1. Attendance:
   Aero – Jen-Ping Chen
   AVN – Not present (Chul Lee)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS –
      Civil – Chuck Moore
      Environmental – Not represented
      Geomatics – Not represented
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – George Valco - Chair
   ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)
   FAB – Bob Gustafson (for Alfred Soboyejo)
   IWSE –
      ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell
      WLD – Dave Farson
   MSE – Not present (Kathy Flores)
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Harry Pierson and Hannah Gustafson
   Undergraduate Student – Timothy Schroeder and Rebecca Murphy
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Julie Higle, Judith McDonald, Ruby Smith, Jessica Mercerhill

2. The Minutes from the 14 November 2007 meeting were approved as written.

3. Rita Alevriadou informed the committee of the recommendations of the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommended that the new course requests for ChBE 702; ChBE 713; ChBE 734, contingent upon receipt of concurrence from Statistics; ChBE 755; ChBE 777 contingent upon receipt of a new form and syllabus that reflect the proper prerequisites; ChBE 780, contingent upon receipt of concurrence from Statistics; and that the withdrawal requests for BME 581, 582, and 692 be approved.
   3.2. Bruce Weide requested that CSE be allowed to concur on ChBE 734. Dave Tomasko agreed to this request.
   3.3. George Valco requested that ECE be allowed to concur on ChBE 777. Dave Tomasko agreed to this request.
   3.4. Rita informed the committee that the subcommittee had some concerns about how ChBE 713, Fuel Cells and Catalysis, would interact with other courses covering this topic. It was pointed out that Chemistry, ME, and MSE had concurred on this course and that it was a topic that different disciplines had an interest in.
3.5. There being no further discussion Rita made a motion to approve the course requests with the noted contingencies on ChBE 734, ChBE 777, and ChBE 780. Dave Tomasko seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Jen-Ping Chen told the committee that Gary Kinzel informed him that the revised ASAP Policy should be given to the subcommittee at the beginning of winter quarter.

5. Jen-Ping presented Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B’s summary of the IWSE Department name change proposal. Currently, the department is called Industrial, Welding and Systems Engineering and offers two distinct degree programs: Industrial and Systems Engineering and Welding Engineering. At the undergraduate level, these programs have exactly one course in common and, aside from that, they are complete disjointed. At the graduate level, there are no common course requirements. The current name has been a problem for the department since it was adopted in 1994. The department is often misunderstood as Industrial Welding Systems. Changing the name of the department has been a part of the department’s strategic plan for many years. The first attempt to change the name was in 2002 when the faculty voted 14 to 10 in favor of a new name, Industrial Engineering, but the action was held due to the simple majority. The matter was brought up again with the name Integrated Systems Engineering with a vote of 18 to 9 in favor of the proposed name. It appears all who have an interest in this matter agree that it is not whether the old name should or should not be changed but what new name should be chosen. The most concerned group is the Welding Engineering whose main concern is that its identity may be lost in this name change. To assist in maintaining the identity of the WE program, a committee chaired by Karl Graff, a former chair of the WE Department, suggested administrative measures be taken to ensure visibility of the WE program once the department is renamed. The department agreed to address this suggestion once the proposal is approved. However, these measures are not included in the proposal. The subcommittee recommended that these suggestions be included in the proposal so that CCAA could have a record and also have an understanding of the department’s plan in this direction. This suggestion was made to Dr. Julia Higle, the ISWE department chair.

6. Julia Higle was introduced to the committee and gave the committee some background on the proposal. In 1948 the department split into two separate departments but in 1994 they were forced to merge at which time the current name was adopted. The name was adopted even though everyone knew that it was not a good one but no one could come up with a better one. There has been about a year since the faculty voted on the proposed name change and the proposal being sent forward. The year has been spent talking to various groups and developing additional support for the name change. An idea that is being
worked on is making both Welding and Industry separate sections for administrative purposes. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The question was asked as to why the proposal did not have any input from the Welding Advisory Board while it had input from the Industrial Advisor Board. The reply was that the Industrial Advisor Board was in session because the program is working on a curriculum revision and it was decided to take advantage of the opportunity.

6.2. The question was asked as to why Welding does not have a ranking. The reply was that Welding does not have a peer group. OSU Welding Engineering is the only Welding Engineering Program in the country as all of the others are Welding Technology. This is understood by the welding community but not by outsiders.

6.3. The question was asked as to whether other options were being considered such as having separate departments for Industrial and Welding. The response was that no other options were being considered and that the dean has stated that the two programs would stay as one department.

6.4. The question was asked as to how many faculty are in each program. The response was that there are 17.67 faculty in Industrial, the fraction of a person is due to faculty being in multiple departments, and 7 faculty in Welding.

6.5. The question was asked as to whether this proposal should be voted on by the college faculty as a whole. The committee secretary informed the committee that approving the proposal would be a two step process. First, CCAA would approve or disapprove the proposal. If CCAA approves the proposal then CCAA votes on whether the proposal should be voted on by the faculty as a whole either in a faculty meeting or by mail ballot.

6.6. The question was raised as to who else in the college is aware of this proposal. Julia responded that she believed that all of the chairs know about it. It was decided that all members need to discuss the proposal with the faculty in their department to let as many people as possible know about it.

6.7. The comment was made that there was only one mention of student input in the proposal. Before the proposal gets sent to CAA more student input will need to be documented.

7. Clark Mount-Campbell informed the committee that nothing has been heard or received concerning the Aviation MS proposal and that he has just received a revised Transfer Credit Across the College proposal from Judith McDonald.

8. Jessica Mercerhill briefed the committee on the Cluster Pilot Program. The idea for the cluster program is to combine two to three GEC courses with a theme that crosses different disciplines. They just finished their review of proposals for the 2008-2009 academic year and will be putting out during winter quarter a request for proposals for the 2009-2010 academic year. These proposals would be due in autumn quarter 2008. Jessica stated that she would be willing to work with
anyone who is interested in submitting a proposal. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. The question was asked as to whether any clusters exist outside of Arts & Science. The reply was that a cluster that included FAES and SBS has recently been approved.

8.2. The question was asked as to whether the policy of only providing funding for Arts & Science clusters is still in effect. The response was that yes it is but that she is working on getting it changed.

8.3. The question was asked as to the process a non GEC approved course would need to go through if it is part of a proposal. The reply was that it would need to go through the normal GEC approval process but that once it is part of a cluster a strong letter of recommendation from the Cluster Approval Committee would accompany it.

8.4. The comment was made that due to the prerequisites for most courses in Engineering majors that any Engineering cluster course would need to be a course created specifically for the cluster program with the idea of making it a GEC course.

8.5. The question was asked as to what clusters have been approved. The response was that a Before History Cluster with Astronomy, Anthropology, and Geological Sciences and a Living Chemistry Cluster with Biology and Chemistry have been approved.

8.6. The question was asked as to whether a student who starts in a cluster must take all of the courses in a cluster. The response was no but that it was hoped that they would be interested in the overall topic enough to take all of the courses. In addition, they get preference in scheduling the courses that are part of the cluster.

9. Judith McDonald briefed the committee on substitution petitions that were approved by the college last year. Judith stated that outside of math, chemistry, and physics they try to be very liberal with substitutions for liberal art GEC courses. Judith is working with Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B to develop a uniform policy for the college on substitutions for courses in the Engineering core as well as the selected core and major courses. The idea is that substitutions for core courses will follow a student when they change a major while substitutions for selected core and major courses will not automatically follow a student. The question was asked as to the process for a substitution. The reply was that the petitions are initiated by the academic advisor at the department level.

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