1. Attendance:
   Aero – Rama Yedavalli
   AVN – Not present
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – Bob Sykes
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Linn Van Woerkom
   FAB – Not present
   IWSE –
      ISE – Shahrukh Irani
      WLD – Charlie Albright
   MSE – Rudy Buchheit
   ME – Not present
   Graduate Student – Not present
   Undergraduate Student – Michael Johnston
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Mike Hoffmann

2. The Minutes from the 14 April 2006 meeting were approved as written.

3. Mike Hoffmann briefed the committee on the work done by the Enhanced Classroom Subcommittee. (A copy of Mike’s report to the subcommittee is attached.)
   3.1. The purpose of the subcommittee is to speed up the process of providing technology enhanced classrooms for engineering classes. A meeting has been held with the Classroom Readiness Committee. It has been determined that it is possible to get rooms done ahead of the university’s schedule if we are willing to pay. Tom Bell of the Classroom Readiness Committee has provided some cost figures (shown in Mike’s attached report). However, no agreement has been reached on any cost sharing arrangements. One major problem is scheduling the rooms for renovation. Even if we are willing to pay we will probably not get all of the rooms we would like renovated as quickly as we would like. Mike has done some research and has found that Bolz, Aviation, Dreese, and Baker are the most common buildings used by engineering classes that are held in pool classrooms. The key now is to identify those rooms we would like to have renovated and in what order. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.2. The question was raised as to whether or not we have to use the package created by Tom Bell, specifically the second screen. The response was
that we may be able to get them to change the package but will have to check.

3.3. The question was raised as to whether CCAA would be the place to find out if any of the departments want to put any money into this effort. The response was that such a decision would need to be made by the Executive Committee.

3.4. It was decided that the Enhanced Classroom Subcommittee would present a proposal to the full committee at its next meeting and at that time it will be decided if we should continue to proceed on this project.

4. Linn Van Woerkom presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the Committee.

4.1. All of the courses under consideration are part of the BS in Environmental Engineering Proposal as part of the proposal is to create their own course listing. There are three new courses requests and 29 course change requests. The three new courses are for a 693, 694, and H783. All of the course changes are to switch courses from a Civil Engineering listing to an Environmental Engineering listing or to add Environmental Engineering as a cross listed course. All of the course proposals are an integral part of the degree proposal and, as such, will not be processed by the Office of Academic Affairs until the degree proposal is fully approved. The only problem the subcommittee saw with the requests is that the syllabi do not have all of the required information.

4.2. Linn Van Woerkom made a motion that all of the course requests accompanying the BS in Environmental Engineering Proposal be approved contingent upon receipt of complete syllabi and final approval of the degree proposal. Dave Tomasko seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Bob Sykes presented Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B’s recommendation on undergraduate research course numbers.

5.1. The subcommittee feels that a 699 course does not offer any new opportunities for undergraduate research as almost all departments already have 693 and H783 courses. However, a 699 course would make the opportunity for undergraduate research more visible. The subcommittee does not believe that any important issue is at stake and recommends that individual departments be allowed to pursue their preferences in this matter.

5.2. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.2.1. The question was asked as to what the difference would be between a 693 course and a 699 course. The response was that a 693 course would be used for projects while a 699 course would be used for research. A 693 course can be used for a wider variety of things than a 699 course.
5.2.2. The comment was made that if a department creates a 699 course it will need to have a policy that will distinguish between how a 693 course can be used versus a 699 course.

5.2.3. The question was raised as to whether a 699 course would be letter graded or pass/fail. The response was that this would be up to the program but that in most cases a 699 course will be pass/fail.

5.2.4. The question was raised as to whether a 699 course could be repeated. The response was yes and that the number of hours it could be repeated would be up to the program.

5.2.5. The comment was made that the creation of a 699 course could open the possibility of abuse by departments forcing students to sign up for the course just to increase the number of credit hours students are taking in the department. An additional comment was made that while this may be true that the same thing can currently be done with 693s and that creating a 699 would not create any new opportunities for abuse.

5.2.6. It was agreed that creating a 699 Undergraduate Research Course would have two major benefits. First, it would show up on a student’s transcript as research and would parallel the graduate research course number. Second, it would simplify book keeping on the number of research hours our undergraduates are doing.

5.3. Bob Sykes made a motion that the creation of a 699 course would be left to the discretion of the programs but that the college would make a mass request for those programs that were interested with the deadline for having the request into the Committee Secretary by the 31st of October 2006. Charlie Albright seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. The committee was informed that the majority of the concurrences have been received for the BS in Environmental Engineering Proposal. George Valco recommended that Environmental Engineering get in contact with Randy Smith in the Office of Academic Affairs as he will know who should be asked for concurrence on this proposal.

