1. Attendance:
   Aero – Jen-Ping Chen
   AVN – Not present (Chul Lee)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS –
     Civil - Chuck Moore
     Environment – Bob Sykes
   CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)
   FAB – Not present (Alfred Soboyejo)
   IWSE –
     ISE – Not present (Blaine Lilly)
     WLD – Not present (Charlie Albright)
   MSE – Rob Wagoner
   ME – Mike Moran
   Graduate Student – Not present (Shivraman Giri, Justin McKendry)
   Undergraduate Student – Not present (Linda Wang, Ashley Hand)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Bob Gustafson, Rich Hart, Jerry Chubb, Nawal Taneja, Ruby Smith

2. The Minutes from the 25 January 2007 meeting were approved as amended.

3. The committee secretary informed the committee of the recommendations from the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommends that the course proposals for ECE 813, ECE 814, ECE 817, ECE 819, FABE 481, and FABE 650 be approved and that ECE 715 be approved contingent upon receipt of concurrence from CSE.
   3.2. Rob Wagoner made a motion that these course requests be approved with the contingency upon ECE 715. Chuck Moore seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Bob Sykes briefed the committee on the two outstanding issues concerning the Biomedical Engineering BS Degree Proposal. The issue concerning admission to program has been resolved. The issue concerning concurrences on the course requests accompanying the proposal is still a concern. To date only CSE and ChBE have expressed any concerns while ECE has fully concurred. Biomedical is currently working with CSE and ChBE to resolve their concerns. The floor was opened for discussion.
4.1. Mike Moran stated that ME does have a concern about the additional teaching load for their courses but that this is an issue that the department chair and the dean will need to resolve.

4.2. Rob Wagoner stated that he had not seen the request for concurrence yet. Rich Hart commented that a copy of the request for concurrence had been sent to each of the department chairs and that the departments who had not responded had been reminded in an Executive Committee meeting that a response was needed.

4.3. It was decided that the committee secretary would send a copy of the current proposal, the course packet, and the request for concurrence to all committee members and the department chairs with the understanding that if a response was not received back by the 26th of February that it will be assumed that the non responding departments concur with the proposal and course requests.

5. Bob Sykes informed the committee that Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B had received and read Aviation’s MS in Air Transportation Systems Proposal. The subcommittee is actively considering the proposal and does have some questions about it specifically, how do other programs with transportation interests feel about it. The review of the proposal will not be completed by next meeting, but should be completed early spring quarter.

6. Mike Moran briefed the committee on Aviation’s new Undergraduate Track in Aviation Proposal. The subcommittee met with Aviation early winter quarter and since then Aviation has responded to the subcommittee’s concerns. There have been some additional meetings and some additional revisions to the proposal since then. The subcommittee is willing to endorse the proposal in its current form. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The statement was made that the new track has more of an engineering component than Aviation’s other tracks as it has a design component and is more analytical than Aviation’s other tracks. In addition, Aviation plans on applying for ABET accreditation with this new track. It was strongly recommended that the proposal be unequivocal on this matter.

6.2. It was pointed out the courses associated with this new track have already been approved by CCAA.

6.3. The question was asked as to whether or not Aviation’s current program is accredited by ABET. The response was that it is not.

6.4. It was decided that a vote on this proposal would be delayed until the committee’s next meeting so that an executive summary of the proposal could be distributed to everyone. If anyone has any questions or issues after reading the executive summary they should send them to Nawal Taneja or Jerry Chubb.

7. Mike Moran briefed the committee on the Environmental Engineering BS Degree Proposal. The work on this proposal is almost finished and there is the possibility that the subcommittee will be ready to make a formal recommendation to the full
committee at its next meeting. The committee chair requested that an Executive Summary from the proposal be distributed to the committee prior to a formal recommendation so that everyone will have time to read it before the meeting.

8. Rob Wagoner presented the CCAA-ASAP Study Subcommittee’s final report to the committee. About ten people made comments about the report after it was presented at the CCAA’s January meeting. The subcommittee met after the comments were received and revised the report (revised report is attached). Rob informed the committee that the main differences between this report and the previous report are that the controversial paragraph in the background section has been deleted, the duties of ASAP have been clarified, clarification has been made on to what courses dismissed students can take, and that a deadline has been set on when a student must be notified they are on probation.

8.1. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1.1. The question was raised as to whether this document will determine program dismissal policies. The response was that this document is an enabling document for ASAP and will give it the rules and procedures needed for it to function.

