1. Attendance:
   Aero – Rama Yedavalli
   AVN – Jerry Chubb
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – Robert Sykes
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Linn Van Woerkom
   FAB – Jay Martin
   IWSE –
     ISE – Not present
     WLD – Not present
   MSE – Rob Wagoner
   ME – Mike Moran
   Graduate Student – Not present
   Undergraduate Student – Not present
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – R. Gustafson, Ruby Smith

2. The Minutes from the 18 November 2005 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Linn Van Woerkom presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee's recommendations to the Committee.
   3.1. The following course proposals were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee: Bio Med 739, Bio Med 741, ECE 582, MSE 831, and ME 727.
   3.2. Linn Van Woerkom 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.

4. Bob Sykes presented Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B’s recommendation on the new CSE option to the committee.
   4.1. Bob informed the committee that the option in the proposal is already an individual option and that CSE would like to formalize the process and make the option more visible.
   4.2. The question was asked if this option would show on a student’s transcript. The answer was no that it would not.
   4.3. Bob Sykes made a motion to approve CSE’s proposal and that the proposal not go to CAA for further approval as the changes are a formality that do not change the requirements for the degree. Mike Moran seconded the proposal. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
5. The committee discussed the question of when a curriculum proposal needs to come before CCAA for approval. It was decided that if a proposal does not change the degree requirements for a program nor the balance between technical electives and required courses and does not impinge upon another program’s area of interest that the proposal does not need to come to CCAA for approval.

6. Bob Sykes made a motion to authorize the committee secretary the authority to inform programs that their curriculum proposal does not need to come to CCAA if it does not change the degree requirements for the program nor the balance between technical electives and required courses and does not impinge upon another program’s area of interest. Rob Wagoner seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Bob Gustafson updated the committee on the college’s GEC proposal.
   7.1. CAA has not yet taken any action on the college’s request for a new review of parts of the proposal that were initially rejected.
   7.2. The Core Committee is in the process of forming the Ethics Course Subcommittee. This subcommittee will use the procedure outlined in our GEC proposal. Even though the ethics requirement will be in effect this coming autumn, we do not expect a dramatic impact then as it will be a year or two before that incoming class will be ready to take the ethics course. There is the possibility though that upper class students will be allowed to take the ethics course and then, by petition, use it for their second history course.
   7.3. It appears that because of the letter CCAA sent to CAA complaining about the lack of adequate written feedback on our GEC proposal that we will be getting something from them in writing. This is a new process for CAA as in most cases a compromise is reached or the proposal is withdrawal and detailed written feedback has not been necessary.

8. The committee was informed about the upcoming proposals from Environmental Engineering and Biomedical Engineering as well as the receipt of a revision of the Geomatics Engineering degree program. The proposals were assigned as follows:
   8.1. Revision of the Geomatics Engineering degree program – Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A
   8.2. BS Degree in Environmental Engineering - Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B
   8.3. BS Degree in Biomedical Engineering - Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A

9. The chair informed the committee that the question has come up on what rules should be followed when courses are petitioned to be substituted for core or selected core courses. One example is that some programs are substituting
CSE 201 for CSE 202. The problems are that CSE would prefer not to encourage engineering students to take CSE 201 because of the intimidation factor they exert on most of the CSE 201 students, who have far less math background since CSE 201 has only a weak math prerequisite, and that CSE 201 is not an approved selected core course. The main question is one of principle – how flexible is the core and selected core and should there be specific substitution rules for courses in the core and selected core? The floor was open for discussion.

9.1. The comment was made that based on the course petition policy this committee passed in February that we gave an open book for approving petitions to the Petition Committee.

9.2. The question was raised as to who the members of the Petition Committee were. The answer was that the committee consists of Ruby Smith and Judith McDonald. Also, Bob Gustafson is consulted on any controversial petitions.

9.3. The question was raised as to how many petitions are approved each year. Ruby Smith stated that most of the petitions are for transfer students. Ruby also stated that she did not know the number of petitions that were approved each year. Ruby stated that she could start keeping a list of the number and the courses that are being petition and report back to CCAA in the spring.

9.4. The committee agreed with Ruby’s suggestion and her report will be part of the committee’s agenda at its last meeting in the spring.

10. Bob Gustafson informed the committee that the number of engineering students is dropping, though the drop is not across the board. Most of this decrease is in international students. We have a lot of competition for domestic students, especially in-state students. However, our number of applications is up for next year. Bob asked that faculty in each program be prepared to help us recruit new students. Programs can help our recruiting by being prepared to provide a discipline specific tailored response to a potential student’s inquiry.

10.1. The question was asked if the downward trend in international students was university wide. The response was that Bob did not know but that engineering makes up a large percentage of the international students.

11. The chair announced that Jerry Chubb and Laura Nash have agreed to be CCAA’s representatives to the college’s McHale Report Response Subcommittee. The chair asked that if anyone else was interested in serving on this committee to please let him know.

12. The chair asked the committee if other programs are having difficulty getting classrooms that are technological equipped with computers. The response was that this appears to be a general problem. It was decided that Brad Meyers would be invited to one of the committee’s meetings to discuss this issue rather than have individual programs complain to him.
13. The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 PM.
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