1. Attendance:
   Aero – Jen-Ping Chen
   AVN – Not present (Chul Lee)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Chuck Moore
   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 – Not present (Dave Farson)
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Harry Pierson and Hannah Gustafson
   Undergraduate Student – Timothy Schroeder (not present Rebecca Murphy)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Pam Hussen

2. The Minutes from the 28 November 2007 meeting were approved as written.

3. Jen-Ping Chen presented the committee with Subcommittee A’s recommendation on the proposed revision to the college’s and ME’s ASAP Policy (attached). The committee was informed that the subcommittee has been working with Gary Kinzel and Ruby Smith on these revisions and that the subcommittee is recommending that the revisions as shown in the attachment be approved. The question was asked as to how a student becomes academically dismissed. The response was that a student is academically dismissed when their deficiency points, based on a low grade point average, reach a certain level after they have previously been placed on probation. There being no further discussion Jen-Ping Chen made a motion that the revisions to the college’s and Mechanical Engineering’s ASAP Policies be approved. Chuck Moore seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Jen-Ping Chen presented the committee with Subcommittee A’s recommendation on the proposed department name change for Industrial, Welding and Systems Engineering (attached). The proposal has been revised since the committee last saw it to include more information on student involvement and a better explanation of the administrative measures that will be taken concerning Welding Engineering once the proposal has been fully approved. Jen-Ping Chen made a motion that the proposed name change of the
Department of Industrial, Welding and Systems Engineering to the Department of Integrated Systems Engineering be approved. Clark Mount-Campbell seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The question was raised as to why the proposal only states that the creation of a Welding Section will be addressed after the proposal has been approved rather than creating a Welding Section now. The response was that the Welding faculty have not initiated this discussion.

4.2. The comment was made that there appear to be an unsatisfied group whose issues have not been fully addressed in the proposal. The response was that everyone agreed that the current name is unacceptable but that no one could come up with a new name with which everyone could agree on. Consequently, the proposed name is a compromise.

4.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

5. Jen-Ping Chen made a motion that the proposal be voted on by the faculty at the next college faculty meeting but, if a quorum was not present at the meeting, that the vote be conducted in a method authorized by the faculty rules. Clark Mount-Campbell seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The comment was made that having the issue discussed at a faculty meeting was important as the issue needs to be discussed at an open forum.

5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. Clark Mount-Campbell informed the committee that Subcommittee B is on the 4th draft of the transfer credit across the college proposal but that it is still not ready to be brought before the full committee. In addition, the subcommittee has not heard anything from Aviation concerning their master’s degree proposal. The chair informed the committee that he had e-mailed Aviation last week on this issue and was informed that they would let him know something this week.

7. Bob Gustafson informed the committee that the Outcomes Assessment Committee has discussed the ABET requirement of 48 hours in math and basic science. The committee determined that there is no flexibility in this requirement and that programs, especially those whose curriculum is right on the border for this requirement, need to monitor their students to ensure that they meet the requirement. There is nothing CCAA can do about this issue.

8. The chair informed the committee that Civil has submitted a curriculum change proposal that involves moving two hours from lower level courses to their capstone courses. The proposal was assigned to Subcommittee A with the Course Proposal Subcommittee working in parallel on the course change requests.
9. The committee was informed that the Biomedical BS Degree Proposal was approved by CAA and will be going to the University Senate.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 PM.

C: College Faculty
   CCAA File
Subcommittee A recommendations of the revision of COE ASAP policies  
1-14-2008

The revised proposal submitted by the ASAP subcommittee has two changes:

**Page.5: Clarification of 8.10 in the old version**

Old:

8.7 Individual programs alone have the authority to reinstate students who have previously dismissed.

New:

8.10 After the ASAP Committee approves a dismissal, the following policies shall apply:

8.10.1 When a student is Academically Dismissed, no department or program may reinstate the student for a minimum of three quarters

8.10.2 After a student has been Academically Dismissed for three quarters, any department or program has the authority to reinstate the student to their program

8.10.3 No Academically Dismissed student may be reinstated unless into a department or program

8.10.4 When a student is Departmentally or College Dismissed, any department or program has the authority to immediately reinstate the student to their program

Recommendation: approve

**Page 39: Revised policy of mechanical engineering**

The following conditions must be met to be considered in good academic standing in the Mechanical Engineering degree program:

1. A quarter point-hour ratio (QPHR) of 2.0 or above in all courses taken at The Ohio State University

2. A cumulative point-hour ratio (CPHR) of 2.0 or above in all courses taken at The Ohio State University

3. A cumulative secondary point-hour ratio (SPHR) of 2.0 or above in all required premajor courses taken at The Ohio State University. If a course is taken multiple times, all grade earned will be used in the SPHR calculation with the exception of any grades that have been “forgiven” according to University Faculty Rule 3335-8-27.1 (Freshman forgiveness rule).

4. A cumulative point-hour ratio of 2.0 or above in all major courses taken at The Ohio State University (MPHR). Prior to fall quarter of 2007, the MPHR was based on all grades earned in a given course. After summer quarter of 2007, the MPHR will be based on the best grade earned in a given course. Therefore, if a course is taken multiple times, only the highest grade earned will be used in the MPHR calculation.

Recommendation: approve

Comment: change 'all grade' to 'all grades' in items 3.
A revised proposal was submitted by IWSE chair Julia Higle. In which the question raised by subcommittee A on the original proposal to clarify the suggestions made by the Welding Engineering Transition Planning Committee that administrative measures should be taken to ensure visibility of the WE program once the department is renamed. The revision is the following:

‘They (the planning committee) suggested a change in the administrative structure of the program leading to the formal creation of a “Welding Engineering Section” within the department. This will require discussion and a vote from the department faculty. As of now, the Welding faculty has not initiated this discussion. Upon approval of this proposal, the department faculty will address this suggestion if they have not done so by then.’

The department has also initiated a review of the recruiting methods to determine whether they might enhance visibility of the program through other methods.

Ed’s draft minutes of the last meeting say:

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.

Recommendation:

Subcommittee A decided that the revised proposal has cleared the question raised before and the proposal is fine. However, the approval of this proposal should be subject to a CoE faculty vote where all interested faculty have a chance to voice their concerns.