1. Attendance:
   Aero – Mei Zhuang
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger (for Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – Not present (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
   MSE –
      MSE - Kathy Flores
      WLD – John Lippold
   ME – Not present (Marcelo Dapino)
   Graduate Student – Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram, Bob Lowe
   Undergraduate Student – Not present (Anchie Huang & Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Pam Hussen

2. The minutes from the 24 February 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. Hal Walker presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations.
   3.1. The subcommittee recommended that the new course request for BME 652 be approved. The course is being created as BME is splitting their cell and tissue engineering class into two separate classes. Hal Walker moved that the request be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the proposal. The floor was opened for discussion. Dave Tomasko made a friendly amendment that Chemical Engineering be asked for concurrence on this course request as some of their faculty do work with cells. The amendment was accepted. A friendly amendment was made that BME be required to specify whether the course will be marked as undergraduate or graduate as SIS will not accept a combined UG ranking. The amendment was accepted. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed with the amendments.
   3.2. The subcommittee recommended that the course change requests for Chemical Engineering 808 and 812 be approved. They are changing the prerequisites so that it will be easier for graduate students who did not go to OSU can take the courses. Hal Walker moved that the request be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the proposal. The floor was opened for discussion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
3.3. The subcommittee recommended that the new course request for ISE 688 be approved. The subcommittee had a meeting with David Woods, the course instructor, to discuss the course as the subcommittee had some concerns especially with the lack of any prerequisites. Dave agreed to add some prerequisites. Hal Walker moved that the request be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the proposal. The floor was opened for discussion. The question was asked as to whether it was expected that students outside of engineering would take the course. The response was yes. The comment was made that having a vague prerequisite of rank 4 would allow students who had only been at OSU for 2 ½ years to take the course. The response was that Dave Woods had taught the course as a group studies with a mix of students and was happy with the results. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

3.4. The subcommittee recommended that the generic group studies request for WE 794 be approved. Hal Walker moved that the request be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the proposal. The floor was opened for discussion. A friendly amendment was made that Welding designate the course as either an undergraduate or graduate course due to SIS before it leaves the college. The amendment was accepted. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed with the amendment.

4. John Lippold presented Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A’s proposed changes to the college’s minor policy. The subcommittee recommended that the college change its Minor Policy so that it will conform to the university’s semester minor policy. The only changes to the quarter minor policy is that the minimum number of hours in a minor would be 12 semester hours with no maximum and that courses numbered less than 2000 may not count toward the 12 credit hour minimum. Bruce Weide made a motion that the revised Minor Policy be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The comment was made that if someone proposed a minor with a lot of required hours that the committee can have it revised or, if approved, students may not want to take it.

4.2. The comment was made that for colleges in the university that require a minor and have an approved list that there is the possibility that only minors with a large number hours may be on the list. However, this is a concern that may not happen.

4.3. The question was asked as to whether we want to make some requirement about requiring a certain number of courses in a minor be taken at OSU. The reason for this question is that with the Computational Minor it is possible for a student to take all of the needed courses from other universities yet receive the minor from OSU. The suggestion was made that we could require ¼ of the hours in a minor be taken at OSU as we require that a student take 45 credit hours at OSU before they can get an undergraduate degree. The comment was made that it is possible for a student to transfer to OSU and with their transfer credits meet all of the requirements for a minor. The suggestion was made that
we not accept or limit the number of K credits that can be applied to a minor. The suggestion was made that we have a capstone course for all of our minors and that this course must be taken at OSU. The decision was not to pursue this issue as it may not come up and if it does the committee can deal with it then.  

4.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. The draft bingo sheets were discussed by the committee.
5.1. It was noted that some of the hours for courses were incorrect on some of the bingo sheets.
5.2. The question was asked as to what the prerequisites were for Physics I. The response was that it would have a pre or co requisite of Engineering Calculus I.
5.3. The comment was made that it is important to know the best time to schedule courses and the prerequisites a student must have to take them.
5.4. The question was asked as to whether CAA has given any thought to two hour courses. The response was that we should not have a problem with that as we have very few two hours courses. In addition, CAA has stated that ½ credits can be used.
5.5. The comment was made that we need information from Mechanical on their statics, dynamics, and strength courses. This information is critical for some programs as it is needed for them to complete their curriculum.
5.6. The committee was informed that the registrar’s office is working on the possibility of making the 5000 level courses undergraduate and graduate. The problem right now is figuring out a method of doing this on SIS.
5.7. Dave Tomasko stated that he will put an updated version of the course numbering system on the Task Force’s webpage.