8.1.2. The question was raised as to who will be the members of ASAP. The response was that the current members would continue serving.

8.2. Rob Wagoner made a motion that CCAA form a standing subcommittee called the Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP), that the policies in the CCAA-ASAP Study Subcommittee’s final report be approved by CCAA for the operation of ASAP, and that the current roster and terms of members of the old ASAP committee be continued in the newly formed ASAP Subcommittee. Mike Moran seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

9. Bruce Weide presented a proposal (attached) to the committee that would add CSE 214 to the list of courses in the Programming Topic in the General Engineering Category in the Selected Core. This proposal has been approved by the Core Curriculum and UG Services Committee and is being brought to CCAA for final approval. CSE wants to add 214 to the list of approved courses so that students can have the opportunity to take a Java programming course and have it count as a programming course in the Selected Core. This will be especially useful for two categories of students: (1) those who get AP credit for CSE 201 and CSE 214 (which can be achieved by getting a 4/5 on the CS-AB AP exam), and (2) those who get AP credit only for CSE 201 (which can be achieved by getting a 3 on the CS-AB AP exam or by getting a 4/5 on the CS-A AP exam) and who would like to gain deeper expertise in Java by taking CSE 214, since by exclusion they are not eligible to take CSE 202. The floor was opened for discussion.

9.1. There being no discussion Rob Wagoner made a motion that CSE 214 be added to the list of courses in the Programming Topic in the General
Engineering Category in the Selected Core. Dave Tomasko seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Bob Gustafson informed the committee that the College of Engineering has the opportunity to nominate a faculty member to be a member of the new GEC Oversight Committee that will be reporting to CAA. This committee will be the group that will be overseeing the GEC for non Arts & Science colleges. In addition, we have the opportunity to nominate a faculty member to be a member of CAA. While we can nominate people to these positions there is no guarantee that they will be chosen. George Valco, who is currently a member of CAA, was asked as to what the time commitment would be. George stated that while it is a substantial time commitment he has not been appointed to some of his departmental committees because of it. George also stated that CAA considers a wide range of policy issues beyond curriculum proposals. Committee members were asked to let Bob know if they have any suggested names or to have that person contact Bob directly.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 AM.

C: College Faculty
CCAA File
Final Report of the CCAA/ASAP Ad-hoc Subcommittee

Rob Wagoner – Chair
Ed McCaul - Secretary
Dave Tomasko
Linda Wang
Gary Kinzel
Ruby Smith
Pam Hussen
Chuck Klein
Bob Gustafson

This report consists of a motion to CCAA and background information.

Moved:
1. That CCAA form a standing subcommittee called the Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP),
2. that the attached policies be approved by CCAA for the operation of ASAP, and
3. that the current roster and terms of members of the old ASAP committee be continued in the newly-formed ASAP Subcommittee.

Background:
The ad-hoc subcommittee determined that the current ASAP committee is a standing committee of the College of Engineering that has existed, under various names, since at least the 1980’s and possibly longer. Its purpose has been to take actions regarding academic warning, probation, and dismissal. It may have at some time had a role in enrollment management, but not currently. In recent years it has reviewed and carried out actions related to Special Action Probation (SAP) and Academic Probation.

The College of Engineering Pattern of Administration states that CCAA has responsibility for “educational and academic policies of the College.” It is therefore appropriate that ASAP should be formed as a subcommittee of CCAA and that its establishment and operational policies should be approved by CCAA. Since some of ASAP’s operation involves blanket approval of actions consistent with approved departmental SAP policies, those policies should also be approved by CCAA.

The proposed operational policies (attached) reflect the current operation of ASAP. Changes, such as required minute-taking, are clarifications deemed necessary by the ad-hoc subcommittee.

att: Operating Policy for the Standing Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) of CCAA
Items to refer to the ASAP Subcommittee for discussion and future action
Operating Policy for the Standing Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) of CCAA

February 7, 2007

1.0 History:

The Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) evolved from a committee established in approximately 1990 to monitor policies established and issues arising as the college and departments began to manage enrollments. The subcommittee was established by the Engineering College Dean.

2.0 Position in College:

ASAP is a standing subcommittee of CCAA. Conforming with the College of Engineering’s Pattern of Administration, at least one member of ASAP must be a CCAA member.

