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 – Not present (Ann Christy)
   IWSE –
      ISE – Not present (Clark Mount-Campbell)
      WLD – Not present (Dave Farson)
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Hannah Gustafson and C.J. Mullin
   Undergraduate Student – Japheth Pritchett (not present Tim Schroeder)
   Secretary – Not present (Ed McCaul)
   Guests – Gregory Washington

2. The minutes from the 6 April 2009 meeting were approved as written.

3. Updates from Chair
   3.1. A revised Computational Science minor proposal has been received and sent to Subcommittee B, which did the initial review last academic year.
   3.2. Ed McCaul had informed the Chair that the proposal for the Masters of Engineering Leadership Degree may be here soon.

4. Greg Washington addressed the committee concerning PPAT
   4.1. Dean Washington distributed several documents outlining the PPAT process, commented on some of the documents, and gave CCAA an update on the status of the proposals that are being developed.
   4.2. The first document was the Draft Rollout Process that had previously been distributed to all Engineering faculty.
   4.3. Other documents represent feedback from the college to the individual subcommittees working on various recommendations from the PPAT committee.
   4.4. While the overall PPAT process started with feedback on graduate programs, there was a need for a holistic look since it is difficult to separate G/UG programs.
   4.5. Dr. Washington summarized the document and indicated that draft proposals for any mergers are being developed. The process hasn't been very smooth, but is now moving along well. The Dean is pleased with where the subcommittees are now.
4.6. The proposed restructuring for Welding/MSE, MechE/AeroE and Aviation and name change for CEEGS are expected to flow through CCAA this academic year.
4.7. The dean was asked as to the impact the change to semesters will have on these proposals. The reply was that there should not be any impact since the committees were advised to be general in their recommendations.
4.8. The Dean mentioned that votes by faculty in the individual affected departments for each proposal are being sought, although they are not required by faculty rules. The required vote is by the college faculty, not individual departments.
4.9. Required strategic plans for all departments involved will need to be updated.
4.10. Hannah Gustafson asked about the mechanisms for informing students and seeking student input. The Dean plans to meet with Engineers’ Council, however there was some concern that the message may not reach many students. It was requested that a general communication be made to all students during the proposal stage, before the vote.
4.11. Deadlines to the subcommittees vary, but CCAA should see proposals in early May.
4.12. The CEEGS renaming proposition was shared with the College of Math and Physical Sciences. They had concerns that we distinguish between Geodetic Science and Geodetic Engineering.
4.13. Degree name changes that may be coming require Board of Regents Approval and those proposals will probably not be ready until next academic year.
4.14. There was a question regarding representation on CCAA from the restructured departments. Dr. Tomasko and Dr. Valco explained that degree programs have representation on CCAA, but voting members are by department. Representatives from departments with more than one program coordinate to determine how that department will vote.
4.15. There was a question regarding BME becoming a joint department between Engineering and the Medical School. Dean Washington responded that CCAA should not expect any recommendations on BME joining with the Medical School during this academic year. Meetings have been set up with the Medical School to discuss this, but the cash commitments make this situation very complex.

5. Rita Alevriadou presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee recommendations to the committee.
5.1. The course proposal subcommittee recommended approval on all three new courses in their report (ISE 685, ISE 742 and ME 788).
5.2. A question was raised regarding the number of pre-reqs for the courses, with confusion over whether all of the listed courses were required or just some of them. The syntax is confusing.
5.3. Rita Alevriadou moved to approve pending clarification on pre-reqs for ISE 685. Seth Young seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
6. Bruce Weide presented Subcommittee A’s recommendation to the proposed revisions to ASAP Policy to the committee.
6.1. Subcommittee A does not have in-depth knowledge about the detailed workings of the Academic Standards and Progress (ASAP) subcommittee. They read through the proposed revisions to the ASAP policy, and didn't find any problems.
6.2. Bruce Weide made a motion to approve the proposed changes. Kathy Flores seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.3. George Valco provided an executive summary of the ASAP report. The main revision was to come up with a centralized appeal process at the College level. A subcommittee of ASAP will hear appeals and make recommendations. The changes proposed for each department were described; most were updates and clarifications to maintain consistency with current practice.
6.4. Bruce Weide asked for discussion of the need for CCAA oversight on this, since the department representatives on the ASAP committee involved in academic standards and progress know what they are doing. Dr. Tomasko explained that ASAP is functionally a subcommittee of CCAA, so they can't approve changes to the policy without CCAA. It was noted that all proposed changes are already studied and voted on by the ASAP subcommittee prior to being sent to CCAA for final approval. Tomasko suggested that a CCAA representative on ASAP (currently Valco and Flores are on both committees) could bring the report directly to CCAA in the future without going through review by a subcommittee of CCAA. The point was made that faculty governance provided by CCAA members should be made aware of the document. Regular updates are helpful.
6.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Harris Kagan made a motion that a member of ASAP present a summary of future proposed changes to the ASAP policy to CCAA, and CCAA vote directly on the ASAP policy updates without going through subcommittee. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.1. Currently George Valco and Kathy Flores are members of both committees, and the ASAP policy mandates that at least one member of ASAP be a member of CCAA, thus an 'extra' person would not be required to attend CCAA meetings to present future proposals.
7.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on the Semesters Task Force.
8.1. The pressing issue right now is that the universities Calendar Committee is meeting to develop a proposal for May 21st, and the calendar model is pushing rapidly forward. There is concern over the current model. The College of Engineering has been having an open forum on Friday mornings at 8 AM for discussions to prepare input to the calendar committee. A goal is to come out with input so that the calendar committee considers at least two models. An alternate proposal should be distributed today, as the semesters calendar working group is meeting tomorrow. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1.1. The question was asked as to whether classes during “mini-mesters” will be "expected" for all students and faculty? Wasn't inclusion of the “mini-mesters” supposed to enable research mid-year? Won't logistics of registering, submitting grades, etc. be increased with several mini-terms added in? Does the proposed schedule need to be consistent with other universities in the State of Ohio?

8.1.2. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of communication among other Ohio universities.

8.1.3. All CCAA representatives should try to attend the next Faculty Senate Meeting May 28, at which the vote on the semester calendar is expected to occur.

8.1.4. Dave Tomasko will connect with colleagues in the College of Business regarding the semester calendar.

8.1.5. A listserv COESemesters has been created for discussion of the conversion to semesters. Tomasko will send e.mail with procedures for enrolling.

8. The committee was informed that the meeting scheduled for May 4 is cancelled.

9. Being out of time the meeting was adjourned.