1. Attendance:
   Aero – Jen-Ping Chen
   AVN – Not present (Jerry Chubb)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Not present (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 – Hannah Gustafson and Harry Pierson
   Undergraduate Student – Timothy Schroeder (not present Rebecca Murphy)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Pam Hussen, Judith McDonald

2. The Minutes from the 1 April 2008 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Rita Alevriadou presented the committee with the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations. The subcommittee is recommending that the following course requests be approved:
   3.1. Course Withdrawal: Aviation 540. The content of the course has been incorporated into other courses. There being no discussion Rita Alevriadou made a motion that the course request be approved. Marcelo Dapino seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
   3.2. Industrial and Systems Engineering is requesting that the program’s course designation be changed from INDENG to ISE. In addition, they are submitting a mass request to renumber their courses. The subcommittee met with Clark Mount-Campbell concerning the request and he has added a section on the logic behind the renumbering as well as explained to the subcommittee about the few courses whose numbers are being lowered. Completed course requests have been sent to all programs whose cross listed courses will be impacted by these changes. The floor was opened for discussion.
     3.2.1. The question was asked as to whether there will be any changes in the credit hours for any of the courses. The response was no, credit hours are not being changed.
     3.2.2. The question was asked about the courses shown as being in process. The response was that these courses have recently been approved by
CCAA and are not yet completely through the approval process at the university level.

3.2.3. It was pointed out that in a few cases Engineering Mechanics courses are shown as new prerequisites but that this was not possible as Engineering Mechanics no longer exists. It was decided that the subcommittee would work with Clark Mount-Campbell to fix this oversight.

3.2.4. There being no further discussion Rita Alevriadou made a motion that the course requests be approved subject to correcting new prerequisites so that the Engineering Mechanics courses are changed to reflect the current Mechanical Engineering courses. Clark Mount-Campbell seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Clark Mount-Campbell informed the committee that Subcommittee B has not yet received a revised version of the Minor in Computational Science Proposal.

5. Clark Mount-Campbell presented the proposed CCAA Policy for Applying Engineering Students’ Transfer Credit (attached). It was decided that the proposal would be considered one section at a time.

5.1. The first section deals with transfer credit for GEC courses and the proposed policy states: “If a student has the total number of credit hours needed for graduation, he or she will not be required to “make up hours” in any particular GEC category when course requirements are met by transferred courses having fewer hours than the OSU course(s) for which that credit was granted.” The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1.1. It was pointed out that some of the math and science courses our students take are GEC courses and would be included in this policy even though many in Engineering typically only think of liberal art courses as GEC courses.

5.1.2. It was pointed out that the proposed policy does not include any provision for ABET requirements which dictate the minimum number hours in math and basic science that our students must take. It was proposed to change the policy so that it would read: “If a student has the total number of credit hours needed for graduation, he or she will not be required to “make up hours” in any particular GEC category when course requirements are met by transferred courses having fewer hours than the OSU course(s) for which that credit was granted. If any program has an hour or proportional number of hours requirement for ABET, that requirement will take precedence.”

5.1.3. The question was asked as to whether students would be allowed to take courses again if they wish to under this policy. The response was that this policy does not prohibit it but that the offering department would have to allowed them to.

5.1.4. There being no further discussion Clark Mount-Campbell made a motion that the policy be approved as changed. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.
5.2. The second section deals with required Engineering Central Core courses and the proposed policy states: “Chemistry 121, Physics 131 and 132 are required Central Core courses. The substitution of general credits for Chemistry or Physics will be permitted if and only if the appropriate department (i.e., Chemistry or Physics) has determined that the student may advance into the next course. At this point the student would be able to substitute the course(s) they have transferred for Physics 131 or Chemistry 121 as appropriate. Furthermore, once a petition is approved for a Central Core course it is valid for all programs in the college.” The floor was opened for discussion.