3.0 Duties:

ASAP has the responsibility to recommend policies and rules relative to academic standards controlling warning, probation, and dismissal of undergraduate students in the Engineering College, to implement appropriate actions in these areas, and to monitor the progress of students in academic difficulty. ASAP does not consider or regulate program admission requirements, except as they interact with warning, probation, and dismissal. Specific duties include:

3.1 Develop, update, and act upon CCAA-approved policies for students being given an academic warning, being placed on probation, or being dismissed from the College.

3.2 Review policies of individual departments regarding probation and dismissals and recommend approval of such policies to CCAA.

3.3 Review and approve departmental/programmatic recommendations for warning, probation, and dismissal actions ensuring compliance with their approved departmental/programmatic policies. While the departmental/programmatic policy and recommendations should always be strongly considered, the voting subcommittee has the authority to decide the final outcome in all cases.

3.4 Recommend actions regarding undecided pre-major students.

3.5 Recommend to CCAA such actions, policies, or procedures that may reduce the number of students in academic difficulty.

4.0 Membership:

4.1 Each undergraduate program in the College shall recommend, for appointment by the dean, a faculty member to represent their program on ASAP. The designated
faculty member will generally be the Undergraduate Program Chair. When a
department has multiple programs, different programs may be represented by the same
faculty member if they so choose; however, that faculty member will be allowed only
one vote.

4.2 Undergraduate Program Advisors are asked to attend meetings of the
subcommittee and have all privileges of the meeting except the vote. However,
one Undergraduate Program Advisor, designated by the advisors annually shall
have voting rights on ASAP.

4.3 A student member shall be appointed by the dean. The student member may
vote on all policy issues but not on actions regarding the status of individual
students. The term of the student member would normally be one year;
however, their membership can be renewed for additional years if both the
student and subcommittee agree.

4.4 The Minority Engineering Program shall designate a member with voting rights.

4.5 The Women in Engineering Program shall recommend, for appointment by the
dean, a member with voting rights.

4.6 The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services shall
serve as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member of ASAP.

4.7 A College staff member who monitors student status shall serve as an Ex-
Officio member with voting rights. This member will be appointed by the dean.

4.8 Departments/programs may delegate an alternative voting member for an
absent member. Such delegation must be made in writing prior to the ASAP
meeting.

4.9 At least one member of the ASAP subcommittee must be a member of CCAA.

5.0 Officers:

5.1 During the spring quarter of each year, the subcommittee shall elect a new Chair
for the following year from the continuing members of the subcommittee. No individual
may serve as Chair of ASAP for more than three consecutive one-year terms. The
College Staff representative who monitors student status shall serve as the Secretary of
the subcommittee.

6.0 Meetings:

6.1 The subcommittee shall meet at least once each quarter, normally on the
Thursday following graduation. Other meetings may be called by the Chair if policy
issues arise that cannot be handled during the time of the regular quarterly meeting.

6.2 Minutes will be recorded for each of the meetings. Normally, the minutes will
be recorded by the Secretary. The minutes shall be circulated prior to the next
meeting and a corrected minutes approved at the next meeting. Consistent
with university and FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act)
regulations, the minutes should include:

   6.2.1 A list of those attending the meeting
   6.2.2 A record of all motions and their disposition
   6.2.3 Any policy documents that were distributed at the meeting
6.2.4 Any discussion of principles or policies that lead to a vote

6.3 The College will maintain a repository to archive the meeting minutes and the detailed spreadsheets that are submitted by programs to the ASAP Subcommittee summarizing the pertinent information on each case for which action was taken. The repository will be available to members of the ASAP Subcommittee.

6.4 For voting purposes, a quorum of the ASAP Subcommittee is 50 percent plus 1 of the voting members.

7.0 Operational Definitions:

7.1 Department Dismissal (DD). Department dismissal means that the student will not be allowed to enroll in a given program or in any program-specific course unless it is required in the core of their new major (or by permission of the dismissing program). A department or program may recommend departmental dismissal based on that department’s or program’s SAP policy. No student can be dismissed from a department unless he or she is already on probation. Departments (or programs) may specify in their policy the number of times that a student may be dismissed and reinstated to their programs. Department/program dismissal is authorized under the SAP Rules of the University [3335-9-25(B)].

7.2 College Dismissal (CD). College dismissal means that the student will not be allowed to enroll in any program in the College of Engineering without submitting a petition for reinstatement. A college-dismissed student will not be allowed to enroll in any course that is open only to engineering students in the College of Engineering unless required in the core of their new major (or by permission of the unit offering such course). The subcommittee may college dismiss a student if it determines that the student:

7.2.1 has been accepted to a major, is departmentally dismissed, and has a cumulative gpa (“gpa” = grade point average) less than 2.0, or
7.2.2 is unlikely to succeed in any program in the college, or
7.2.3 is in the Re-Exploration or Engineering Undecided program and fails to meet the terms of their probation, or
7.2.4 has shown a lack of progress by failing to take any engineering core, select core, or major courses for their past three quarters of enrollment or more.

