1. Attendance:
   Aero – Not present (Jen-Ping Chen)
   AVN – Seth Young
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – 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 – Sheikh Akbar (for Kathy Flores)
   ME – Gary Kinzel (for Marcelo Dapino)
   Graduate Student – Hannah Gustafson (not present C.J. Mullin)
   Undergraduate Student – Japheth Pritchett (Not present Tim Schroeder)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul

2. The minutes from the 26 January 2009 meeting were approved as written with one abstention.

3. Rita Alevriadou presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommended that BME 693 and 740 be approved. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that both course requests be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.2. A question was asked about MSE's concurrence on BME 734. The response was that BME 734 was approved at the committee’s last meeting with the contingency that concurrence be obtained from MSE.
   3.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Interim Dean Greg Washington addressed the committee on the implications of the College of Engineering Performance Plan Acceleration Task (PPAT) Force Report. Seven of the nine recommendations in the report if implemented will need to be reviewed by CCAA with CCAA making a recommendation to the college faculty. There are two issues driving this process. First, is the Graduate Program Review 2008 Report. We need to respond to this report and make efforts to improve our programs. Second, we must deal with fiscal constraints. Currently the college has 2.4 million in permanent debt and 7.2 million in cash debt. We must address this issue without delay. CCAA will get a lot of work because of this report and it will
need to move fast but deliberately on any proposal that results from it. The College of Engineering is in the top three colleges on campus in size and ranking yet is underfunded. The college is also the second highest in research money. We need to make the case that we are important to the university. Greg stated the he had a couple of issues with the Aviation/Aero Department consolidation proposal the committee is considering. The main issue is that the proposal does not consider the impact such a merger will have on Aero’s graduate program. CCAA is the college’s light to the outside world and it needs to make sure that it gets it right. In order to strengthen our programs we need to look at all of them in context to all proposed changes. The floor was opened for questions.

4.1. The comment was made that CCAA has taken it job seriously but in general it has not looked at graduate programs in mergers as they come under the Graduate School. Graduate programs are somewhere between academics and research and different departments view graduate programs differently. Unfortunately the PPAT Report does not tease out the difference between these two points of view. Greg’s response was that CCAA has responsibility for curriculum and that a program’s research areas may be different than its curriculum.

4.2. The comment was made that there is a legacy issue involved in that it has only been recently that CCAA has been reviewing new graduate degree programs. In the past CCAA only review of graduate curriculum was limited to course requests. Greg’s response was that CCAA needs to consider the entire spectrum and not just undergraduate issues. CCAA is the most appropriate committee to review all curriculum.

4.3. The comment was made that CCAA has also not gotten involved in funding issues when considering curriculum and reorganizational proposals. Greg stated that CCAA needs to consider the entire picture of any proposal. Regarding decisions on teaching and research, teaching is important but has a specific threshold. Above a certain level is fine, below that level is not. Evaluation research is more variable but it is the major component on which tenure is based. These two issues cannot be separated and resources are an integral part of both areas. Greg is not telling CCAA to agree or disagree with the recommendations but is asking it not to be a barrier to the process. The provost is aware of the PPAT report and if he sees CCAA moving the college in a different direction with the current Aviation/Aero Department consolidation proposal we will be viewed as being backward. CAA has been focused on the graduate program review report and we need to address it too.

4.4. The question was asked as to whether there has been any student feedback to the PPAT report. Greg responded that while no students were on the committee that created the PPAT report he has gone to Engineers’ Council to discuss it. Each of the small groups that are discussing each of the recommendations will include students.

4.5. The question was asked as to the role of the Graduate Chairs Committee in the process. Greg responded that they have already exercised their part when they responded to the Graduate Program Review Report.
4.6. The question was asked as to whether the groups considering each recommendation will interact with CCAA. Greg’s response was that he wants to keep CCAA a part of the process and will send to CCAA a copy of the charge that is given to each group.

5. The Chairs of the Aviation and Aerospace Departments were introduced to the committee and all committee members introduced themselves. Clark Mount-Campbell presented Subcommittee B’s report on the Proposal to Consolidate Aviation and Aerospace Departments (attached). Clark stated that he feels that based on Greg’s statements a fourth issue for discussion, the impact of the proposal on the graduate program in Aero, should be added to the report. This proposal originated under our former dean when it became obvious that Aviation was no longer viable as a department. The question was where to place the faculty and degree programs and it was decided, with Aero’s agreement, that a consolidation with Aero would be the most sensible thing to do. It took quite a while for the proposal to have the necessary information and format required by university rules. The subcommittee looked at the PPAT report but felt that it did not offer a good permanent solution to the problem of where to put Aviation and feels that we should move ahead with the proposal. Another possible solution the committee may want to consider is to put Aviation in another college as only a small percentage of their students are in Engineering. Regarding student input, a letter opposing the proposal was recently received from the Ohio State Flight Team, but since then, after discussions with the dean and the two chairs, they have submitted a second letter supporting the proposal. The consolidation of these two departments should make for a stronger overall department as more faculty will be available. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. Seth Young commented that the possibility of moving the program to another college was discussed when the proposal was created but rejected as the research by the faculty is engineering based. He came from a college where the faculty were in the College of Business and it was not a workable solution.

