1. Attendance:
   Aero – Mei Zhuang
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger (for Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Harris Kagan
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   WLD – Not present (John Lippold)
   MSE – Prabhat Gupta (for Kathy Flores)
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Bob Lowe, Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram
   Undergraduate Student – Anchie Huang (not present Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Pam Hussen

2. The minutes from the 1 October 2009 meeting were approved as written.

3. Hal Walker presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the committee.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommended that the course change request for Aero 851 and the new course request for ME 827, which are to be cross listed, be approved. Hal Walker made a motion that these two courses be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. The question was asked as to what the rules are for cross listing. The response was that the two courses need to be academically identical although the number of each course can be different. Who is to teach the course and how that person is to be paid is an issue decided between the chairs of the involved departments. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
   3.2. The subcommittee recommended that the following BME new course requests be approved with certain contingencies: 612 with concurrence from ECE; 642 with concurrence from ME; 643 with concurrence from ME; 651 no contingencies as it already has concurrence from ChemEng; 768 with concurrence from ECE, ISE, and ME; and 679 with concurrence from ECE and ISE. Hal Walker made a motion that these course requests be approved with the noted contingencies. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
3.2.1. Clark Mount-Campbell commented that ISE would like to be able to concur on 642 and 643. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

3.2.2. Prabhat Gupta commented that MSE would like to be able to concur on 651 and 768. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

3.2.3. The comment was made that the prerequisites on many of the proposals could be better worded so that it would be clear exactly who could take the course. Mark Ruegsegger stated that he did not think that BME would have any problems with making those changes. The committee secretary stated that he would work with BME to clarify the prerequisites.

3.2.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The amended motion passed.

3.3. The subcommittee recommended that the BME course change requests for 721 and 751 be approved. Hal Walker made a motion that these course requests be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.3.1. The comment was made that the new title for 751 should be Biomedical Engineering Research Ethics rather than Research Ethics as the proposed title will probably create some concerns for people outside of Engineering. Mark Ruegsegger stated that he did not think that BME would have any problems with such a change. The title change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

3.3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The amended motion passed.

3.4. The subcommittee recommended that the ECE new course request for 822 be approved. Hal Walker made a motion that this course request be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.4.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.5. The subcommittee recommended that the ISE course change requests for 761.01, 761.02, 868.01, 868.02, 868.03, 869.01, and 869.02 be approved. Ann Christy made a motion that these course requests be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.6. The subcommittee recommended that the MSE new course requests for 777, 895, and 895.01 be approved. Hal Walker made a motion that these course requests be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.7. The subcommittee recommended that the ME new course requests for 838, contingent upon receipt of concurrence from CE, and 842 contingent upon receipt of concurrence from BME, CE, and MSE be approved. Hal Walker made a motion that these course requests be approved with the noted contingencies. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
3.8. The subcommittee recommended that the WE 716 new course request be approved contingent upon receipt of concurrence from MSE. Hal Walker made a motion that these course requests be approved with the noted contingency. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. George Valco updated the committee on the Aero & Mechanical Merger Proposal. Subcommittee A met on the 15th of October and reviewed the revised proposal. Last spring the proposal was sent back to its initiators with six questions that needed to be answered. Four of the questions have been adequately answered but one answer did not clearly state what specific steps will be taken to increase the number of the AE faculty and PhD students once the merged department is established. The initiators were asked as to whether the increase in AE faculty simply arise from the fact that current ME faculty with AE interests would be counted as AE faculty? Or are there plans to hire new AE faculty as positions become available? What is the critical mass of AE faculty within the merged department that is needed to support the degree programs? What is the plan to maintain/sustain this critical mass? Have metrics been established that will indicate success or failure in the increase of faculty and PhD students? The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was also vague especially when compared to the MOU that accompanied the Welding/MSE merger. Under Personnel, Item 2 the use of PBA returned to the new department is discussed and it is stated that “MAE will reinvest these resources to realize the anticipated benefits of the merger in terms of stronger MEC and AE programs.” It is not clear what this means. The MOU does not discuss specific faculty slots to expand the AE faculty or maintain a critical mass of AE faculty within the merged department. The subcommittee realizes that the MOU should not be overly restrictive, but is there a danger that this flexibility may in fact threaten the future of the AE academic programs within the merged department? Finally, the MOU mentions the use of PBA “for the administrative leadership of the Center for Propulsion.” There is no mention of this center in the merger proposal. The subcommittee requested additional information on this center and its potential impact on the merger. For example, will this result in an additional faculty position for AE? The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The question was asked as to whether there was a faculty vote in Aero and Mechanical. The response was that there was with 100% of the Aero faculty being in favor while Mechanical, although being overwhelming in favor, was not unanimous.

5. The committee secretary informed the committee that a revised Aviation Center Proposal has not been received and that no information has been received as to when it can be expected. Concerning the Masters of Engineering Leadership Degree Hazel Morrow-Jones stated that the proposal is currently in front of the Deans of Engineering and Business for their approval. Once they approve it the proposal will be sent to CCAA.
6. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on the switch to semesters. The college’s task force has been meeting regularly and the Office of Academic Affairs has started to organize groups to work on various tasks such as enrollment and the GEC. The approved quarters to semesters template has been shared with other deans but most of the other colleges do not appear to be willing to take advantage of the opportunity and make whole sale changes. Consequently, most other colleges are probably going to just do a straight conversion from quarters to semesters. The floor was opened for questions.

6.1. The question was asked as to whether the GEC will remain the same. The response was that the current assumption is that the proportion of GEC hours will remain the same. There is the possibility that we may get some additional flexibility for if our GEC hours go to 24 and all GEC courses are three hours then we will have eight courses rather than the current seven.

6.2. The comment was made that sometime at the end of October a draft of the new GEC is suppose to be made public.

6.3. Dave Tomasko asked the committee if the task force could have the authorization to make changes to the quarters to semesters template as needed. The response was that we need to keep flexible on the switch but that changes would need to be approved by CCAA.

6.4. The question was asked as to what the proposed schedule was for submitting our proposals. The response was that we do not have one yet but need to develop one.

6.5. Dave Tomasko commented that CCAA may be asked to work over the upcoming summer to review the proposals. The response was that too many of our faculty are gone over the summer consequently it is not possible to conduct faculty governance then.

6.6. The comment was made that we need to complete our proposals so that we will have them ready when we have the ABET visit in 2011. Ann Christy stated that based on her recent ABET training and experience that this will not be critical as long as we have a process in place that includes feedback.

6.7. The question was asked as to when we can expect to have something on the college core. The response was that the task force is at the straw man stage of creating a semester core and that it will possibly be ready by the end of the quarter.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55.