Approved Minutes - January 15, 2003

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Meeting Minutes Wednesday 15 January 2003

1. Called to order at 10:35 A.M.
2. The Minutes from the 6 December 2002 meeting were approved as written.
3. There was a discussion on how CCAA would deal with a name change from CIS if it were proposed. The chair stated that CCAA should deal with any future name change as it has dealt with EE’s proposed name change, that unless there is an overwhelming reason not to change the name then the burden of explaining why a change should not take place is on the objecting unit. Many times departments must change their names to keep up with how their discipline is perceived and CCAA should not stand in their way.
4. There was a discussion on the draft of the letter that would go to Bob Gustafson, the College Secretary, and how CCAA wanted the college faculty to deal with the issue.
   4.1. Bob wanted to know if CCAA wanted the matter on the winter faculty meeting agenda.
   4.2. It was pointed out that the letter is just a recommendation to the faculty and that a number of different options are open to them.
   4.3. The question was raised as to whether the college faculty need to approve CCAA’s philosophy towards departmental name changes as reflected in paragraph three of the letter. It was decided that their approval of the philosophy was not necessary and that asking it would distract from the major issue of EE’s proposed name change.
5. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that, “CCAA requests that a discussion of Electrical Engineering’s proposed name change be held at the college’s winter faculty meeting and that a paper ballot on the proposal take place subsequent to the winter meeting.” Jerry Chubb seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
6. Mark Ruegsegger reported to the committee on the status of the Biomedical proposal. Several drafts have been made of the proposal and the proposal should be ready to come to CCAA within a year. They are not seeing any roadblocks from either of the two deans.
   6.1. Mark was asked to give a brief summary to the committee, as some of the committee members were not on the committee when the proposal was last brought before CCAA, about the problems with the original proposal. Mark stated that the problem with the original proposal was that not enough thought had been given to the problems posed by having the department in two different colleges. This problem was even greater than what would normally be expected as engineering and medicine have very different ways of viewing the patterns of administration for a department. In addition, a proposal for an undergraduate degree in Biomedical Engineering was piggybacked on the departmental proposal and Dean Williams did not support such a degree.
   6.2. Mark was asked if he thought that would be any problem with the use of the name Biomedical with Biomedical Informatics. Mark replied that he did not think that there would be any problem as the term Biomedical is a fairly generic name.
   6.3. The question was raised as to why Biomedical did not become 100% in either Engineering or Medicine. There are a number of examples of departments being in one college but having a program in
another as well as departments being located in one college but doing a lot of research in another. Doing this would simplify any departmental patterns of administration.

7. The committee secretary informed the committee that a Graduation with Honors in Engineering Proposal has been received and is currently being distributed to the curriculum subcommittee.

8. Jerry Chubb informed the committee that the dean has asked two task forces to look into Aviation and Aero and what should be done with them in the future. Both task forces should have turned their reports in to the dean before the committee’s next meeting. There is the possibility of curriculum issues being raised. The chair requested that Jerry inform the committee on the contents of the reports at the next committee meeting.

9. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Attendance:
AA –
Aero – R. Yedavalli
AVN – J. Chubb
BME – M. Ruegsegger
CHE – J. Chalmers (Chair)
CEGS –
CIV – R. Sykes
EGR – Not present
GSS – Not present
CIS – B. Weide
EE – Not present
ENG PHY – R. Scherrer
FAB – J. Martin
IWSE –
ISE – Not present
WLD – C. Albright
MSE – Not present
ME – Not present
Graduate Student – Not present
Undergraduate Student – Not present
Secretary – E. McCaul

Guests – R. Gustafson, P. Hussen

C: College Faculty
CCAA File

TO: Robert J. Gustafson
Secretary, College of Engineering
FROM: Jeff Chalmers  
Chair, CCAA  

SUBJECT: Academic Unit Name Change  

DATE: 6 December 2002  

In the winter of 2001 CCAA received a request (attached) from the Department of Electrical Engineering to change their name to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. At that time Electrical Engineering was requested to get concurrence from Computer and Information Science for this change. An Ad Hoc Committee was created with faculty from both departments to work on this issue. The Ad Hoc Committee could not come to an agreement and in the spring of 2002 the Electrical Engineering component of the committee issued their own report. Consequently, Computer and Information Science was requested to also provide a report from their component to the committee. Both of these reports are attached.  

On 6 December 2002, CCAA voted to approve by a vote of 8 approved, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention a motion that “CCAA recommends to the faculty of the College of Engineering approval of the Electrical Engineering proposal to change the department name of Electrical Engineering to Electrical and Computer Engineering; that both sides of the issue be presented by representatives from Electrical Engineering and Computer and Information Science at a faculty meeting before it is sent to all faculty for a vote; that CCAA’s recommendation is with the understanding that Electrical Engineering be receptive to a corresponding name change for Computer and Information Science if it is proposed.”  

CCAA felt that this request should be approved based on three major reasons. First, the committee believes that unless there is an overwhelming reason not to change the name of a department then the burden of explaining why a change should not take place is on the objecting unit. The objecting unit must show that damage will take place, not just that they believe damage will take place. Second, that allowing EE to change their name will bring their name in line with the name of their undergraduate degree. Third, by allowing EE to change their name will bring their name in closer alignment to what the department is actually doing.  

If you have any questions on CCAA’s actions please contact me.