5.2. Nawal Taneja stated that moving the program to another college is not the direction Aviation wants to go as they want to increase the engineering aspects of their degrees. One problem with the PPAT report is that no one on that task force talked to anyone in Aviation. It has been difficult for Aviation to hire new faculty even though it has the available slots as faculty do not want to come to a program that does not have a graduate degree which implies limited research opportunities. One advantage to the merger is that it will be easier for Aero faculty to make use of the airport’s planes and pilots for research purposes.

5.3. Meyer Benzakein stated that some people think that merging the two departments is the right thing to do but that procedural problems are slowing it down. Bob Gustafson and Nawal Taneja will be on the group that will be considering with the PPAT recommendation on Aviation. The question remains of whether CCAA should act now on the proposal or see what happens in the group’s consideration of the PPAT recommendation. It appears that Greg would like for the committee to table the proposal until the group working on this recommendation makes its recommendation.
5.4. Seth Young commented that the PPAT report assumes that Aviation only has students working on undergraduate degrees but the reality is that Aviation has graduate students but they are in other departments as Aviation does not have its own graduate degree.
5.5. The question was asked as to what has changed from when Aviation and Aero split up about five years ago and why would a merger work now when it did not work then. The response was that the people who worked against having the two programs combined are no longer here and at that time Aviation was non engineering based. All of this is covered in the proposal.
5.6. Gary Kinzel commented that the committee should table the proposal for now as approving it would complicate the PPAT discussion.
5.7. The comment was made that the PPAT report made an assumption that merging Aero with Mechanical would make Aero stronger but did not seem to have considered if an Aviation/Aero merger would be a better and stronger combination.
5.8. Meyer Benzakein commented that he wants to make sure that the work of the subcommittee is not lost if the proposal is tabled until the groups considering Aviation and Aero have made their recommendation.
5.9. Seth Young commented that the proposal should not be tabled based on some draft recommendations that may change.
5.10. The comment was made that even if CCAA approves the proposal it will still need to go to the faculty for a vote.
5.11. The comment was made that CCAA needs more time to consider and discuss all of the implications of the proposal.
5.12. The comment was made that the committee that created the PPAT worked under a tight time schedule and as such was not able to fully consider all of the implications of their recommendations.
5.13. Seth Young made a motion that the proposal to merge Aviation and Aerospace be approved.
5.14. The comment was made that the merger proposal should be given to the groups that will be working on the Aviation and Aerospace recommendations in PPAT. The response was that some of the people who will be on these groups already have the merger proposal.
5.15. Clark Mount-Campbell made the comment that the Aviation/Aerospace merger proposal has been with CCAA for quite a while and now that it complies with the university rules we have an obligation to do something with it. If the PPAT recommendations are followed putting Aviation’s degree in EEIC and putting their faculty in other programs the degree will probably disappear.
5.16. The comment was made that we could table the proposal and wait until May to consider it.
5.17. There being no second to the motion it was not voted on.

6. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and approved by acclamation. The meeting was adjourned at 11:55.
Subcommittee B Report on the Proposal to Consolidate Aviation (AVN) and Aerospace (AER)

Background: Faced with dwindling resources the former Dean of Engineering recognized that building a strong independent department of AVN was not possible. As a result, he began discussions of merger with the AVN faculty. The discussions were about which department would be the best match for the AVN program. Considerations included Industrial, Welding and Systems Engineering because of their human factors work in aircraft control systems, air traffic control and the operations research work in airline operations; Civil Engineering because of their transportation program; AER and perhaps others. A consensus emerged for a consolidation of AVN and AER, so a proposal to consolidate was submitted to CCAA in September 2008.

After revisions the proposal is now ready for consideration by CCAA. Subcommittee B notes that the proposal complies with the faculty rules governing the abolition or alteration of units. We further note that with only two tenure track faculty in the AVN department and little prospect of increasing that number the AVN program is unsustainable as an independent department. We therefore recommend approval of the proposal.

However, before CCAA acts the committee believes there are issues that should be discussed. These are:

1. The Performance Plan Acceleration Task Force (PPAT) has recommended that the AVN program be run out of the EEIC and that AER merge with Mechanical Engineering. One possible action for CCAA would be to table the proposal until the PPAT recommendations are more fully fleshed out. Subcommittee B recommends against tabling.
2. A rather small percentage of AVN majors that remain in the program to year 4 are engineering majors (10%-15%), and to our knowledge there has never been a task force to consider what is the future of AVN at OSU and should it be moved to another College where better support might be obtained. Should this be a consideration?
3. A letter of opposition from a student group has surfaced since committee B’s review of the proposal, and previously there have been concerns raised by an alumni group. The issue for discussion here is what steps have been taken and what further steps might be recommended to address the opposition and concerns?