law issues. We also need
evaluations from both from employers and students. If students are finding their own internship, that is something different. When academic credit is involved, we have to adhere to state authorization agreements. Through ECS, we have built in checks for employer and student.

3.7. Jane Murphy asked how we could assess the internship and tasks that students perform. What if students were asked to sweep floors?

3.7.1.1. Daniel Pradel commented that students needed to show reporting requirements. If the company is not deemed to the level required by the department, then the students will not receive the credit. The company would send a description of the work completed, and the student will complete a written assignment at the end of the course.

3.7.1.2. Dave Tomasko informed Daniel Pradel that he would set up a meeting with ECS and CIV to clarify these issues and to decide how best to collaborate and determine what was best for the student experience.

3.7.1.3. Daniel Pradel agreed.

3.8. Soroush Zamanian commented that ECS support is not strong for graduate students.

3.8.1.1. Dave Tomasko responded that the college is working to address this problem, which is historical.

3.9. Dave Tomasko commented that the college wants to protect faculty and not force a particular method on students. When we do things that are formally in our programs, we have to do everything by the book. International students have additional trouble because of immigration issues.

3.10. Jeff Chalmers commented that we need to be careful who we recommend and referred to Title IX training. Should we understand rules so we can function better?

3.11. Daniel Pradel commented that preferential access could not be used. Faculty cannot recommend a student to a company.

3.12. Mark Ruegsegger asked if students enrolled in a 4999 can be paid at the same time for their work.

3.13. George Valco commented that if students are working on a project for course credit and for pay, they should be spending more time on the project than if they were only doing it for course credit.

3.14. Dave Tomasko commented that different faculty would have different opinions on that, but there are no hard and fast rules that dictate a particular approach.

3.15. Deb Grzybowski commented that students should just go through ECS.

3.16. Paul Sivilotti commented that it was not right that students have to pay for a two credit hours ($956.00 – for instate and over $2,500 for Non-Residents including other education fees) for a course in order to participate in a paid internship when there was not much input (faculty time) from OSU.

3.17. The comment was made that if ECS charges ½ a credit ($277 in state - $675 non-resident) only, what was the benefit for the student.

3.18. Daniel Pradel responded that students would be applying their knowledge, and it would be a great experience and opportunity.

3.19. Jane Murphy commented that it would go on their CV.
3.20. Deb Grzybowski questioned if students had to self-report for a course where credit is involved would they voluntarily disclose that they swept the floor.
3.21. Since there were more questions, it was suggested that more information was needed from the instructor.
3.22. A motion to table discussion on these two courses until more information was received was made and seconded.
3.23. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken – 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.
4. Paul Sivilotti moved to recommend approval of new course ISE 5230 *Decomposition Techniques in Mathematical Programming*
   4.1. The motion seconded by Mark Ruegsegger, and the floor opened for discussion.
   4.2. Carolyn Sommerich informed the committee that a faculty member who also has an appointment in ECE would teach the course. There is no other course like this, and it is filling a gap. This course would be a good technical elective opportunity.
   4.3. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken - 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.
5. Paul Sivilotti motioned to recommend approval of course changes to Civil Engineering 4001 *Civil Engineering Capstone I* and Civil Engineering 4002 *Civil Engineering Capstone II*
   5.1. Daniel Pradel seconded the motion, and the floor opened for discussion.
   5.2. Paul Sivilotti informed the committee that the changes align with the proposed changes approved by CAA in spring 2017, which involved adding lab components. He also informed the committee that a plan is in place to accommodate transition students.
   5.3. There were no additional comments or questions, and a vote was taken - 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained
6. Paul Sivilotti moved to recommend approval of the following course changes:
   - Computer Science and Engineering 5911 *Capstone Design: Software Applications*
   - Computer Science and Engineering 5913 *Capstone Design: Computer Animation*
   - Computer Science and Engineering 5914 *Capstone Design: Knowledge-Based Systems*
   - Computer Science and Engineering 5915 *Capstone Design: Information Systems*
6.1. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion, and the floor opened for discussion.
6.2. Changes were straightforward and involved prerequisites chain changes to accommodate a new philosophy course that is part of the degree requirement.
6.3. There was no further discussion, and a vote taken - 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.
7. Paul Sivilotti motioned to approve the first offerings of the following Group Studies courses
   - Aviation 5194 *Aviation Applied Dispatching* – Part of a certificate program that has an age requirement. No concurrences needed.
   - Biomedical Engineering 5194 *Medical Design with International Teams*. A syllabus revision was requested to provide a more detailed schedule of the 3-credit hour, 2 ½-week course. OSU students went to China last year and this year students from China will attend OSU. OSU students will be able to enroll in this course as well and receive credit. There is extensive field experience and multicultural / social events.
   - Electrical and Computer Engineering 6194.08 *Power Devices*
7.1. With no additional comments or questions a vote was taken - 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained
Subcommittee A Report – Mike Sumption
8. There was nothing to report, as the chair was not present.

Subcommittee B Report – Mark Ruegsegger
9. Mark Ruegsegger informed the committee that Tony Luscher was ready to present the MAE Grad Certificate Program in Mechanical Design and Simulation proposal, but the subcommittee was not aware of this intention, so they did not have the opportunity to read it. The proposal will be presented during the April 24 meeting.

Academic Affairs – Dave Tomasko
10. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that the ABET 30-Day Responses were due on Monday, March 26th. He was hopeful that most concerns would be eliminated, and weaknesses “bumped up” to concerns.
11. The General Education Review continues to be “interesting”. The Core Committee will meet to discuss creating an ENGR version of the GE program to fit the proposed model. We are facing challenges, but keep in mind that ultimately CCAA is responsible for certifying degrees, which means in a purely power sense, COE can create a GE program structure that is necessary and that work for our programs. We can refuse but no one really wants that. The university cannot go to the state with the idea of raising hours for engineering.
11.1. Jane Murphy informed the committee that KSA went through the numbers and noted that students truly do not have free electives. This proposed GE program would affect students’ ability to graduate in 4 years.
11.2. Dave Tomasko confirmed that many of the other engineering programs are in the same situation. It feels as if COE has been written out of the GE proposal. Is there a possible framework that does not hurt a student’s time-to-degree within this proposed model? Can we find a way to put our interpretation on that model? We now have Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that we can work with.
11.3. The rollout is not expected until 2020. Randy Smith wants to do it right rather than fast.
12. Small grants were going out to encourage Digital Learning Exchanges, which were created to address the high cost of textbooks. An email was forwarded to the committee with a spreadsheet from Barnes and Nobles with electronic access codes.
12.1. The committee was charged to talk with faculty who are using these exchanges and to find out how they decided to use this service and why.
12.2. The use of electronic access codes closes out the used book market.
12.3. Department curriculum committees may need to discuss if they want to start making policies regarding the use of textbooks and to consider the values of the electronic access option.
12.4. Paul Sivilotti asked about COE’s support for this initiative.
12.5. Dave Tomasko responded that he did not really know, as the UG Student Government initiated the discussion.
12.6. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello referred to the handout of highlights from the annual COAM (Committee for Academic Misconduct) meeting.
   - Plagiarism remains to be one of the top violations.
   - The workload of COAM has increased.
   - Violations using social media have increased.
   - There are more high ability students brought up for hearings.
The difference between collaboration and using one’s own work remains to be misunderstood by students. Instructors needed to do a better job of explaining the difference.

The meeting was adjourned at 11 am.