Approved Minutes - November 18, 2005

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Meeting Minutes 18 November 2005

Attendance:

Aero – Rama Yedavalli
AVN – Jerry Chubb
BME – Rita Alevriadou
CHE – Not present
CEGS – Robert Sykes
CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Not present
FAB – Larry Brown
IWSE –
ISE – Shahrukh Irani
WLD – Charley Albright
MSE – Rob Wagoner
ME – Not present
Graduate Student – Robin Ng
Undergraduate Student – Michael Johnston
The Minutes from the 28 October 2005 meeting were approved as written.

Linda Schoen briefed the committee on the revised “Science and Technology in Society” minor.
  - A need has been expressed for such a minor.
  - This minor is part of a recognized field of study.
  - It is an interdisciplinary minor.
  - A student will be required to take one course out of a list of four as well as 15 hours of elective courses.
  - The name of the minor has been changed so that it now better reflects the interaction between science/technology and society.
  - Engineering 367 has been added as an elective course. Engineering 181 and 183 cannot be part of the minor as Arts and Sciences’ requirements state that 100 level courses cannot be part of a minor.

The floor was opened for discussion.
  - George Valco stated that a university level committee is currently considering a university wide minor policy.
  - The question was asked as to why this minor is so broad in nature. The impression is that a minor should give a student more depth in a subject than breadth. The response was that an interdisciplinary minor will result in a broader curriculum than a discipline specific minor.
  - The question was asked as to whether or not all of the courses in the minor are GEC courses. The response was that they were not but the ones that are can be double counted in both the minor and the student’s major.
  - The comment was made that it appeared that many of the courses were in areas that would be of little interest to engineering students. It appears that health care and patient safety are topics that are not included but probably should be and Engineering would be willing to work with Arts and Science on including these topics. The response was that not all of the syllabi were included in the copy of the proposal engineering was sent due to the large number of them.
  - Linda Schoen explained that the minor is intended for students with a science and technology background so that they can get a better understanding of the relationship between science/technology and society. Arts and Science would like to partner with Engineering on courses that could be included. The minor is not intended for students who are not majoring in science or technology fields. Ed Adelson offered that students outside of those majors should be advised against taking this minor.
  - The question was asked as to why engineering had not been included when the minor was first proposed. The response was that if they knew then what they know now that
engineering would have been included.

- The comment was made that there was not enough information in the proposal on similar minors in other universities to make a good judgment on their content. The response was that they would add more information on these other minors.
- The question was asked that if science and engineering students are the focus of this minor what was to prevent a non science or engineering student from taking it. The response was that there was currently nothing to stop them from taking it. Suggestions were made that a prerequisite be used to limit access to the minor or that a statement be added that would either say that it was not allowed or that it was not advised.
- The question was asked as to whether Arts and Science had contacted any of the faculty listed on Engineering’s response that was sent to them in May. The response was no and that the meeting with this committee was their first real contact with engineering.
- The question was asked as to where in the process the minor was. The response was that the minor had only gone through the first approval level in Arts and Science. Arts and Science is not in any rush to get the minor fully approved.
- Ed Adelson asked if Engineering saw any problems with the structure of the minor and advising engineering students about it. The response was that any engineering student who was interested in it would probably be referred to an Arts and Science advisor.
- Linda Schoen asked if the new title better explained the relationship that minor is trying to explore. The response was that it does as long as any student taking it has a science or technological background.
- Bruce Weide summarized Engineering’s concerns.
  - Arts and Science needs to contact the faculty in Engineering who have an interest in this area, especially since engineering majors are considered one of the two prime potential audiences for the minor.
  - The students who take the minor need to be limited to students with a science or technical background and that non science or engineering students should be strongly discouraged from taking it

- Ed McCaul presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the Committee.
  - The following course proposals were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee: CSE H680 and Geodetic Science 888. All of the contingencies noted on the handout for Geodetic Science 888 have been met and thus the subcommittee is now recommending that this course be approved.
  - Bob Sykes asked why none is not an acceptable explanation for the nature of program adjustments, new funding, and/or withdrawals that make the implementation of this new course possible. Bob feels that the college is beginning to micro manage course requests. The response was that it is important for the committee to know how a department is going to fund and staff a new course. In addition, if this question is not adequately answered the request may get sent back to us for a better justification which will delay its final approval.
  - Bob Sykes made a motion that the requests be approved. Rob Wagoner seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
Charlie Albright presented Subcommittee A’s proposed GEC Transition Policy. The third point in the policy was changed by the committee. Jerry Chubb made a motion that the revised policy be adopted. Bob Sykes seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed. A copy of the policy is attached to the minutes.

All members present were given a copy of the letter that the chair sent to the Raymond Noe, Chair of CAA. The purpose of the letter was to express the committee’s disappointment in the lack of communication from CAA concerning the college’s GEC Proposal. A copy of the letter is attached to the minutes.

The committee was reminded that a joint meeting with the Core Committee will be held on Tuesday the 6th of December from 3:30-4:30 PM to discuss the implications of the Report of the Committee on the University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education may have for engineering.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

C: College Faculty

CCAA File

College of Engineering
Policy on Transition to the New Engineering GEC
Approved by CCAA
18 November 2005

Revised GEC requirements for Engineering students approved by the Council on Academic Affairs during academic year 05-06 will be implemented under the following policy:

1) Any student entering the University as new first quarter first-year students or by transfer beginning AU 06 will be under the new Engineering GEC requirements.

2) Current students will not be required to meet the new requirements. Current students may petition for specific changes in their requirements which would coincide with the new GEC model, e.g. use of University Capstone 597 class to replace lower level class, use an approved ethics class for humanities or social science requirement.

3) Returning students who have been out for longer than five years will return under the new requirements. Students returning within five years or less may remain under the requirements in effect when they entered the college or may chose to fulfill the requirements in effect at the time of their return.
Date: 5 November 2005
To: Raymond Noe, Chair, CAA
From: Bruce W. Weide
Chair, College of Engineering’s Committee on Academic Affairs

Subject: CAA’s Response to Engineering’s GEC Proposal

To date, the only written response in regard to CAA’s actions on our GEC proposal is a one page e-mail message from Randy Smith to Bob Gustafson announcing the outcome of the CAA vote as "approved" or "not approved" on each of our recommendations. The College of Engineering put significant time and effort into preparing this proposal and we are disappointed in CAA’s limited written response after it spent 18 months at CAA. At the least, we expected a timely, formal written response outlining the reasons CAA did not approve some of our recommendations. While we can read the minutes of CAA’s meetings, once they are placed on the university’s webpage, they are not published until well after the meetings. Moreover, the minutes do not convey all of the discussion that was held. Since our representatives were not allowed to be present during the discussion, it is difficult for us to determine CAA’s reasoning for the decisions that were made. We would like to request that in the future CAA’s meetings be truly open meetings so that representatives from any unit presenting a proposal are allowed to be present as observers during the discussion.

Can you please send us now (for this proposal) and in the future (for others) enough information about the rationale for each decision that we can decide how to proceed? Thank you for your consideration.