7. The revised Arts & Science Minor in Science and Technology in Society was discussed.

7.1. The general opinion was that the minor is more of a philosophical view of technology and does not really address technological issues.

7.2. The comment was made that Arts & Science’s desire to create interdisciplinary minors appears to be driven by their desire to get students to take more hours from them.

7.3. The question was asked as to whether the engineering faculty listed in the minor were really contacted. The committee secretary was asked to contact those faculty members and ask them if they were contacted and, if so, what sort of contact they had.
7.4. The question was raised as to whether it would be better to ask Arts & Science to take technology out of the title or to try and make them do something effective with technological issues.

7.5. It was decided that Bruce Weide, Bob Gustafson, and Ed McCaul will write a draft response and present the draft to the committee at the committee’s next meeting.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.

C: College Faculty
CCAA File
Date: May 1, 2006

To: Bruce Weide, Shahrukh Irani, CCAA subcommittee members

From: Mike Hoffmann

Subject: College of Engineering CCAA subcommittee, Technology-Enhanced Classrooms

This is a status report to the technology-enhanced-classrooms subcommittee of the College of Engineering Committee for Academic Affairs (CCAA).

The intent of CCAA is to encourage an acceleration of the technology enhancements to those OSU “pool” classrooms used by engineering faculty.

1. There has been a meeting that confirmed the possibility of the College of Engineering working with the registrar’s scheduling office and with the classroom readiness committee. (Jeff Carson, registrar’s office and Tom Bell, Classroom services). This apparently has been done before, with preferential scheduling given to sponsoring units.

2. Tom Bell has conveyed an estimate of $8210 per room for just the electronic equipment. The largest portion of the cost ($4200) is for an effective, reliable projector. Note that two projector screens are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM Classroom A/V equipment</th>
<th>4/6/2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Model Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Data projector and mount</td>
<td>$ 4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small full range speaker and mount</td>
<td>$ 80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM control system and pipe mount</td>
<td>QM-RMCRXBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM wall plate and A/V control buttons</td>
<td>QM-WMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projection screen, manual, 6’-7’ wide</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projection screen, electric, 8’-9’ wide</td>
<td>$ 950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flip up wall mount shelf</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equipment Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A verbal estimate for a more fully equipped room (podium+VCR+DVD+computer) was about $17000. Neither Jeff nor Tom could officially say what any cost-sharing arrangement might be; the classroom readiness committee would decide such an issue. There was an implication however that the cost-shared OSU part would be the labor to install (and still not sure about electrical supply provisions).

3. Classroom Services is strapped for labor hours to get scheduled jobs finished; and scheduling just “took back” four rooms for AU06. Scheduling any rooms for improvements will be challenging.

4. Very recently (Fri), OSU classroom scheduling sent a promised usage report for engineering courses during AU05. It will take longer to glean useful info from it since it appears to have more than just “pool” classrooms involved. The college is expected to provide a short list of rooms to improve.

5. A survey of engineering faculty was taken with a resultant 72 responding.
a. 51 respondents chose to reveal their department. The distribution by department (based on self-disclosure) is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>IWS</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>ChBE</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>FABE</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>CEEGS</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>BME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Further observations about results relative to this academic year regarding technologies in the classroom are:

1) Respondents wanted to use a computer (94%), a projector (97%), or an internet connection (83%) for at least one class presentation. About 35% wanted to use a DVD player or a VCR; and 19% wanted to use a television.
2) 84% have used OSU technology equipped “pool” classrooms, and 48% have used department-controlled enhanced rooms.
3) 42% have requested a technology-equipped classroom but have been assigned a less-capable room.
4) 80% have a personal mobile computer that could be used in class.
5) 54% are aware of wireless connectivity in “pool” classrooms.
6) 89% find the currently defined technology-equipped classroom to be acceptable; 63% would accept a classroom with projector/screen/wireless-internet while using their own mobile computer; and 31% would accept a room with projector/screen/wireless-internet while checking-out a mobile computer from their department or the college for the quarter they needed it. Any other choices were by 13% or fewer of the respondents.
7) The preferred classroom was the OSU “full-up” enhanced room. Some commented that ALL rooms should have at least a projector and screen. Remote mouse, smart board, electronic response system, and docucam/overhead were mentioned.
8) 94% used a whiteboard/blackboard at least some of the time while teaching: 66% used overhead with transparencies; 14% used a smart board; 44% used an audio (PA) system; 71% used a classroom installed computer; 69% used a mobile computer; 52% used some other computer; 92% used standard office software; 68% used specialized engineering software; 96% used a projector and screen; 18% used an electronic response system; 51% used a VCR and 51% used a DVD player; 28% used a video camera or camcorder; 27% used a document camera; 34% used a television; 18% used an audio cassette player; and 54% use a flexible room arrangement.