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

2. The minutes from the 13 January 2010 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. The draft bingo sheets were discussed. The chair stated that he would like to have
   the committee meet one week from today to discuss in a special meeting the draft
   bingo sheets so that everyone will have time to review them. The floor was opened
   for discussion.
   3.1. The question was asked as to what members should be looking for as they
       review the draft bingo sheets. The response was that everyone should be
       looking for errors and what everyone else is doing especially in regard to internal
       service courses. We need to give everyone some feedback and alert them if
       there appears to be any major problems.

4. The draft proposed new Core was discussed. The draft is being given to CCAA so
   that members can review it and provide feedback and direction. The floor was
   opened for discussion.
   4.1. The question was asked as to the status of the external MOUs. The response
       was that they are not yet completed but the ones for Physics and Math are close
       to being ready.
   4.2. The question was asked as to what members should be looking for as they
       review the draft. The response was that it should be reviewed as if it was
       coming to the committee for approval. It needs to be looked at conceptually
       along with what needs to be added and/or deleted.
4.3. The question was asked as to how internal MOUs will be dealt with in the proposal. The response was that we really do not need internal MOUs with the proposal as those courses must be finalized prior to the offering department submitting its semester proposal.

5. The question was asked as to the possibility of all Engineering students taking the same curriculum until the first semester of their second year. The reply was that we are close to this in that 20 hours of the first year could be common. The differences begin in the second Physics and first Chemistry course. Those two courses make it impossible to have a completely similar first year experience.

6. Hal Walker presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations to the committee.
6.1. The subcommittee recommends that the Course Withdrawal Requests for Engineering Graphics 122, 166, and 204 be approved. These courses have not been offered in a number of years and there is no plan to offer them in the future. None of the courses are required in any program’s curriculum. Hal Walker made a motion to approve the requests. Dan Mendelsohn seconded the motion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
6.2. The subcommittee recommends that the Course Change Request to make Engineering Graphics 167 a generic course and the New Course Requests for Engineering Graphics 167.01 and 167.02 be approved. The reason for the requests is SIS. SIS does not allow letters to be used to differentiate between sections and as C++ is taught in 167.01 and MatLab is taught in 167.02 a method must be used to differentiate between the sections. Hal Walker made a motion to approve the requests. Harris Kagan seconded the motion. The question was asked as to what was meant by a generic course. The response was that a generic course is just a place holder and no one will ever take it. In the future all of the generic course will disappear. The question was asked as to what happened to the Fortran section of 167. The response was that the Fortran section has been eliminated. As it was a section and not the course no approval was needed. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
6.3. The subcommittee recommends that the New Course Request for ISE 759 be approved. The subcommittee did have some questions about the prerequisites for the course but these appear to have been corrected. Hal Walker made a motion to approve the requests. Seth Young seconded the motion. After a discussion it was decided that the motion be amended contingent upon the prerequisites being changed to “Senior or Graduate standing in ISE; or permission of the Instructor”. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. John Lippold informed the committee that Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A would be prepared to make a recommendation to the full committee on an update to our Minor Policy at the committee’s next regularly scheduled meeting.
8. Seth Young updated the committee on the status of the Aviation Center Proposal, the abolishment of the Aviation Department, and the moving the Aviation degree programs to the Aviation Center. The proposal has been revised based on feedback provided by CCAA and discussions with Randy Moses and Stu Zweben. The proposal is about ready to come back to CCAA. It will come to CCAA in two parts. One part will be a proposal to create college guidelines for creation of a college center and the other part will be abolition of the Aviation Department and the movement of the degree programs to the Center. Currently they are working on getting letters of agreement from Business and SBS. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. The question was asked as to whether the college can create a center. The response was that yes it can but this is a relatively new development. The problem is that the college does not yet have a policy in place. One difference between a college level center and university center is that a college center can have curriculum and degree programs. The college’s center policy that is being proposed will need to be approved by the college’s faculty and by CAA.

8.2. The suggestion was made that Randy Moses be invited to a future meeting and brief the committee on the center proposal.

9. The committee was informed that Hazel Morrow-Jones has left the college and is now in the Provost’s Office. Her replacement has not yet been named but once they are they will become responsible for the Masters of Engineering Leadership Degree proposal. Currently this proposal is waiting on a few more items before it is ready to come before CCAA.

10. The meeting was adjourned so that members could review the draft bingo sheets.