5.2.1. It was pointed out that this is the most controversial of the three proposed policies. The key part of the policy is that if the student’s approved transfer credit is determined to be sufficient to allow them to take the follow-on course that they would not be required to take the previous class. This policy would mainly impact Civil and Chemical Engineering as they want their students to take the lab portion of Chemistry 121, and that is often the component missing from the course the student received general credits for. However, Chemistry will allow a student to take Chemistry 122 even if they have not been given credit for the lab portion of Chemistry 121.

5.2.2. The question was asked as to how many students are in this situation. The reply was that this was unknown but a uniform policy is needed so that when a student changes majors they do not have to retake a Central Core course.

5.2.3. The question was asked as to who approves these petitions. The response was that these petitions are approved at the college.

5.2.4. Dave Tomasko commented that Chemical Engineering requires a full year of chemistry and that any student interested in Chemical Engineering would not have a problem with taking chemistry courses. Dave stated that Chemical Engineering does not have any real problem with the policy.

5.2.5. There being no further discussion Bob Gustafson made a motion that the policy be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5.3. The third section deals with Select Core courses and courses approved for a student’s major. The proposed policy states: “Any approved substitution for a Select Core course or other specific advanced major course requirement must state clearly “Approved for Major XXX only.” Furthermore, when a student changes major, the major program must review all approved petitions for the student and decide which ones to accept without requiring the student to process a new petition.” The floor was opened for discussion.

5.3.1. It was pointed out that the “must review all approved petitions” part of the proposed policy could conflict with the other two policies. The suggestion was made that the policy be rewritten to state: “Any approved substitution for a Select Core course or other specific advanced major course requirement must state clearly “Approved for Major XXX only.” Furthermore, when a student changes majors, the new major program must review all approved Select Core and major program approved petitions for
the student and decide which ones to accept without requiring the student to process a new petition."

5.3.2. The question was asked as to how a student can find out if their petitions have been approved and the new major program will know which previously approved petitions need to be reviewed. The response was that approved petitions would be reflected on the student’s Degree Audit Report and that the student’s file with the paper copy of the petitions should move to the new major program.

5.3.3. There being no further discussion Clark Mount-Campbell made a motion that the policy be approved as rewritten. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. Bob Gustafson presented a revised proposed Policy on Graduation with Distinction in Engineering for Undergraduates based on comments received at the committee’s last meeting. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The comment was made that the college’s website needs to be updated so that it agrees with the proposed policy.

6.2. The comment was made as to what will happen if a program has a different policy other than the six hours of independent study.

6.3. Being out of time it was decided to table the discussion on this proposed policy until the committee’s next meeting.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 1:32 PM.

C: College Faculty
CCAA File
PROPOSAL FOR APPLYING STUDENTS’ TRANSFER CREDIT TO ENGINEERING GEC REQUIREMENTS

BACKGROUND: In this case OSU course credit has been assigned to a transferred course but with credit hours differing from the normal OSU course.

OSU Transfer Credit Policy, Section IV, D#4, states “if an Ohio State course-specific equivalent is awarded for transfer credit, the University may "over-award" or "under-award" by one (1) or two (2) credit hours respectively, relative to the number of quarter credit hours that students earn when taking this course at Ohio State.” ([http://www.ureg.ohiostate.edu/ourweb/Transfer_Credit/tcpolicy.html](http://www.ureg.ohiostate.edu/ourweb/Transfer_Credit/tcpolicy.html))

Thus a student may be awarded 3, 4, 5, or 6 hours of a 5 hour class, or 2, 3, or 4 hours for a 3 hour course. Students are generally regarded as having credit for the course under any of these credit hour awards.

The consequence is that a student may meet all course requirements in any or all GEC categories, but may fall short in the credit hour requirements in any or all of the categories.

PROPOSAL:
If a student has the total number of credit hours needed for graduation, he or she will not be required to “make up hours” in any particular GEC category when course requirements are met by transferred courses having fewer hours than the OSU course(s) for which that credit was granted.

