1. Attendance:
   Aero – Mei Zhuang
   AVN – 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 – Not present (Harris Kagan)
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE –
      ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
      WLD – John Lippold
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram (not present Bob Lowe)
   Undergraduate Student – Anchie Huang (not present Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Pam Hussen, Peg Steele

2. The minutes from the 5 November 2009 meeting were approved as written.

3. Dave Tomasko presented the proposed College of Engineering Principles for Semester Conversion to the committee. (The proposal is attached to the minutes.) The principles are designed to be a statement of philosophy and have been recommended for approval to CCAA from the College’s Quarters to Semesters Task Force. One purpose of the principles is to assure our students that we have their best interests in mind. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The comment was made that the last sentence in the second paragraph was confusing. “The distribution of courses and credits in the new curriculum should be justifiable in terms of faculty and student workload in addition to student progress toward a degree.” The response was that this sentence was a warning that faculty need to be cautious when developing the semester curriculum so that students do not end up having to take a large number of courses as the courses are only worth one or two credit hours. Such a situation could also increase faculty work load if a department requires their faculty to teach a certain number of credit hours in a year. The comment was made that this sentence does not clearly state what the committee was just told. The comment was made that paragraph four clearly explains what the last sentence in the second paragraph means for the students.
   3.2. The question was asked as to how the principles will impact the proposals as they are brought forward. CSE is considering creating some one hour credit courses and wants to make sure that the guidelines are not blindly applied but
are flexible. The response was that if a large number of required courses are one hour it could be an issue but if the one hour courses are sprinkled throughout the curriculum that would probably be acceptable. The rationale behind the one hour courses would be the key.

3.3. The comment was made that the principles are something that can be shared with your faculty. They are not faculty rules and were not created to make the process rigid or a criterion for approval. Rather they were created so that everyone would have some guiding principles.

3.4. George Valco made a motion that the College of Engineering Guiding Principles for Semester Conversion be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on the semester conversion. Progress has been made on most of the major issues. The task force has met with Physics, Math, and Chemistry and will be meeting with Statistics next week. Math and Chemistry are close to being finalized but Physics is still under discussion. The semester core will be vetted through the Core Committee and then sent to CCAA. The idea is to send the semester core to CCAA for approval prior to any of the program proposals being presented so that everyone will have a baseline to build on. It is hoped that the semester core will be to CCAA by the end of January. Hopefully all of our work will be done this year as during the summer we will need to concentrate on our ABET Self Study Reports. The Core Committee will be working on getting Memorandums of Understanding from Physics, Math, and Chemistry. The university has a massive group working on the semester conversion but do not expect anything on the GEC this quarter. The GEC will probably end up being the same basic structure as we currently have. There is the possibility that technological literacy and moral reasoning will be part of the GEC but will be a zero count requirement. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The question was asked as to whether the Physics and Math will be offering more applied sections. The response was that right now it appears that we will have a calculus for engineers sequence with two-five hour courses and then a divergence with various two-three hour courses.

4.2. The question was asked as to whether the two-three hour courses would be in the core or selected core. The response was that right now they would be in the selected core.

4.3. The comment was made that the goal is to create a core that will not penalize our undecided first year students.

4.4. The question was asked as to the status of chemistry. The response was chemistry may end up in the selected core and that there will probably be two different versions. One version would be a four hour chemistry course for engineers and a five hour general chemistry course that would be taken by engineering students whose programs require more chemistry. A biology for engineers course is also being considered that would be a quantitative biology course and co-taught by Engineering and Biological Sciences.
4.5. The question was asked as to what the plan is for dealing with Statistics as they would like to get rid of all of the statistics courses being taught outside of their department. The response was that there will probably not be any change in the balance of power but we need to be sensitive to the situation and not push the system by blatantly offering more statistics courses.

4.6. The comment was made that it would be good to have a deadline for our internal service courses to be finalized as some programs are dependent upon other programs for part of their curriculum. The response was that the task force will be discussing this in January but if information is needed before then a program should go ahead and talk with the offering unit.

5. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that Randy Moses would like the guidelines for creation of a center to be processed in parallel with the Aviation Center Proposal. The hope is to get both proposals to CCAA over the Christmas break.

6. Hal Walker presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee's recommendations to the committee.

6.1. The subcommittee recommended that the new course request for CSE 205 be approved. The subcommittee did have a couple of questions about the course such with the main one being concurrence with EEIC. Bruce Weide stated that CSE worked in conjunction with EEIC in creating this course and, as such, they are fully aware of it. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1.1. The question was asked to how the students will know that they will be taught MatLab. The response was that this information is part of the general course information that will be shown in the course handbook and that the syllabus discusses it.

6.1.2. The question was asked as to whether students who have a background in MatLab will be taking the course. The response was probably not.

6.2. There being no further discussion Hal Walker made a motion that the course be approved. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 13 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. The committee discussed creating a schedule for submitting semester proposals.

7.1. The chair stated that everyone needs to find out when their programs will have their proposals and service courses ready. It would be better if the submission of the proposals was staggered rather than all of them coming to CCAA at the same time.

7.2. Seth Young stated that Aviation could have their proposal ready by the end of winter quarter and would be willing to be the test proposal for the committee.

7.3. The question was asked as to whether syllabi for all of the courses being offered by a unit will need to be submitted or just the ones the ones they require their students to take. The response was that all of the syllabi need to be submitted.

7.4. Ann Christy stated that OAA is developing a university semester submission template but it is still undergoing revision. There is some resistance to having any syllabi in the submission packet from Arts & Science. The template we
developed in Engineering should be a good guideline as we may be requiring more than OAA will require.

7.5. The question was asked as to what information will be required in the syllabi. The response was that at a minimum all of the information in Book 3, goals/learning objectives, and a list of topics.

7.6. The question was asked as to whether it would be possible to submit an incomplete proposal that is missing some syllabi and then submit the missing information at a later date. If this was done CCAA could start reviewing proposals earlier. The general opinion was that this was a good idea. Bruce Weide stated that if that was the case then CSE could have a preliminarily proposal to CCAA by the end of winter quarter.

7.7. The comment was made that CCAA needs to establish a deadline for an established deadline will force faculty to get things done.

7.8. The chair asked everyone to go back to their programs and find out when proposals can be submitted. A submission matrix will be created early winter quarter that will show when each program is required to submit their proposal.

7.9. The question was asked as to how we should deal with the May mini-mester. The response was that most programs are ignoring it. Kathy Flores stated that MSE is considering offering elective courses during that time period especially graduate level elective courses. Dave Tomasko stated that Chemical Engineering is considering offering their summer lab during that time period. Ann Christy stated that the mini-mester would be a good time to offer bridge and study aboard courses.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 9:42.
1) Student progress toward graduation will not be impeded by the conversion process. As in all previous curriculum changes, transition issues will be anticipated and planned for as a part of the conversion process.

2) Programs are encouraged to make curriculum changes; changes should preserve the intellectual integrity of the degree program as well as the program’s ABET or other accreditation outcomes. The total number of quarter-equivalent credits required for the degree should not increase as a result of the conversion. The distribution of courses and credits in the new curriculum should be justifiable in terms of faculty and student workload in addition to student progress toward a degree.

3) Students already enrolled will be given the choice of fulfilling either the “old” or “new” graduation requirements. This may occur by converting earned quarter credits to semester credits and following through with “alias” or “equivalent” semester courses corresponding to the “old” curriculum.

4) When determining the number of credit hours for particular courses, programs should carefully consider the load for a typical student in a single semester. While a typical load may be 15-18 semester hours, the number of courses per semester should probably be no more than 5 or 6. A larger number of courses at low credit hours is not necessarily a quality educational experience because of the inefficiency of frequently switching topics and the temptation of overloading the amount of work per credit hour.