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

2. The minutes from the 7 April 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. The Committee Secretary presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee’s recommendations.
   3.1. BME has submitted course change requests for 205, 402, 411, 421, 431, 441, 451, 461, and 500. All of the changes deal with the prerequisites for the courses. The subcommittee is recommending that the changes be approved. Rita Alevriadou made a motion the BME’s course change requests be approved. Mei Zhuang seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
      3.1.1. The question was asked as to whether the courses are being changed. The response was no, that only the prerequisites are being changed.
      3.1.2. The question was asked as to why BME is making all of these changes. The response was that they have learned that the current prerequisites are not adequately preparing their students.
      3.1.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

   3.2. CEEGS has submitted a course change request for CE 460 and course withdrawal requests for Geodetic Science 597, 603, 604, 623, 624, 637, 638, and 640. CE 460 is being changed from pass/fail to a letter grade while the Geodetic Science courses are being withdrawn as they have not been offered in a number of years and there is no plan on offering them again or the course is cross listed with one in Civil and the Civil version is not being withdrawn. The subcommittee is recommending that the changes be approved. Rita Alevriadou
made a motion the BME’s course change requests be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.2.1. The question was asked as to why CEEGS is withdrawing all of these courses. The response was that they have lost faculty in Geodetic Science and can no longer teach all of these courses. There are still a large number of courses in Geodetic Science and some of the topics are covered in various Civil Engineering courses.

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

3.3. Mechanical has submitted a course change request for ME 501 which will changes its prerequisites so that only Mechanical Engineering majors can take the course. The subcommittee is recommending that the change be approved. Ann Christy commented that ME 501 is a required course for some FABE students and that this change would make it very difficult for them to enroll in the course. Based on that information it was decided that the request would be sent back to Mechanical so that they could work with FABE on an acceptable solution.

4. Marcelo Dapino informed the committee that Subcommittee B has had a hard time coming up with a good meeting time. Consequently, the subcommittee has been sharing their thoughts on the Aviation Proposal electronically. However, he has not had responses from everyone on the subcommittee yet. Marcelo does have three observations that he would like to get clarified. First, the proposal mentions that the center would have a graduate program but no details were given. Second, he would like to see some documentation from the TIUs that the Aviation faculty will be going to stating that they are agreeable with the individual joining them. Third, it is not clear in the proposal on how students will be admitted to the various programs offered by Aviation. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. Nawal Taneja commented that the proposal is not specific about a graduate program because they do have a firm plan for it yet. The hope is that once the center is established that a graduate program can be built on the faculty in a variety of departments as the center will not be a TIU. Admission to any of the undergraduate programs will work the same way that it does now. As far as the undergraduate students are concerned there will not be any visible change. Right now there are just oral agreements with the two departments which will be accepting the faculty but it would be better if the agreements were in writing.

4.2. Marcelo commented that the graduate program comes up in multiple places in the proposal and that the reader gets the impression that it is very important to the center. The proposal needs to be very clear that the creation of the center is not dependent upon the creation of a graduate degree and that the creation of such a degree is dependent upon developing adequate interdisciplinary resources.

4.3. The comment was made that the department with only two faculty did not have the critical mass of faculty to have a graduate degree but as a center Aviation will have the resources of the entire college behind it.
4.4. The comment was made that these discussions should be included with the proposal when it is sent forward to CAA. One method of doing this would be to take an excerpt from the minutes and attach them to the proposal.

5. Clark Mount-Campbell stated that the committee has an enormous amount of work to do this spring and that everyone needs to cooperate with the subcommittee chairs if we are to get the work done. Subcommittees may need to meet with only some of their members present if a date and time that everyone can be there cannot be arranged. This time slot was chosen for the full committee to meet as most members are available during it. Subcommittees could meet during this time slot in the weeks when the full committee is not meeting. If it is necessary Clark would be willing to move people from one subcommittee to another to better accommodate people’s time schedules.