No student can be dismissed from the college unless he or she is already on probation. No student may be reinstated more than two times in the College. College dismissal is authorized under the SAP Rules of the University [3335-9-25(B)].

7.3 Academic Dismissal (AD). Academic dismissal is defined by University Rule 3335-9-26.
Students who do not meet university academic standards will be dismissed (AD) from the University. No student can be dismissed from the University unless he or she is already on probation. Students who have been dismissed cannot enroll in any courses taught at the University. This action is taken under University Rule 3335-9-26.

8.0 ASAP Subcommittee Operations:

8.1 All ASAP college-wide operational policies must be approved by CCAA and will to be made public by being placed in the CCAA Handbook.

8.2 Before taking effect, all departmental/program policies must be approved by CCAA following a review and recommendation from ASAP. These policies will be made public by being placed in the CCAA handbook and on the appropriate web page. Departments may request CCAA consideration of proposed policies whether they are recommended for approval by ASAP or not.

8.3 If a program elects not to participate in actions under Special Action Probation [University Rule 3335-9-25(B)], only the academic policy of the University will apply (University Rule 3335-9-26).

8.4 If a conflict arises between Departmental and ASAP policies, ASAP policies shall prevail.

8.5 ASAP takes final action on all probation and dismissal recommendations in the College of Engineering, including CD and DD. Final action means that the department/program may not deviate from the ASAP decision with one narrow exception. When the outcome of a case that was recommended and approved based on objective departmental standards (e.g. grades, gpa) would be changed by new objective information (e.g., new grade, gpa), the department may revise the outcome and notify ASAP (Chair or Secretary) accordingly. The secretary will record the change and will report it as part of the Minutes. This exception does not apply to other new, non-grade based information such as personal or health updates.

8.6 In practice, departmental recommendations consistent with the approved objective (i.e. grade-based) policies for that program will normally not be discussed by ASAP before acting, but will simply be approved unless a subcommittee member, the department/program involved, or the student in question requests a discussion. Departments / Programs must certify that such cases are consistent with their and the College’s published, objective policies.

8.7 ASAP discusses departmental recommendations before acting on them if:

8.7.1 The objective standards in the approved department policy statement are contrary to, are ambiguous about, or do not address the action proposed,

8.7.2 The proposed action is based on subjective standards (i.e. “lack of progress”),

8.7.3 The program requests a review,

8.7.4 A member of the ASAP Subcommittee or CCAA committee requests a review,

8.7.5 A student appeals a previous decision (after first appealing to the program), or

8.7.6 The department policy is unapproved or out-of-date.
8.8 Reports by the ASAP chair or designee will be made to CCAA of unusual issues or proposed policy changes.
8.9 The ASAP Subcommittee does not consider or regulate program admission or reinstatement requirements, except as they interact with SAP.
8.10 Notification of a student of SAP actions will be consistent with OSU notification procedures.
8.11 Notification of a student going onto probation shall be made by the end of the second week of the quarter.
8.12 The chair of the ASAP Subcommittee (or, if unavailable, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services) can, in extraordinary circumstances, make decisions on behalf of ASAP concerning dismissals if the issue cannot be handled during the time of the regularly scheduled quarterly meeting. If the chair takes such action, the chair must make a report to the full subcommittee at the subcommittee’s next meeting, and the action must be recorded in the minutes.
Items to be referred to ASAP for discussion and potential recommendations to CCAA