RATIONALE:
This will align the COE policy with university policy and facilitate the transition to OSU of transfer students. It will also reduce the paper work associated with petitioning to count non-description credit hours against some GEC category’s hour requirements. Furthermore, this policy should apply to all major programs in the COE in order to properly advise students who are undecided. It should be emphasized that if any program has an hour or proportional number of hours requirement for ABET, that requirement must take precedence. It would be up to each program to determine how the student should meet their minimum ABET requirements for Math and Basic Science hours without repeating a course for which the student already has credit.

PROPOSAL FOR UNIFORM SUBSTITUTION OF TRANSFER CREDITS FOR CENTRAL CORE CHEMISTRY 121 AND PHYSICS 131, 132 COURSES

BACKGROUND: This applies to cases when OSU equivalency is not awarded to a Chemistry or Physics course in the Central Core. The different engineering programs have different policies for approving substitutes for Chemistry and Physics courses in the common core. This creates difficulty in advising students into the most efficient set of courses for those students who have not declared a particular major. Specific situations in Physics and Chemistry are as follows:
Chemistry: When Chemistry evaluates chemistry transfer courses they do not give credit for 121 unless there was a lab associated with the chemistry that they are transferring. However, after evaluating the chemistry competency of the student they will permit the student to advance into the next level chemistry course without full credit for the prerequisite.

Physics: A transfer student may gain credit for Physics 131 and 132 in a number of ways. No matter how it is done the central core Physics requirement is satisfied. The anomalous case is when the department of Physics allows a student to take Physics 132 without credit for 131. They do this only after evaluating the student’s actual physics competency, but if the student fails Physics 132, Physics requires them to start over with Physics 131.

PROPOSAL:

Chemistry 121, Physics 131 and 132 are required Central Core courses. The substitution of general credits for Chemistry or Physics will be permitted if and only if the appropriate department (i.e., Chemistry or Physics) has determined that the student may advance into the next course. At this point the student would be able to substitute the course(s) they have transferred for Physics 131 or Chemistry 121 as appropriate. Furthermore, once a petition is approved for a Central Core course it is valid for all programs in the college.

RATIONALE:

The Central Core is required of all engineering majors. As such it should be general enough and flexible enough to give students nearly unfettered mobility into the College and among programs within the College, while providing math, science, and engineering basics. At the same time it should not burden students in every program to satisfy a requirement that is particular to just one or two programs. The Select Core and Major Courses are intended to satisfy the particularities of the different programs. Even if a petition for Physics 131 is approved the student will still be required by the Physics department to retake 131 if they fail 132. Flexibility means accepting things that are slightly different than you would like rather than requiring exactitude. Additionally, since the Central Core specifies identical requirements for all majors, it is dishonest to tell students one day that they have satisfied a central core requirement and then to tell them the next day that they haven’t satisfied the requirement.

Furthermore, with the policy in place, undecided students would be able to process petitions and to plan their course of study in a more optimal fashion regardless which program they finally elect.

The final rationale is economic. Education is an inexact process, an expensive proposition for students; and the university resources available to provide that education are inadequate. Forcing (or allowing) a student to repeat substantial material to meet some minor goal when the Physics or Chemistry department have qualified the student to attempt the higher-level course is tantamount to squandering both the student’s and the university’s resources. If an educational component that is important to a particular program is considered to be missing from a course substituted for a common core course, then the economically appropriate action would be to make up
that component through an additional or more advanced course rather than repeating substantial material in a lower-level course.

PROPOSAL FOR COURSE SUBSTITUTIONS IN THE SELECT CORE AND MAJOR PROGRAMS

Background: This is intended for completeness, and to inform and unburden the student.

Issue: Petitions generally contain no statement regarding their applicability across programs.

PROPOSAL:
Any approved substitution for a Select Core course or other specific advanced major course requirement must state clearly “Approved for Major XXX only.” Furthermore, when a student changes major, the major program must review all approved petitions for the student and decide which ones to accept without requiring the student to process a new petition.

RATIONALE:
The purposes of this policy are to add completeness to the first two policies, to inform the student about the applicability of their approved substitution, and to minimize the administrative burden on the student wishing to change majors.