Approved Minutes - January 13, 2004

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Meeting Minutes Tuesday 13 January 2004

• Attendance:

AA -
Aero - Jim Scott

AVN - Jerry Chubb

BME - Not present

CHE - Jeff Chalmers

CEGS - Robert Sykes

CIS - Bruce Weide

EE - George Valco

ENG PHY - Linn Van Woerkom

FAB - Jay Martin

IWSE -

ISE - Shah Irani

WLD - Charlie Albright

MSE - R. Wagoner (Chair)

ME - Vish Subramaniam
The Minutes from the 19 November 2003 meeting were approved as amended.

Bruce Weide presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee's recommendations to the Committee.

The following course requests were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee: EE 858 and MSE 794. ME 481 and ME 654 were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee contingent upon receipt of a signed form. ME 561, ME 570, and ME 630 were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee contingent upon receipt of a signed form and a better explanation of why the prerequisites are being changed. A motion was made by Bruce Weide to approve the requests with the contingences on ME 481, 654, 561, 570, and 630 and with the Course Proposal Subcommittee being responsible for ensuring that the revised explanations were acceptable. Jay Martin seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and the chair abstaining. The motion passed.

George Valco informed the committee that his subcommittee has not yet received a revised copy of the Mechanical Engineering Minor. Once it has been received the subcommittee will review the proposal again.

Charlie Albright informed the committee that his subcommittee will be meeting on the 20th of January to review the Master of Engineering Practice Proposal.

The chair assigned the GEC Revision Proposal to Subcommittee A.
The chair reviewed all of the items the committee has received reference the Aero/Aviation Reorganization Proposal. He informed the committee that he had met with the dean and the dean stated that he supported the reorganization, was willing to come and talk with the committee about it, and was going to write a letter discussing his personnel plans for the two programs. The Chair then stated that each committee member would now have an opportunity to tell the committee what they learned from their colleagues concerning their feelings about the proposal.

Linn Van Woerkom, Engineering Physics, stated that he did not discuss it with all of the faculty in his department as Physics is in a different college. His personal feelings are that the proposal seems reasonable and that it should not have any impact on Engineering Physics majors.

Charlie Albright, Welding Engineering, stated that while there was support for the separation there was concern about a small department getting a larger proportional distribution of resources and that a small department will have the same number of votes in many committees as a large department.

Jeff Chalmers, Chemical Engineering, stated that the department supports the proposal though there is concern about the potential impact on future finances.

Bruce Weide, CIS, stated that they had two major concerns that they felt were not adequately explained in the proposal. First, what was the problem between the two programs? Second, the budget information included for aviation does not agree with the proposed new faculty positions. There is not enough money shown in the proposal to support all of the new positions.

Bob Sykes, CEEGS, stated that their faculty did not care one way or the other. They do feel that it should be a free association or disassociation.

Allison Holub, Undergraduate Student, stated that students' concerns deal with the questions of whether or not the reorganization increase opportunity and will it have any effect upon the degrees.

Shah Irani, ISE, stated that they have three areas of interest. First, as there is a fixed pool of positions how are the new positions to be funded? Second, the creation of these two new departments should be based on the same standards as the ones used to create Biomedical. Third, will Aero be a viable department?

Jim Scott, Aero, stated that Aviation and Aero are two completely different disciplines. The faculty of the two programs do get along but the focus of the two disciplines is very different. The two programs want to separate so that they can rebuild back to the levels they were at before they were merged.

Vish Subramaniam, Mechanical Engineering, stated that ME's position on the matter was stated at the
last meeting and is reflected in the minutes of that meeting. He has never had the sense that the faculty of the two programs did not get along personally and that the breakup was mainly due to the difference in their disciplines. Also, there was no real discussion of finances when the Biomedical Department Proposal was discussed so, why should it be discussed as part of this proposal. Jim Scott added that the proposed new faculty for Aero are not a commitment from the dean. The one new faculty member that will be joining the program in June is being paid for by the Wright Brothers Institute. In addition, discussions are being held with the Wright Brothers Institute for sponsorship of other positions.

• Ken Wilkins, Undergraduate Student, stated that many of the students in ISE are wondering why ISE does not separate from Welding. Overall most students do not see that it will have an impact on them. Charlie Albright added that breaking up IWSE did not come up in the discussions he had with the faculty of the department.

• George Valco, Electrical Engineering, stated that they had many of the same general concerns already expressed by others but that the bottom line is that the department is neutral on the proposal.

• Jerry Chubb, Aviation, stated that at one time Aviation had eight faculty positions. Currently, the program only has a few faculty members but a large number of instructors. As for the airport, it is a revenue producing unit but the money earned there must be used at the airport. It is possible for Aviation and Aero to academically work together but the monetary resources have not been made available to make this happen. The OSU Aviation program is an aggressive program with an excellent national reputation.

• Jay Martin, FABE, stated that there was only a short discussion among the faculty about the issue and he was told to use his own judgment.

• The chair opened the floor for a general discussion of the issue.

• The comment was made that the mergers were forced upon engineering by the provost under the threat of loss of budget. We are currently dealing with damage from events that happened over 10 years ago.

• The question was raised to determine if anyone was on the Executive Committee when the merger decisions were being made? Rob Wagoner stated that he was and that there were other reasons for people supporting the mergers. Some people saw it as an opportunity to identify departments that should not be by theirselves due to a number of factors such as no undergraduate program or a small number of faculty. Size of a program became an issue to the Executive Committee as the only consistent correlation found from studies of national rankings of programs is size - larger is better.
Vish Subramaniam made a motion that a letter be sent to the College Secretary stating that CCAA recommends that the college faculty approve the proposal to reorganize the Department of Aerospace Engineering and Aviation to Separate and Independent Department Status. Charlie Albright seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

- Aero/Aviation - approve
- BME - not present
- Chemical - approve
- CEEGS - approve
- CIS - approve
- Electrical - approve
- Eng Physics - approve
- FABE - approve
- IWSE - abstain
- MSE - abstain
- Mechanical - approve
- Graduate student - not present
- Undergraduate student - approve

The motion passed by a vote of 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Jerry Chubb made a motion that the letter should include a statement requesting 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: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions. The motion passed.
• The chair asked all members to read over the handout they were given that list the number of students who have graduated from the college using the BS/MS program in the last three years. It appears that this program has very little formal supervision in the college or at the graduate school. He would like for the committee to discuss at the next meeting the question of who should be responsible for overseeing this program.

• The meeting was adjourned at 1:30.
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