6. The revised semester Second Baccalaureate Degree Policy was discussed by the committee. The suggested changes to the policy are that the minimum credits needed beyond the first degree be changed from 45 quarter hours to 30 semester hours; that number of hours that will be taken from courses in the new major be changed from 30 quarter hours to 20 semester hours; and that the number of hours that may be taken from courses outside of the major be changed from 15 quarter hours to 10 semester hours. Ann Christy made a motion that the changes be accepted. Rita Alevriadou seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   6.1. The comment was made that the revised policy should only become effective when we switch to semesters. The response was that this could be noted on the policy.
   6.2. The question was asked as to what will happen if a student is part way through their second degree. The response was that the student would have to work with their program and its transition plan.
   6.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. The revised semester Combined BS/MS Degree Policy was discussed by the committee. The only suggested change to the policy is that the maximum credits that can be double counted toward the BS and MS degrees be changed from 15 quarter hours to 12 semester hours. The reason that this is not a direct mathematical conversion is that the Quarters to Semesters Task Force felt that as 12 hours will be considered a full semester load we should allow a student to double count a full semester so that they could graduate a semester earlier. One reason for updating the proposal is to put it in the college’s portion of the semester conversion proposal to keep everyone from needing to include it in theirs. Bruce Weide made a motion that the revised policy be accepted. Rita Alevriadou seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   7.1. The comment was made that what will happen if the graduate school only allows 10 semester hours to double count.
7.2. Ann Christy stated that while the Graduate School has thought about this issue that they have not yet made a decision.

7.3. The comment was made that we should encourage the Graduate School to make the number of hours that can double count as high as possible so that it will encourage our students to stay here and get a masters.

7.4. The comment was made that 15 quarter hours are worth about five courses but 12 semester hours are only worth four courses. If we want the number of courses to be the same then we should advocate allowing 15 semester hours to double count.

7.5. George Valco stated that ECE has stricter standards than the college and wanted to know if they would need to have a BS/MS section in their proposal. The response was that if their policy is more restrictive then they will need to include it in their proposal.

7.6. The comment was made that the policy states that all of our BS/MS programs are to be reviewed by CCAA every three years. Has this happened? The response was that we have tried but programs were not very responsive and we were not successful doing it centrally.

7.7. The question was asked as to why we need to review the program. The response was that when the program was created CCAA wanted to know if departments were taking advantage of it. Bruce Weide made a motion that this requirement be dropped. Rita Alevriadou seconded the motion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed and the requirement will be removed.

7.8. The question was asked as to whether we should get rid of our 3.5 gpa requirement as it is the same gpa requirement as the Graduate School has. If they lower theirs we would either have a higher standard or would need to change ours. The comment was made that we should keep the requirement as we can react and change very quickly if the Graduate School changes their policy.

7.9. The comment was made that they liked the 3.5 standard as we do not want the BS/MS program to become a short cut to a masters for everyone. The comment was made that the BS/MS program only really compresses the time to a BS degree as once they are accepted into the program they become graduate students.

7.10. Bruce Weide made a motion that Clark Mount-Campbell write a letter to Roberto Rojas and the Graduate School encouraging them to allow at least 12 semester hours to double count and that 15 would be acceptable. Rita Alevriadou seconded the motion. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7.11. It was decided to wait and see what the Graduate School does before changing the number of hours that will double count in the college’s policy.

8. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A met yesterday to develop a process for dealing with the semester proposals along with an evaluation form. He would like to get comments from the committee on the process and evaluation form. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1. The suggestion was made that the Cover Letter section state whether the program is being withdrawn or deactivated rather than just withdrawn.
8.2. The suggestion was made that the Cover Letter section include information on student and external input.
8.3. Ann Christy stated that we will need to clean up the engineering programs that are shown in SIS. She was surprised to learn that SIS listed ones for FABE that she was not aware of.
8.4. The comment was made that the evaluation form is good and will give everyone a format that can be used to review the proposals. We need to make sure that everyone understands that it is just for the internal use of CCAA.
8.5. The suggestion was made that the Assessment Conversion section be reduced to one row that asks whether a plan is on file with OAA and that it indicate that this question is only for BS programs.
8.6. It was decided that the process and evaluation form be revised as needed and then distributed to everyone on the committee for their use in reviewing the semester proposals.

9. The semester conversion template was discussed by the committee.
9.1. The question was asked as to what CCAA is looking for in regards to student and external input. The response was that some sort of feedback on the semester proposal from those groups is needed. This information can be included in the department chair’s cover letter as Section 10 has a word limit but the cover letter does not.
9.2. The comment was made that we need to do what is right and then let CAA figure it out. Since we are submitting first CAA may end up using our submissions as the standard.
9.3. The committee was informed that the latest word is that the rational is no longer part of the template but instead is to be an attachment but this is still subject to change.
9.4. The comment was made that we need to review the proposals, send them on to CAA, and if they do not like something they will let us know.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00.