1. Attendance:
   Aero – Not present (J. P. Chen)
   AVN – Chul Lee
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – Earl Whitlatch (for Bob Sykes)
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
   FAB – Alfred Soboyejo
   IWSE –
     ISE – Blaine Lilly
     WLD – Charlie Albright
   MSE – Rob Wagoner
   ME – Not present (Mike Moran)
   Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri, Justin McKendry
   Undergraduate Student – Linda Wang (Not present Ashley Hand)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Bob Gustafson, Sarah Hill, Pam Hussen, Ruby Smith

2. The Minutes from the 29 September 2006 meeting were approved as written.

3. The committee secretary asked the committee if anyone had any comments on the proposal CCAA Handbook. The suggestion was made that the handbook be reviewed by a subcommittee every autumn.

4. Rita Alevriadou presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the Committee.
   4.1. The Course Proposal Subcommittee recommended that the course requests for BME 891, CSE 891, ECE 891, BME 891.01, CSE 891.01, ECE 891.01, AVN 310M, AVN 520, AVN 575, AVN 590, AVN 591, AVN 597, AVN 610, AVN 674, CHBE 630, ECE 205, ECE 206, ECE 209, ECE 265, ECE 301, ECE 323, ENG 259, and ISE 715 be approved. AVN 570 was recommended for approval contingent upon concurrence from ISE.
   4.2. The committee was informed that ENG 259 is worth five credit hours because it is an alternate for a similar course that targets liberal arts students and that course is worth five credit hours. In addition, the course is worth five credit hours so that students will be able to spend time concentrating on improving their study skills rather than taking additional hours that will allow them to be a full time student. This course is an intervention course that helps students get their GPA back to where it was before they started having problems. It does not make a 2.5 student a 4.0 student. The question was raised as to whether this course could count
as an elective. The response was that it would count as a free elective, not toward a degree program; but engineering students do not have free electives so it simply means extra hours.

4.3. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that the subcommittee’s recommendations be approved. Rob Wagoner seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

5. Rita informed the committee that the Course Proposal Subcommittee is working on revising the college’s standard syllabus and will be presenting a proposal to the full committee at a future meeting.

6. There were no reports from Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A or B. The committee secretary informed the committee that Mike Moran, Chair Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A, had informed him that he had not yet received a revised Environmental Engineering Proposal. Earl Whitlatch informed the committee that a revised proposal was being prepared. Chul Lee informed the committee that the Aviation proposal deals with the creation of a new track, Air Transportation Systems, which would replace Aviation’s Human Factors track.

7. The issue was raised with the committee on whether or not CCAA should review graduate curriculum issues. The college’s Faculty Rules state that CCAA has been delegated the power to “Review and approve or disapprove proposals for changes in courses and curricula which are recommended by departments reporting its decisions directly to the departments concerned and, subject to appeal as described in paragraph 5.9 of these rules, to the University Council on Academic Affairs.” In addition, one of the stated responsibilities of CCAA is to “make recommendations concerning the establishment, alteration, and abolition of all curricula and courses offered by the College, and all departments, schools, and bureaus of the College.” The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. The comment was made that while graduate students belong to the Graduate School their curriculum is established by the faculty in their department.

7.2. George Valco stated that CAA looks at a report from the Graduate School when a graduate curriculum related proposal comes to them and that the Graduate School does not rubber stamp the proposals.

7.3. The question was raised as to whether CCAA should have an advisory role in the college’s approval process for graduate curriculum related issues.

7.4. Bob Gustafson stated that he will check with the Graduate Chairs Committee to find out what their opinion is and that he will do some homework on the faculty rules.

8. The issue of the university’s/college’s/department’s dismissal policies was discussed.

8.1. Rob Wagoner informed the committee about a case where his department dismissed a student and the college’s Academic Standards and Progress
Committee (ASAP) initially approved the dismissal. However, the student appealed and ASAP reversed itself and let the student stay. Rob’s question is, who has the right to departmentally dismiss someone?

8.2. Ruby Smith informed the committee that there are three levels of dismissal – the enrolled department, the enrolled college, and the university. ASAP’s policy states that a student has three quarters once they are dismissed by a department to find a new major or they will be dismissed from the college. ASAP does have a collection of dismissal policies from most of the departments.

8.3. The comment was made that these policies were sent to CCAA for approval but no one present at the meeting could remember this ever being done. The committee secretary was asked to search the minutes to see if anything could be found.

8.4. The comment was made that faculty attendance at ASAP meetings was not very good and by default most of the responsibility for dismissals has been left to the advisors.

8.5. The committee was informed that a department was supposed to get college approval before a dismissal letter was sent to a student.

8.6. It was decided that a joint subcommittee between CCAA and ASAP will be created to look at this issue and that the issue will be discussed again at a future meeting.

9. Bob Gustafson asked everyone for their opinion on how aggressively the College of Engineering should pursue a minor in engineering for non-engineering students. Everyone was given a copy of the Minor in Engineering Studies at Iowa State University as one possible model. The floor was opened for discussion.

9.1. The comment was made that if you created such a minor that it would require a commitment from the dean to provide the necessary resources as it does not fit any one department.

9.2. The comment was made that we do have a responsibility to the rest of the university to provide an opportunity for non-engineering students to become technically literate.

9.3. The comment was made that if we create such a minor that the courses will have to be well taught. We do not want to do something like this half hearted.

9.4. The decision was made that the Core Committee would be the ideal group to study this issue.

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