1. Attendance:
   Aero – Rama Yedavalli
   AVN – Not present
   BME – Not present
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – Bob Sykes
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Not present
   FAB – Bob Gustafson
   IWSE –
     ISE – Not present
     WLD – Not present
   MSE – Rudy Buchheit
   ME – Not present
   Graduate Student – Robin Ng
   Undergraduate Student – Michael Johnston
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Pam Hussen

2. The Minutes from the 17 February 2006 meeting were approved as amended.

3. Ed McCaul presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the Committee.
   3.1. The following course proposals were recommended to be approved by the committee: FABE 697, ME 631, ME 683, and ISE 683.
   3.2. It was pointed out that ECE 753.01, Powertrain Control, is very similar to the ME 631 new course proposal. It was decided that ECE should have the opportunity to look at this new proposal.
   3.3. Bob Sykes made a motion that the requests be approved with the contingency that ME obtain concurrence from ECE for ME 631. Robin Ng seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Bob Sykes gave Subcommittee B’s report on Embedded Honors Courses to the committee.
   4.1. The concept of Embedded Honors Courses has been approved at the university level and we have been asked to approve it for our college as well as to determine how the concept should be implemented.
   4.2. The purpose of an embedded honors course is to enhance the interaction between honors students and faculty in those courses where there are not enough honors students to justify a separate honors section. Any student who takes an embedded honors course will get H credit for the course.
4.3. The subcommittee saw two issues with the proposal.

4.3.1. There was no total enrollment limit in the proposal. There is a limit of 12 honors students but no limit on the total number of students in the course. The subcommittee has no recommendation on this issue.

4.3.2. The proposal’s path for approval of an embedded course does not go through CCAA. The subcommittee recommends that this be changed and that an embedded course proposal goes from the department to CCAA with CCAA referring it to the College’s Honors Committee for their recommendation.

4.4. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.4.1. The question was asked as to what the rationale behind the limit of 12 honors students. The response was that the committee creating the proposal felt that if there were more than 12 honors students that a separate section should be created for them. The embedded course concept was not intended to replace a normal honors section.

4.4.2. The question was asked if an embedded section would need to be created each quarter. The response was that it was a one time approval process. Once an embedded section has been approved that course will have two call numbers with the same schedule.

4.4.3. The comment was made that any professor having an embedded section will be doing a double teaching assignment. It was pointed out that embedded sections must be requested by the faculty and that it is optional.

4.4.4. The question was asked if any trials have been done on embedded sections. The reply was that Arts & Science did experiment with embedded sections and the concept appeared to work for them.

4.4.5. The comment was made that an embedded section could end up with an honors versus a non honors atmosphere if the professor is not careful on how the course is run.

4.4.6. The question was raised as to whether any reports will need to be done on an embedded section when the course is over. The response was that there will be a self generated report by honors but that this report will not involve the faculty.

4.5. Bob Sykes made a motion that the college adopt the embedded honors proposal with the addition that any proposal to create an embedded honors course be subject to review and approval by CCAA with consultation from the college’s Honors Committee. George Valco seconded the motion.

4.6. A vote was taken: 8 approved, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Bob Gustafson discussed the three page draft McHale Report response with the committee.
5.1. This is the same draft as the one Bob recently presented to the Arts & Science Senate. At that meeting eight other professional colleges gave their thoughts on the McHale Report. While there was a variety of opinion expressed at the meeting the common themes were:
5.1.1. A concern with flexibility
5.1.2. A concern with getting the hours to a degree down to 180. Some of the colleges said that there is no way for them to reduce their hours to 180 and some asked why 180 hours was picked.
5.1.3. A concern with how budget will be impacted.
5.1.4. Disagreement on who controls the GEC.
5.1.5. A concern with who will have oversight of the proposed changes.
5.1.6. While freshman clusters appears to be a good idea it does not seem to be a workable proposal to all colleges.
5.1.7. A desire on the part of some colleges to reduce GEC courses from 5 hours to 4 hours.

5.2. The comment was made that no one is saying that the McHale Report needs to be accepted as it is.

5.3. Bob stated that the joint CCAA/Core subcommittee will continue its work and that he would like to get feedback on the draft response from CCAA at its next meeting.

6. Bob informed the committee that there is no new news on our resubmitted GEC proposal. The college’s Ethics Subcommittee has met and letters will be sent out to Philosophy, Social Science, and Comparative Studies concerning using some of their courses for our ethics requirement.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 PM.
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