College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes 3 February 2012

Attendance:
  AVN – Not present (Seth Young)  
  BME – Mark Ruegsegger  
  CHE – Not present (Jeff Chalmers)  
  CEG – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker: Chair  
  CSE – Paul Sivilotti  
  ECE – George Valco  
  ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)  
  FAB – Not present (Gonul Kaletunc)  
  ISE – Carolyn Sommerich  
  MSE –  
    MSE – Not present (John Morral)  
    WLD – Dave Farson  
  MAE –  
    Aero – Jen Ping Chen  
    ME – Blaine Lilly (ASAP Rep)  
  Graduate Student – Kevin Disotell (Not present Sushma Santapuri)  
  Undergraduate Student – Chelsea Setterlin (Not present Dominic Labanowski)  
  Secretary – Ed McCaul  
  KSA – Jane Murphy  
  Guests – Dave Tomasko, Shaun Rowland, Suzanne Dantuono

1. The minutes from the 13 January 2012 meeting were approved as written.

2. Dave Tomasko updated the committee.
   2.1. The ABET draft statement was just received and programs will be starting to 
       prepare their responses.
   2.2. Dave met with Randy Smith and Dan Shapiro concerning math prerequisites for 
       engineering students. The agreement was that engineering students would 
       need a C- or better in the first calculus course to take the second one but that 
       there would not be a grade prerequisite for other math courses. The reason is 
       that we have a very robust program to monitor our student’s progress and that 
       our alumni surveys have shown that our graduates feel that they are more than 
       prepared in math. Once exception to this agreement is Math 2568 as this 
       course is not dominated by engineering students. Students will need a C- or 
       better in the previous course to enroll in Math 2568.
   2.3. Everyone was asked to let their faculty know that if they have issues with Math 
       that they should contact their Core Committee representative as the Core 
       Committee works with Math on issues between Engineering and Math.
   2.4. Jennifer Cowley, Bob Gustafson, and Dave have been tasked by the dean to 
       look at how the college assesses teaching across the college for promotion and 
       tenure. Currently, assessing teaching is highly variable across the college and 
       the dean would like for it to become more uniform. If anyone has any thoughts
or ideas on this topic or if someone wants to get involved in looking at this issue please let Dave know.

2.4.1. The question was asked as to whether the college would support using a paper survey for each class in addition to the university’s electronic version. The response was that all options are on the table.

3. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the proposed new voting rules for CCAA (attached) be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.1. The rationale behind the change was to ensure that every undergraduate program in the college has an independent voice on the committee.

3.2. Currently programs in three different departments share votes.

3.3. If this is approved there will be an increase in the number of representatives required to hold a meeting.

3.4. The graduate programs that are not associated with an undergraduate program (Nuclear and MBLE) were not included in this proposal, even though there is a precedent for them to have a vote, because CCAA has minimal oversight of graduate programs.

3.5. A friendly amendment was made that the last sentence in 6.1 “Approximately one-third of the membership terms shall expire each year.” be taken out as the rule is not followed. The friendly amendment was accepted.

3.6. The question was asked as to whether ex-officio members should be stated. It was decided not to include them as CCAA can invite anyone it wants to attend meetings.

3.7. The question was asked as to why student membership was not included. The response was that student membership is included in a different part of the faculty rules.

3.8. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

4. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that CSE 2232, 3903, ECE 3567.01, and ISE 6999 be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. CSE 2232 is a transition course, CSE 3903 is a conversion course, ECE 3567.01 is a transition course, and ISE 6999 is a new course.

4.2. The Course Proposal Subcommittee discovered that neither Mechanical nor Nuclear have Research for Thesis courses. These are courses both programs may want to create.

4.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

5. Paul Sivilotti and Shaun Rowland updated the committee on issues between the college’s syllabus tool and the university’s course proposal system.

5.1. There are now differences between our tool and the university’s which makes it impossible to electronically transfer data from our system to theirs.
5.2. The long term solution for this problem is that Shaun will develop a system that will allow our system to electronically take data from the university’s.