6. The committee was informed that the Aviation proposal has been received and will be reviewed by Subcommittee B.

7. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on the switch to semesters. The MOU with EEIC on the Introduction to Engineering sequence is ready to sign. The Physics MOU just needs to be finalized and the Math MOU is close to being agreed upon. Dave asked the committee as to who should sign the MOUs for the college. Should it be Steve Bibyk, Chair of the Core Committee, Clark Mount-Campbell or Dave? It was decided that as Associate Dean it would be better if Dave signed for the college. Rough deadlines have been established for the submission of the proposals and some should be ready to come to CCAA by the middle of spring quarter.

8. The committee reviewed CSE’s draft semester proposal. Bruce informed the committee that he feels that there are holes in the proposal in regard as to how to use the May term and summer term offerings. However, the Task Force will be meeting tomorrow with some representatives from OAA and CAA and hopefully some clarification can be gotten at that time. Bruce stated that he found the template easier to follow and complete that what he thought it would be. Bruce also
found that the rational and description of the changes were easy to write. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. The committee was informed that one rule passed by the Senate was that a program cannot offer a required course only in the May term. Any required course must be offered in other terms and once the requirement is met it can also be offered in the May term.

8.2. There is also a financial implication for student aid in the May term. The problem is that the May term is after spring graduation and as such federal regulations state that it is not part of the spring semester. The university is working on this problem.

8.3. On the 7th of May people from other universities that offer a May term will be coming to OSU to discuss how they use the May term. This discussion should help as there is a lot of confusion about the May term.

8.4. Dave Tomasko stated that our syllabus tool does not give CAA all of the semester conversion information that they want. What we will do is include a spreadsheet with our syllabi that will have the information they want.

8.5. The question was asked as to how we will map our curriculum to our outcomes and do we need to map the curriculum to our objectives too. After a short discussion it was decided that only a program’s outcomes need to be mapped to their curriculum.

8.6. The question was asked as to what the review process will be. The committee chair stated that there are two levels to the review process. The first is clerical to make sure that everything is included and in the proper order and format. The second is whether the proposal is academically solid. Clark will ask Dave for some help from the college on the clerical portion of the review. Whether each proposal is academically solid will need to be determined by this committee. All three subcommittees will be involved in the review process.

8.6.1. The comment was made that the transition policy is one of the key sections.

8.6.2. The question was asked as to how much time should be scheduled to review a proposal. Would 10-15 minutes be enough? The response was that it will take some time to carefully read each proposal and that 10-15 minutes will not be enough.

8.6.3. The suggestion was made that we break down into specialized groups that only review one section of each proposal. It was decided that this would not save any time as everyone would need to read the entire proposal to get an understanding of how one section fits into the entire curriculum.

8.6.4. The comment was made that everyone will need to review the all of the syllabi that will be attached to each proposal.

8.6.5. The suggestion was made that everyone review three proposals and then the three people who reviewed a proposal get together to discuss it.

8.6.6. The suggestion was made that subcommittees be allowed to directly contact the program if they have questions about the proposal. This suggestion was accepted by the committee.

8.6.7. The question was raised as to what was meant by double counting in section 11. Bruce replied that he was not sure but the way he interpreted it
that CSE did not have any. Tomorrow the representatives from CAA and OAA will be asked as to what they meant and want in that box.

8.6.8. The question was asked as to whether syllabi for technical elective courses need to be included in the packet. The response was that we should include as much as possible. For technical electives as a minimum enough syllabi need to be included to cover the technical elective hours.

8.6.9. The question was asked as to whether we will be able to make changes to our proposal after it has been approved without going through the entire process. The response was that we will be able to go back and fix or add minor changes but major changes would need to go through the approval process.

8.6.10. The comment was made that we should use the college portion of the submission packet to discuss the common courses such as Engineering Calculus I.

8.6.11. CSE only shows one transition plan in their proposal and that is from quarters to semesters. What happens if a student wants to stay with quarters and wants the semester courses to translate back into quarters. Will we need to submit two transition plans one from semesters back to quarters and one from quarters to semesters? The response was that this will be up to the programs but DARS will only be in semesters. Once we switch to semesters a grandfather clause for quarters will not be valid.

8.6.12. The comment was made that if there are no new requirements that there should only be one transition plan but that could be a problem if there are new requirements.

8.6.13. The comment was made that we will need a liberal policy for substituting courses at the same time we need to be aware of ABET criteria.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 2:05.