1. Attendance:
   Aero – Jen-Ping Chen
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Halil Sezen for Patrick Fox
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – George Valco - Chair
   ENG PHY – Harris Kagan
   FAB – Ann Christy
   IWSE –
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell
   WLD – Dave Farson
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   ME – Not present (Marcelo Dapino)
   Graduate Student – C.J. Mullin (Not present - Hannah Gustafson)
   Undergraduate Student – Timothy Schroeder and Japheth Pritchett
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – none

2. The minutes from the 22 October 2008 meeting were approved as amended.

3. Rita Alevriadou presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommended that ChBE 794, ChBE 894, CSE 102, and CSE 421 be approved.
   3.2. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that these course requests be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.3. There being no discussion a vote was taken. 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Clark Mount-Campbell informed the committee that Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B met and compared the Combination of Aviation & Aero Department Proposal to the appropriate faculty rules for changes in academic units. Because the proposal did not meet the requirements outlined in the faculty rules the subcommittee sent the proposal back to the two chairs with a report outlining the problems the subcommittee found with the proposal. The subcommittee feels that the two departments have a lot of work to do on the proposal before it is ready to be resubmitted. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The question was asked as to what some of the problems were. The response was that faculty rules allow proposals for changes in academic units to be initiated by the dean, executive vice president and provost, the Council on Academic Affairs, or the faculty of the affected units, but this proposal appears to have been initiated by the two department chairs. In addition, the proposal is
missing much of the required analysis. Lastly, the proposal appeared to be based on a report submitted by a task force, retaining the pros but removing the cons from the task force’s analysis of merging the two units.

4.2. The question was asked as to how the faculty could be affected by such a merger. The response was that each department has their own P&T rules and that adopting one department’s rules over another can have an impact on the promotion and tenure of the faculty in the department whose rules were not adopted. This issue needs to be addressed in the proposal.

5. The committee chair passed out a report generated from the college’s spreadsheet showing information on students in the BS/MS program. This is a continuation of a discussion the committee had at its last meeting. The two options presented at that meeting were to get the information centrally either through the college or the university and to send that information to the departments for verification. Judith McDonald provided the information in the spreadsheets and the committee secretary has contacted the university about getting the data. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The question was asked as to whether there was any difference between Electrical Engineering and Electrical & Computer Engineering at the Master’s level. The reply was that at one time there was but not anymore. It is possible that the Electrical Engineering designation is a typo or a legacy issue.

5.2. The question was asked as to why there were no entries for Civil as some Civil students have participated in the program. The response was that this question will need to be addressed to Judith McDonald.

5.3. The comment was made that Judith has no method of knowing if and when a student completes their MS degree as there is no requirement for them to inform her.

5.4. The comment was made that the information is a good start but does not appear to be complete.

5.5. The comment was made that it would be good to know if a student takes the thesis or non thesis route along with whether they continue on for a PhD.

5.6. The question was asked as to whether a BS/MS student can skip the MS and go directly to a PhD. No one present knew what the rules were on this but the assumption was made that it would be program dependent. The chair tasked all members to go back to their program and find out what their program’s rules were in regard to this.

5.7. The question was asked as to why we want this information and what do we plan on doing with it. The responses were that the data should:

5.7.1. help us increase the number of students in the program;
5.7.2. provide information on how these students are being funded;
5.7.3. provide information on the percentage of our MS students who are in this program;
5.7.4. help us create a report which will highlight best practices, and
5.7.5. provide information on whether the program is working as envisioned.

5.8. George Valco stated that he would send the tables to everyone electronically and asked all members to start gathering appropriate information.
5.9. The committee secretary was tasked to check with the university to find out if they can provide more complete information.

6. The committee discussed the potential change to semesters and what we could be doing to prepare for it.
6.1. Ann Christy presented some suggestions on what the college could be doing now based on the assumptions that there will not be any increase in the total credit hours to graduation and that the proportion of hours between liberal art GEC courses, the Engineering Core, and major courses will not change. Ann stressed that there has been no official announcement that we will change to semesters and that the topic is just now being discussed in a University Senate subcommittee. However, if we begin to prepare now it will make life a lot easier if we do switch to semesters. Ann’s suggestions were that:

6.1.1. Each program should create a list of service courses that its students take. A list of topics that the program feels are essential to its students should be included with each course. This list would be due at CCAA’s next meeting and will be used to give feedback to the offering unit on what is needed in the course.

6.1.2. The offering departments would be required to present to CCAA sometime winter quarter a proposed two page syllabus for each of their service courses showing the credit hours and content.

6.2. The question was asked as to what exactly was meant by a service course. The response was that a service course was a course required by a program but offered by another program. Some examples were ISE 504, MSE 205, ECE 300/309, ME 410, CSE 202, along with Math, Physics, Chemistry, Introduction to Engineering, and Engineering Graphics.

6.3. The comment was made that this is an excellent opportunity to influence what will go into the courses.

6.4. The committee chair charged each member with sending to the committee secretary by Wednesday the 26th of November a list of the service courses their students take along with a list of essential topics for each course so that he can compile the information for the committee.

7. Clark Mount-Campbell informed the committee that the University of Chicago just published a list of the ten happiest professions and Industrial Engineering was number nine on the list.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25