5.3. Everyone was shown how they can use an application on the college’s tool to help identify differences between information placed in the college’s tool and what was place into the university’s system. The application will show any differences by highlighting in red what is in the university’s system under what is in the college’s tool. The differences can be compared and the unit can change what is in the college’s to match what is in the university’s or submit a course change request to update what is in the university’s system.

5.4. Everyone was warned to be careful updating what is in the college’s tool as some of the differences are just spacing issues. In addition, there is a character set issue between our system and the university’s and, thus, the university’s will show “?” instead of what a program entered.

5.5. The question was asked as to whether any updates will be reflected in the college’s approved version. The response was yes. In addition, a program can create a new version but Shaun will eventually need to know which version is the correct one.

5.6. The question was asked as to who is authorized to make the changes. The response was that only a few people are but that Shaun could change that and make anyone who is a proposer authorized to make changes. It was decided to keep the number of approvers limited with the idea that if a program wants someone added they can request for them to have the authorization.

6. George Valco informed the committee that he had nothing to report on updating the CCAA handbook.

7. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the ISE revised semester proposal be approved. Jen Ping Chen seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. Randy Smith met with some of the ISE faculty and let them know that OAA did not have any issues with ISE submitting a revised semester curriculum proposal.

7.2. The revised proposal will bring ISE curriculum more in line with other programs’ curriculum in the College of Engineering. It is also more balanced and has combined some courses.

7.3. A letter of support was obtained from Bob Gustafson stating that there was no problem with ISE requiring their students to take Engineering 2367.

7.4. The comment was made that Biology 2100 is four credit hours and not three as shown on the bingo sheet. Carolyn stated that this would be corrected.

7.5. Carolyn Sommerich was asked to clarify ISE’s technical elective policy. The response was that students must take a total of six technical electives with three of those being from one package. Four of the six courses must be ISE courses and the other two, if they were not ISE courses, must be approved by the ISE undergraduate committee. The question was asked as to whether ISE would have a problem meeting the number of hours ABET requires in engineering topics. The response was no.
7.6. The question was asked as to how the faculty voted on the proposal. The response was that this is discussed in the cover letter, but that, while it was not unanimous, it was overwhelming approved.

7.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

8. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the Semester College Admission Criteria (attached) be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. This proposal will formalize the rules for OSU students who are not in the college to enter the college.

8.2. The proposal addresses issues that were brought up at a previous meeting such as expanding the list of science courses and making it a requirement for students to have a C- or higher in Math 1151.

8.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 3:28.
Proposed change to voting membership in CCAA

3 February 2012

Rationale

The reason for proposing this change to the structure of the College Committee on Academic Affairs is to ensure that every undergraduate program in the College has an independent voice on the committee. With the merger of several programs, there is a risk that the voice of the smaller programs will be lost. By giving each degree–granting program a vote, this risk is removed.

Proposed Language

6.1 Faculty Membership: One member shall be elected from each undergraduate degree–granting program, including the Department of Food, Agricultural and Biological Engineering and the Engineering Physics Program; but excluding the three undergraduate programs in the Austin E. Knowlton School of Architecture. Each College Center offering an approved undergraduate degree program also will be permitted to elect a member. Approximately one–third of the membership terms shall expire each year.

6.2 Each program represented on the Committee shall have one vote.
Proposal for College Change Criteria for Current OSU Students

Proposed College Change Admission Criteria, effective Summer 2012 and forward:

• OSU CPHR 2.0 or higher, and
• C- or higher in Math 1151, equivalent or higher, and
• Credit for one of the following: Chemistry 1210, Physics 1250, Biology 2100; equivalent or higher.

Current OSU students meeting these criteria are allowed to enroll in the College of Engineering through the Pre-Major program within their desired department, or through the Undeclared program within the College. Admission into a Pre-Major program does not guarantee admission into the corresponding Major program. Students pursuing admission into a Major program must follow the current Application to Major process designated by the corresponding department. Students who have previously been dismissed from the Department, College, or University must follow the established process of Petitioning for Reinstatement.