COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Meeting Minutes Wednesday 22 October 2003

1. Attendance:
AA -
Aero - Rama Yedavalli
AVN - Jerry Chubb
BME - Doug Kniss
CHE - Jeff Chalmers
CEGS - Robert Sykes
CIS - Bruce Weide
EE - George Valco
ENG PHY - Not present
FAB - Not present
IWSE -
ISE - Shah Irani
WLD - David Dickinson
MSE - R. Wagoner (Chair)
ME - Vish Subramaniam
Graduate Student - Not present
Undergraduate Student - Allison Holub, Ken Wilkins
College of Medicine Liaison - Bob Bornstein
Secretary - E. McCaul
Guests - Joanne DeGroat

2. The Minutes from the 1 October 2003 meeting were approved as written.

3. Bruce Weide presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the Committee.
3.1. The following course requests were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee: EE 719, EE 810, EE 811, EE 835.03, ISE 503, ISE 881, ISE 871, MSE 581.04, MSE 705, and ME 794. A motion was made by Bruce Weide to approve the requests. Jerry Chubb seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
3.2. The request from Mechanical Engineering for a temporary curriculum change was recommended to be approved by the subcommittee. In this request ME wants to eliminate ME 512 as a required course in the curriculum as there is no lab space to teach the course with Robinson gone and the new building not completed. They want to replace the two credit hour ME 512
requirement with two hours of technical electives, making the total technical elective requirement 17 hours. A plan is in place to take care of those students who are close to graduating so that they will not have to take more than 17 hours of technical electives. A motion was made by Bruce Weide to approve the request. Dave Dickinson seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed. 3.3. The request by ME to add recitation sections to their large lower level courses was recommended to be approved by the subcommittee. Courses of interest are 250, 410, 420, 430, 481, 501, 502, 503, and 561. Voluntary recitations led by GTAs are already being used in these courses but there have been scheduling conflicts with some students not being able to attend. Making the recitations part of the course will end the scheduling conflicts but would not increase the hours. No changes to course content, credit hours, or anything else is proposed — just adding the recitation time to the official course meetings to facilitate student scheduling. Approval of this proposal by CCAA would constitute a blanket concurrence from all programs that are affected by the change. Many of the committee members were concerned how adding a mandatory recitation section for courses taken by a large number of students from other departments would impact the courses in the students’ home department. The courses of concern are 410, 420, and 430. The fear is that students will sign up for one of these courses and then due to the time of the recitation section would not be able to take a course that is required in their major. A motion was made by Bruce Weide that the proposed changes to 250, 481, 501, 502, 503, and 561 be approved and that ME come back to the committee with a plan on how they are going to schedule the recitation sections for 410, 420, and 430 such that there will be minimal conflict with other departments’ regularly scheduled courses. Jerry Chubb seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4.1. The degree is a joint effort between engineering and business. It will fill a demand and it is predicted that the program will grow to 35-45 students. At this time no additional funds should be needed to run the program.
4.2. The proposal has been reviewed by the Graduate Chairs Committee and has their support.
4.3. The subcommittee made some recommendations and comments to Al Miller and he has responded to all of them.
4.4. The subcommittee recommended that the proposal be approved. A motion was made by George Valco that the proposal be approved. Vish Subramaniam
seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5.1. The current proposal is a complete proposal that has answered all of the committee’s concerns from the previous proposal.
5.2. The subcommittee only had administrative revisions that needed to be done to the proposal and Biomedical has responded and made the changes. All of the other recommendations dealt with future issues.
5.3. The question was raised as to where the TIU would be for the faculty that are 50% engineering and 50% medicine. The response was that was one of the reasons for wanting to create the department. Currently the TIU is being written into all new offers. In the proposal it is noted whether the individual is part of the Biomedical core or are participating faculty. Where a faculty’s TIU will be located will be mainly dependent upon how they identify themselves. Right now Biomedical is planning on a very active memorandum of understanding for any joint appointment.
5.4. The subcommittee recommended that the proposal be approved. A motion was made by Jeff Chalmers that a letter be sent to the College Secretary stating the CCAA recommends that the Proposal for the Establishment of the Biomedical Department in the College of Engineering at The Ohio State University be approved by the faculty of the college. Bob Sykes seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
5.5. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that in the letter to the College Secretary that it be stated that CCAA recommends that the proposal be voted on by a vote taken at the college faculty meeting at which it is discussed unless there is substantial controversy about the proposal. Vish Subramaniam seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. The chair stated that he would not be able to attend the college faculty meeting that will be held on the 2nd of December and would like for Bruce Weide, the assistant chair, to represent him and present the proposals from CCAA. Bruce commented that, as he is not as familiar with the proposal as others are, he would prefer if someone like Jeff Chalmers actually presented the proposal. Jeff agreed to do the actual presentation.

7. The committee was informed that the proposal for the reorganization of Aero/Aviation had been received along with a proposal for a minor in Mechanical Engineering. The Aero/Aviation proposal was assigned to the Curriculum/Organization Proposal Subcommittee B and the minor in Mechanical
Engineering was assigned to Curriculum/Organization Proposal Subcommittee
A. Both subcommittees were instructed to report back to the full committee
on their proposal at the committee’s next meeting.

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