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 – Linn Van Woerkom
   FAB – Bob Gustafson
   IWSE –
      ISE – Shahrukh Irani
      WLD – Charlie Albright
   MSE – Rudy Buchheit
   ME – Not present
   Graduate Student – Not present
   Undergraduate Student – Not present
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Pam Hussen

2. The Minutes from the 10 March 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: CE 682, CE 683, CE 688, Eng 510, Eng 697, ISE 619, ISE H619, GeoSci 400, as well as the course withdrawals requested by Geodetic Science 401, 470, 471, 472, 501, 520, 572, 573, 574, 576, 577, 578, 597, H783.02, and H783.03.
   3.2. The following course proposals were recommended to be approved by the subcommittee contingent upon receipt of a new syllabus that reflects a grading plan and agreement between the syllabus and the course request on whether the course will be letter graded or S/U: Geodetic Science 410, 540, 541, 542, 560, 56, 562, 575, 608, H783.01.
   3.3. Bob Gustafson stated that Mechanical Engineering has been taking the lead in offering the FE review course as a 94 (Eng 510) though the course is funded by the college. The course is available to any engineering students as well as anyone who has an engineering degree through continuing education. The question was asked whether this course has been offered on a distance learning basis. The response was that it has not been but it is something that could be considered. The suggestion was made that it would be a good idea if this course had a site on the
college’s webpage so that anyone interested in a review course could find information about it.

3.4. The question was raised as to why the title to Geodetic Science 400 did not include the word engineer and is just called “Introduction to Geomatics” since it is the introductory course for an engineering degree. The response was that not including the word engineering was a decision made by the faculty in Geodetics.

3.5. Linn Van Woerkom made a motion that the course requests be approved with the noted contingences. Bob Sykes seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Linn Van Woerkom discussed the current college syllabus format with the committee. The current syllabus format was created and approved by CCAA in 1999. The purpose behind its creation was to make syllabi as uniform as possible and to include the information required by ABET. The problem the Course Proposal Subcommittee has seen is that there is a wide range of methods of presenting the outcomes for individual courses. In addition, some programs use an alpha numeric method of presenting the outcomes while others use prose to describe the outcomes. The problem with using the alpha numeric method is that if the description behind the letter or number changes there is no easy way of determining what was meant on the syllabus. The question the subcommittee would like to pose to the committee is whether we should require a specific method of presenting the outcomes for a course. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The comment was made that if something like this was done that it would be necessary to create a form that could be filled in and easily available to everyone.

4.2. The comment was made that it is more critical that a syllabus shows what ABET outcomes it meets more than what program outcomes it meets.

4.3. Bruce Weide stated the CSE has an HTML system that they use to organize their syllabi. The comment was made that the problem with using one program’s system was making it compatible with other program’s similar pre-existing syllabi systems.

4.4. The comment was made that this would be a good opportunity to make sure that other information is included on engineering syllabi such as a disability statement or an academic misconduct statement. It was pointed out that for ABET purposes our syllabi cannot be longer than two pages and information such as a disability statement or an academic misconduct statement are not required. While such information should be included in the syllabi given out in class, it is not needed for our purposes.

4.5. The suggestion was made that we call the syllabus required by CCAA something like the “Official ABET Syllabus” to differentiate it from the classroom syllabus as the classroom syllabus will be much longer and have information not required by ABET.
4.6. It was decided that the Course Proposal Subcommittee would create a new college wide syllabus format and present it to the committee at a later date.

5. The floor was opened for feedback on the college’s draft McHale Report Response.
5.1. Rudy Buchheit stated the MSE does not have any problems with the draft response.
5.2. Shahrukh Irani stated that ISE had no comment at this time.
5.3. Rama Yedavalli stated that Aero had no changes to recommend.
5.4. Charlie Albright stated that Welding supported the ideas behind the McHale Report but felt that technology should be a bigger part of it.
5.5. George Valco stated that ECE felt that the McHale Report is confusing. In addition, freshman clusters would be hard to schedule for ECE students and that Engineering minors would not be very useful for allowing our students to complete non major requirements. One question ECE had was, is coherence in the GEC needed?
5.6. Linn Van Woerkom stated that Engineering Physics liked the draft response and that it was similar to the one the Physics Department is creating. One problem Physics has with the McHale Report is the lumping of technology with natural sciences. Technological literacy is important but it is a difficult concept to define.
5.7. Bob Sykes stated that CEEGS has not yet discussed the draft response.
5.8. Dave Tomasko and Bob Gustafson told the committee that they will be revising the college’s response and that any additional comments need to be to them by the 25th of April.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 AM.
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