1. Attendance:
   Aero – Mei Zhuang
   AVN – Doug Hammon (for Seth Young)
   BME – Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Dave Tomasko (for Jeff Chalmers)
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – Not present (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 – Not present (Bob Lowe, Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram)
   Undergraduate Student – Anchie Huang (Not present Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Stacy Weislogel, Pam Hussen

2. The minutes from the 21 April 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. The Committee Chair stated that based on his experience approving all of the proposals will be very time consuming especially if there is a lot of discussion on each proposal and the accompanying syllabi. He has been thinking about how to deal with this problem and three possibilities are extending the meeting times, which would be dependent upon everyone’s schedules; meet every week, which could interfere with subcommittee meetings; or add another meeting time, which would be dependent upon everyone’s availability. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.1. The question was asked as to whether CAA was asking for course syllabi. Ann Christy stated that at the university level they are only interested in bare bone syllabi in the proposals.

3.2. The suggestion was made that we give tentative approval to the courses now and look at them in more detail in the autumn.

3.3. The committee was informed that course requests do not go through CAA but rather go through OAA and OAA mainly reviews them for any obvious conflict of interest.

3.4. The question was asked as to what our subcommittees should do about syllabi when reviewing the proposals. The response was that the subcommittees should look for obvious problems with courses.

3.5. The comment was made that the syllabi could be reviewed by everyone on the college’s syllabus tool.
3.6. The comment was made that it would be better to have paper copies of the syllabi with each proposal.

3.7. The comment was made that in the past CAA has always wanted copies of the syllabi with the proposal.

3.8. The question was asked as to whether all syllabi should accompany each proposal or just the required courses. The response was that for the undergraduate proposals only the syllabi for required courses should be submitted but graduate programs should have all of the syllabi. However, courses such as group studies and research courses would not need to be included.

3.9. The question was asked as to whether the syllabus tool could easily generate a pdf document for all of the syllabi. The response was that at this time the syllabus tool could only generate a pdf document for one syllabus at a time but that it should not be too hard to program it to generate multiple syllabi.

3.10. It was decided that when reviewing a proposal the subcommittees would have access to the syllabi so that they could identify obvious problems. The syllabi would go forward with the proposals as drafts with the understanding that in the autumn CCAA would review the syllabi with the idea of giving them full approval.

4. Marcelo Dapino updated the committee on the status of the Reconfiguration of the Department of Aviation (AVN) into the Center for Aviation Studies (CAS): A College Center within The Ohio State University College of Engineering proposal. Nawal Taneja has provided a letter addressing the two of the three concerns that were expressed at the committee’s last meeting. The concerns that were addressed were about the proposal mentioning that the center would have a graduate program but no details were given and how students will be admitted to the various programs offered by Aviation. However, no documentation has been received from the TIUs that the Aviation faculty will be going to stating that they are agreeable with the individual joining them. While Marcelo does not feel that Nawal’s letter fully addresses the two concerns he does feel that the response was adequate enough to send the proposal forward. Marcelo made a motion that the Reconfiguration of the Department of Aviation (AVN) into the Center for Aviation Studies (CAS): A College Center within The Ohio State University College of Engineering proposal be approved contingent upon the receipt of positive letters from the Civil and Mechanical Department Chairs on accepting the Aviation faculty into their department. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The question was asked as to whether the college has a procedure in place for the creation of a college level center. Doug Hammon commented that Randy Moses was creating one and that it had been through a number of iterations but that he did not know if it had been finalized.

4.2. The comment was made that this proposal was the template for creating a college level center.

4.3. The comment was made that the faculty would need to vote on changing the faculty rules so that a center could be created.
4.4. Bruce Weide made a friendly amendment that CCAA send the proposal, once the positive letters have been received, to the faculty for a vote with the recommendation that the faculty approve the proposal. The friendly amendment was accepted.

4.5. The comment was made that the proposal does not mention disbanding the department, will that need to be in another proposal? The comment was made that this proposal implies that the department will be abolished.

4.6. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.