- Shall reinstatements be approved by ASAP or be handled exclusively by programs?
- Shall all department dismissals also be college dismissals? (Pre-majors? Majors?)
- Shall programs be permitted to treat students leaving a major (but facing a departmental dismissal) differently from one another?
- In view of privacy concerns, shall ASAP continue to have student members?
- Is the current membership structure of ASAP appropriate?
Proposal to Add CSE 214 to the "Select List" of the Engineering Core
From Minutes of Engineering Core Curriculum and College Services Committee:
Meeting of 5 December 2006
5. Neelam Soundarajan made a motion that CSE 214 be added to the Programming
   topic under the General Engineering category in the Selected Core. Dave Dickinson
   seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   5.1. Everyone was given a copy of a message that Neelam had sent to Gonul
       concerning this topic (attached [see below in this document]). There are two main
       reasons for this request. The first is that this will give a Selected Core programming
       option for those students who would rather learn Java rather than C++ which is taught in
       CSE 202. Second, it would allow those students who score high enough on the AP test
       and get credit for CSE 201, which means that they cannot take CSE 202, to take CSE
       214 and have it count in the Selected Core.
   5.2. The question was asked as to whether there is an AP test for C. The response was
       no.
   5.3. The comment was made that just because CSE 214 is added to the Selected Core
       it does not mean that all programs are automatically forced to accept it. What it means
       is that the college would allow it but programs would have to authorize it.
6. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed and
   will be referred to CCAA for final approval.

Additional Background (if needed):
Currently, CSE 202 is on the "select list" for the Engineering Core. CSE 202 is a
programming course (in C++) for engineers and scientists. Some students who want to
learn Java have, in the past, taken CSE 201 and petitioned to use that in place of CSE
202. This would seem reasonable except that CSE 201 is not intended for engineers
and scientists; it is intended mostly for business students, and assignments are far from
engineering-oriented. In some ways it is easier than CSE 202 and that may have been
part of the motivation for Engineering students to try to take it in place of CSE 202.
Another important concern is that having these students in CSE 201 often has a
negative impact (intimidation factor) on other students in the class. After consideration
of these points in an Engineering Core Committee meeting last year, students have no
longer been allowed by Engineering to substitute CSE 201 for CSE 202. Nevertheless,
there are two questions. The first is about how to help Engineering students who want
to learn Java rather than C++ because they feel that Java is likely to be more important
for them than C++. The other has to do with AP credit. The AP courses/exams in
computer science used to be in C++, but some years ago they moved to Java.
Currently, students with a score of 4/5 in the AP CS-A exam or 3/4/5 in CS-AB are given
credit for CSE 201. This, of course, doesn't help Engineering students since they cannot
use CSE 201 as part of their select core. Moreover, they can't take CSE 202 because
there is an exclusion clause for that course for students with credit for CSE 201 or CSE
221 or EG 167. (That exclusion clause is in place because there is too little new
material in CSE 202 for most such students.) Now, of course, if these (Engineering)
students want to improve their Java knowledge and skills, they could take CSE 214,
which has CSE 201 as a prerequisite and is the second course using Java. But that
wouldn't help them with their Engineering program since CSE 214 is not in the select core. Moreover, after carefully looking through the AP course materials, it is clear that a student who scores very high on the CS-AB exam not only has learned the material in CSE 201 but also the material in CSE 214.

To address all of these issues, CSE suggests the following provisions:

- Score of 3 in CS-AB or 4/5 in CS-A: Credit for CSE 201.
- Score of 4/5 in CS-AB: Credit for CSE 201 and CSE 214.
- Add CSE 214 to the list of engineering "select core" courses (in the programming category).

Note that CSE 202 will still be on the select core as it is now and CSE 201 will *not* be on the select core (again, the latter is the situation now). Note also that offering credits for additional courses based on higher AP scores is not uncommon; for example, this is done by Math.

These changes solve a number of problems. There would be no temptation for Engineering students who have no programming background to take CSE 201 in place of CSE 202, because CSE 201 is still not on the select core; students choosing to take CSE 201 also would have to take CSE 214 to meet the select core requirement. Students who have done well in their AP computer science course and scored a 4/5 in CS-AB really know the material quite well and should get credit for that. By giving them credit for CSE 214 and adding CSE 214 to the select core, we will enable them to use this as part of their Engineering curriculum in programs that choose to authorize CSE 214 as part of their select list from the core. Finally, students who have taken the AP course but have not done quite that well and want to improve their Java knowledge and skills will be able to take CSE 214, which they will then be able to count in those Engineering programs. Moreover, the business students who take CSE 214, since they already have completed CSE 201, will not be affected as much by Engineering students also taking CSE 214. So these changes address all the problems noted above.

Based on these considerations, CSE approved these changes and is working with the Registrar's office to put into place the changes regarding AP credit. But, of course, the addition of CSE 214 to the Engineering select core has been approved by the Core Committee (it has; see the first section of this document) and then by CCAA. So the agenda item for CCAA is simple:

- Add CSE 214 to the Select Core in the "Programming" category.

Note that the other courses currently in that category are CSE 202, CSE 221, and EG 167. These would continue to be part of the category.