1. Attendance:
   Aero – Rama Yedavalli
   AVN – Jerry Chubb
   BME – Not present
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – Not present
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Linn Van Woerkom
   FAB – Jay Martin
   IWSE –
       ISE – Shahrukh Irani
       WLD – Not present
   MSE – Rob Wagoner
   ME – Mike Moran
   Graduate Student – Not present
   Undergraduate Student – Michael Johnston, Laura Nash
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – R. Gustafson, Mike Hoffmann, Jim Palavin

2. The Minutes from the 13 January 2006 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: Civil Eng 607, Geodetic Sci 607, CSE 459.22, 651, 762,
       ChBio Eng 995, 762, 764, and 981.
   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. The comment was made that there appears to be a trend to increase the number
   of hours in our courses. A discussion followed:
   4.1. The committee was informed that increasing the number of hours in a
       course is only considered a curriculum change when the course is a
       required course.
   4.2. The committee was informed that the university’s guidelines for the
       number of credit hours in a course are very broad.
   4.3. It was pointed out that curriculum does have a tendency to drift over time
       and that this committee needs to be very aware of any course change
       request that attempts to increase credit hours.
   4.4. The question was raised as to whether the committee should discuss this
       issue at a future meeting.
4.5. The consensus was that a subcommittee should be appointed to investigate this matter and to develop a consistent college policy on course content versus the number of credit hours for the course. Dave Tomasko stated that he would be willing to chair such a subcommittee once his work on the McHale Committee is finished. Rob Wagoner and Bob Gustafson volunteered to be part of this subcommittee.

5. Jim Palavin, University Registrar’s Office, was introduced to the committee. Bruce Weide informed Jim that there has been an inability to schedule technology classrooms and the question is whether or not this will continue to be a problem.

5.1. Jim gave the committee some background information.

5.1.1. The Registrar’s Office does not have a lot to say about how classrooms are configured. The Classroom Readiness Committee is the group that decides which classrooms are upgraded to technology classrooms. The committee has representatives from the Registrar’s Office, OIT, Planning Office, Architect’s Office, and Physical Facilities. The committee gets $450,000 per year for improvements to the classrooms. It is not cheap to upgrade a classroom to a technology classroom. We are not yet at 50% of the pool classrooms being technology classrooms but that is the goal. Demand for these rooms is increasing but so is the cost of converting them. Currently, requests for scheduling technology classrooms are being turned down.

5.1.2. The question was asked as to what the definition of a technology classroom is. The response was that a technology classroom has a video projector and a VHS/DVD capable computer installed in it.

5.1.3. The question was asked as to whether any of the technology classrooms are in this part of campus. There are some and during each Christmas break the Classroom Readiness Committee does a tour of about 30-50 classrooms to determine which ones to upgrade.

5.1.4. There is about $750,000 - $800,000 in the budget each year for maintenance and upgrades. Last year about $40,000 was spent on lamp bulbs. It takes about $25,000 to upgrade one classroom and this does not include the cost of furnishings.

5.1.5. The question was raised as to whether there are any semi-technology classrooms that just have a video projector that can be connected to a laptop. At this time there are not, but this idea was tried a few years ago and was not successful.

5.1.6. The question was raised as to what the cost would be of upgrading a classroom to a semi-technology level. The response was that it would probably cost about $5,000.

5.1.7. It was determined that engineering would be willing to be the subject of an experiment with the semi-technology classroom and
would be willing to help financially. Jim stated that Mike Sherman would be the person to contact about this idea.

5.1.8. The question was raised as to when wireless would be coming. The response was that currently all of the pool classrooms have wireless access right now.

5.1.9. It was decided that the idea of engineering cost sharing on the creation of some semi-technology classrooms would be coordinated by Mike Hoffmann from the college. Bruce Weide and Shahrukh Irani both stated that they would like to be part of this group. Shahrukh stated that it may be possible for some of the students in his ISE capstone class to help with the project.

6. Mike Moran reported that Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A is recommending that the revisions to the Geomatics Engineering degree program and the Surveying Minor be approved. They are basically fine tuning their requirements and the number of hours to the degree is not changing. There being no discussion Mike made a motion that the revision to the Geomatics Engineering degree program and the Surveying Minor be approved. Rob Wagoner seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. It was decided that due to the minor changes being made to this degree program and the Surveying Minor that this proposal does not need to go to CAA.

8. Bob Gustafson briefed the committee on the Embedded Honors Courses proposal and the proposed UG Research Course Numbers.

8.1. The University Honors Committee has developed a procedure that will allow an embedded honors section to be part of a regular section when there are not enough honor students to justify a separate honors section. Even if adopted this will not obligate a program to participate but gives it the option to do so. Bob would like for CCAA to develop a mechanism to manage this new procedure. The college’s Honors Committee has endorsed the concept.

8.2. The university has decided that 699 would be used to designate undergraduate research. This will not be exclusively honors research, but research for any undergraduate student. H783 could continue to exist as the honors thesis course and 693 would become non research independent study. Linn Van Woerkom commented that MAPS sees this new number as a good idea.

9. The committee chair stated that these two items would be considered by Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B. Subcommittee B will report back to the full committee on its findings at its next meeting. The committee secretary was asked to send the subcommittee members all of the pertinent information.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 PM.
C: College Faculty
CCAA File