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

2. The Minutes from the 15 February 2007 meeting were approved as written.

3. Rita Alevriadou informed the committee of the recommendations from the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommends that the course proposals for CSE 204 and MSE 673 be approved and that CSE 203 be approved contingent upon receipt of concurrence from ACCAD.
   3.2. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that these course requests be approved with the contingency upon CSE 203. Charlie Albright seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Chuck Moore informed the committee of the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations concerning BME’s course proposals that are part of their BS Degree Proposal. The subcommittee feels that the proposed courses are typical of other BME programs in the country. BME has made changes to the courses to alleviate CSE’s and ChBE’s concerns as well as renumbering the courses to reflect the normal OSU course numbering system. The course proposal that MSE is objecting to, 431 - Biomaterials, is a viable course that is normally found in a BME curriculum. While the subcommittee feels that there is the potential for a fruitful interchange between BME and MSE on this course, the subcommittee
does not feel that the course should be cross listed with MSE at this time. Chuck Moore made a motion that all of the proposed BME courses be approved without any contingencies. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. Rudy Buchheit stated that while MSE is supportive of the initiate to create the BS degree in BME the department has a fundamental concern about whether students will have absorbed enough life sciences to take this course. Prior to taking 431 the students will only have taken one materials course, MSE 205, and that MSE feels that this is not enough academic preparation for the students. MSE wants to make sure that there is a good integration of the life sciences in 431. A cross listing of this course with MSE will make MSE jointly responsible for the course.

4.2. Rita Alevriadou commented that MSE has stated that they will give concurrence if 431 is cross listed but will not give concurrence if it is not. BME does have some expertise in the area of materials and the instructor who will be teaching 431 will be able to judge if the students have the required knowledge.

4.3. Rudy stated that BME does not have the necessary facilities for the lab component of 431 and that MSE is willing to provide the necessary laboratory facilities no matter if the course is cross listed or not but cross listing will make this arrangement much easier.

4.4. Rich Hart replied that Alan Litsky has stated that he can provide the necessary laboratory facilities for 431. BME plans on starting out with a small number of students so, the initial lab space requirements will be minimal.

4.5. Mike Moran made the suggestion that MSE and BME be given more time to work out their differences. Both department chairs are at this meeting today and it appears that the issues could be worked out. There are fiscal issues involved when additional students are added to the college and these issues need to be taken into consideration.

4.6. Chuck Moore commented that the Course Proposal Subcommittee decided that while fiscal issues are important that they are not the purview of CCAA. The subcommittee did not want to hold up the proposal because of fiscal issues that may not be resolved for a number of months.

4.7. Rudy stated that fiscal issues are not the concern for MSE. Rather MSE is concerned with the academic issue of whether the students will gain enough knowledge from MSE 205 to fully prepare them for 431. There is not enough flexibility in BME’s proposed curriculum to allow an additional prerequisite to be added to 431.

4.8. Mike Moran made a motion that the original motion be amended to drop BME 431 from consideration at this time.

4.9. Chuck Moore commented that there have been a number of requests for input on the proposal and that he does not feel that it is right to give people another opportunity for additional input.
4.10. Rudy commented that MSE views itself as the Materials Science steward of the college and that MSE will only concur with 431 if it is cross listed with MSE.

4.11. The question was asked if MSE was willing to teach 431 every other year. Rudy replied that MSE would be willing, but that such an arrangement would need to be worked out between MSE and BME like it is for every other cross listed course.

4.12. The question was raised as to what would happen to the proposal if BME 431 was pulled out. The committee secretary informed the committee that all new courses associated with the proposal must go forward with it. If 431 is pulled out the proposal would either have to wait until it is approved or the proposal would need to be rewritten to exclude 431.


4.14. Rudy stated that he does not want to delay the proposal and as long as BME will agree to continue working on cross listing 431 MSE will withdrawal their objection.

4.15. Charlie Albright withdrew his seconding of Mike Moran’s motion. No one else was willing to second Mike’s motion so, it was dropped from consideration.

4.16. A vote was taken on the motion that all of the proposed BME courses be approved without any contingencies. 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

5. It was decided that the BME proposal would be sent back to Curriculum Subcommittee B for a final review due to the number of changes that have been made in the proposal since the subcommittee last reviewed it.

6. The committee was informed that Curriculum Subcommittee B is reviewing the Aviation MS in Air Transportation Systems Proposal. The subcommittee has some questions about the proposals for which they are currently seeking answers.

7. The committee reviewed the executive summary for the proposed Air Transportation Systems Undergraduate Track in Aviation (attached). A few grammatical changes in the executive summary were suggested. The proposal has been reviewed by Curriculum Subcommittee A. Mike Moran informed the committee that Aviation is proposing this track as they want to upgrade the amount of engineering in their curriculum. They are currently interviewing faculty to teach the students who want to take this track but they need the track approved to hire the new faculty. Eventually Aviation plans on applying for ABET accreditation. Mike Moran made a motion to approve Aviation’s proposed Air Transportation Systems Undergraduate Track. George Valco seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
8. The committee was informed that Curriculum Subcommittee A has not yet received the revised the Environmental Engineering BS Degree Proposal.

9. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that the Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) has submitted policies from ChBE, CE & Envir, CSE, ECE, FABE, Geomatics, IWSE, Re-Exploring, and Engineering Undecided. Previously CCAA has approved the Operating Policy for ASAP as well as the policies for Aero, MSE, and ME. Engineering Physics is the only program that has not submitted a policy. ASAP has requested that CCAA approved all of the submitted policies. Chuck Moore made a motion that CCAA approve all of the proposals submitted by ASAP. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Rita Alevriadou informed the committee about the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s proposed changes to the college’s syllabus requirements. Currently, there is no university requirement for a syllabus to be given to the students. The proposal would make it a college requirement that a syllabus would have to be given to all of the students taking a course. The proposal is also more specific about what is required on the syllabus especially ABET criteria. In addition, the proposal states that a disabilities and academic misconduct statement must be part of the classroom syllabus. The floor was opened for discussion.
   10.1. The comment was made that while we should urge instructors to give all of their students a syllabus that we should not mandate it due to academic freedom.
   10.2. The question was asked as to how such a rule would be enforced. What would happen if someone did not pass out a syllabus?
   10.3. The comment was made that while we could require a syllabus in a specific format be submitted with a course proposal can we really require a syllabus to be given to students.
   10.4. The question was raised as to what happens if an academic misconduct statement is not included on a syllabus. The reply was that if such a statement was not included and a student was brought up on academic misconduct charges that the committee reviewing the case would berate you and question whether the student could be brought up on academic misconduct charges.
   10.5. The question was raised as to why departments could not be required to put all of their syllabi on line.
   10.6. The committee decided to discuss this issue at its next meeting and that if anyone had any comments concerning this issue that they should send them to the committee secretary.

11. The committee was given a copy of the Council on Academic Affairs approved version of the Societal Perspectives in Science and Technology Minor. Arts and Science has stated that Engineering 367 would be added as a core course to the minor. George Valco informed the committee that adding Engineering 367 to this
minor caused CAA to ask Arts and Science to review the extent to which 367 courses are being used in minors, and determine the extent to which such use is appropriate given the expectations of course content for general education curriculum courses.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

C: College Faculty
CCAA File
Proposed NEW Undergraduate Track in Aviation: Executive Summary

The Department of Aviation in the College of Engineering wants to secure CAA approval to offer a new track for the Bachelor of Science in Aviation. This proposal has been prepared in response to the reorganization of Aviation curricula following the reformation of the Department of Aviation with the separation of the Aviation Program from the combined Aerospace Engineering and Aviation Department in January 2005. Earlier, a Task Force on Aviation appointed by the Dean then, James Williams, strongly recommended an autonomous Department of Aviation and the establishment of both undergraduate and graduate programs in Air Transportation Systems (ATS). That study noted a national and international need for qualified professionals to work in the air transportation system. ATS graduates would fill a critical need for people who know how to appropriately design the organization, do the systems engineering, perform operations management, and implement the technological innovations required to meet current and future demands. This need is distinctly different from the design of new aircraft and the training of pilots; this unmet need to provide ATS specialists is believed to be a principal cause of the troubled operation of current air transportation systems.

Further, this proposal is in support of the current Dean’s direction (Dr. Baeslack) to better align the Aviation academic program with the College’s mission, by providing instruction more compatible with undergraduate engineering students. This program would have strong emphasis on analysis, design, and engineering as it relates to Aviation. This new program will focus on overall systems and operations engineering rather than the design of component products or processes. Industrial and systems engineering serves as a core disciplinary model for this program; that relationship is not unlike the one between mechanical and aerospace engineering. However, aviation is the most heavily regulated industry in the world. Our students also need to be grounded in the federal regulatory process that affects design, manufacturing, repair, and personnel certification as well as the economic and policy issues that strongly influence Aviation. Finally, the ATS track being proposed here has been developed to meet the requirements for ABET (Accrediting Board of Engineering and Technology) accrediting in Systems Engineering.

The proposed curriculum also provides the analysis and design foundation for our complementary proposal to establish a graduate program of study for the M.S. in Air Transportation Systems. A separate and related Graduate Program proposal has been prepared and is being submitted in parallel to this undergraduate proposal. Courses in the undergraduate program may eventually become prerequisites for graduate courses, and some of the proposed upper-level undergraduate courses may be used as technical electives in graduate programs in this or other departments.

An important link between the undergraduate and graduate programs will be the faculty. All present tenured / tenure track faculty (and all future tenure track faculty will) have engineering degrees. The current faculty in the Aviation Department consists of 6 full time faculty (incl. 2 Lecturers). The department has already been awarded one
additional faculty position by the College to support the staffing of our proposed M.S. program (being separately submitted) and a new track in the undergraduate level (this proposal). This undergraduate track will be in Air Transportation Systems. Accordingly, new faculty additions will be hired into areas that will contribute to both the BS and MS programs. The recruiting for the one approved new faculty member has already begun. With the total number of anticipated faculty available being 7, if initially (on an interim basis) each taught 2-3 graduate courses per year, the basic curriculum needs would be met. As the program attracts students and funded research support, faculty loads will be adjusted accordingly. Normal faculty assignments in undergraduate course teaching and research are compatible with the faculty that have been planned for and budgeted.