5. John Lippold updated the committee on the status of the semester proposals in Subcommittee A.

5.1. The subcommittee has completed its initial review of CSE’s BS, MS, and PhD proposals. They have no major issues with any of these proposals but they did not review any syllabi as there were none with the proposal. George Valco, who is lead on these proposals, will be sending a letter to CSE outlining the subcommittee’s concerns. Once these concerns are addressed the proposal will be ready to submit to the full committee.

5.2. Mei Zhuang is the lead on the Civil and Environmental proposals and the initial review should be completed by sometime next week.

5.3. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.3.1. The question was asked as to whether all of the proposals need to be voted on by the entire faculty. The feeling in the committee was that this was not necessary.

5.3.2. The question was asked as to when the college’s portion will be ready to be reviewed. Dave Tomasko stated that it should be ready to go to a subcommittee within two weeks. There has been some delay in getting the Math MOU ready but that CCAA could begin the review while the Math MOU is being finalized.

5.3.3. The question was asked as to when additional proposals will be received. The response was that ISE’s is almost ready and that others should be ready soon.

6. Marcelo Dapino updated the committee on the status of the semester proposals in Subcommittee B.

6.1.1. The subcommittee has met and discussed the ECE proposals. The proposals need syllabi and ECE has stated that they need to redo some of the course numbers.

6.1.2. The subcommittee has not started on the Engineering Physics proposal.

6.1.3. Marcelo stated that it would be helpful if a table of contents was included with each proposal.

6.1.4. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1.4.1. The question was asked as to whether 4000 level courses will count for graduate credit for students outside of the offering department. The response was yes they would just like 500 level courses do now.
6.1.4.2. The committee was asked as to whether proposals need a table of contents.
6.1.4.2.1. The comment was made that a table of contents was not in the template.
6.1.4.2.2. The comment was made that the template is just a guideline and that we can add requirements to it.
6.1.4.2.3. The comment was made that all of the programs who have submitted proposals did not include a table of contents and that it would be unfair to ask them to create one now.
6.1.4.2.4. The comment was made that there was no need for a table of contents as long as everyone follows the template.
6.1.4.2.5. The comment was made that the template is in the process of being changed and that we should let CAA know what version we are using. The committee secretary stated that he would include that information in the college’s portion of the proposal.
6.1.4.2.6. The decision was made that a table of contents would not be required.

7. Hal Walker updated the committee on the status of the semester proposals in the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
7.1. The subcommittee has been meeting on the alternate Wednesdays from the full committee’s meetings.
7.2. Comments have been compiled for the BS and UG Minor in BME as well as the BS in ME. There are no major issues with any of these proposals.
7.3. The MS, PhD, and MD/PhD proposals from BME have been tabled as BME realized that they needed to make some changes to them.
7.4. One general concern is that the transition plans state that extensive advising will be needed but there are no details on how this will be accomplished and what resources will be needed.
7.5. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.5.1. The comment was made that our advisors already have a full time job and that we may need to hire some part time help to do the semester conversion advising.
7.5.2. The comment was made that the solution will be at the department level. Graduate students or seniors could be hired to help each student create a transition plan.
7.5.3. Pam Hussen commented that this topic has been discussed in the college advisor’s group and they have come up with two possible solutions. One would be to hire graduate students and the other was to hire people to teach the survey courses. The campus wide advisor group has found out that when Wisconsin made the switch from quarters to semesters that they put additional money into advising.
7.5.4. Ann Christy commented that money is available at the university for advising and that we should apply for it to pay for help with advising.
7.5.5. The question was asked as to who should apply for it and where should the request be sent. The response was that the request should come from the dean or Dave Tomasko and should probably go to Randy Smith.

8. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that he just talked with Randy Moses on the phone and that guidelines for creating a college center have been created and that the faculty will need to vote to change college by laws so that they can be adopted. Assuming the guidelines are adopted then the Aviation proposal could be voted on. Dave stated that he will circulate the guidelines to CCAA. Dave asked Marcelo if he felt that the Aviation proposal was adequate template for the creation of a college center. Marcelo stated that he had not looked at the proposal that way and would need to review it again before he could make a comment.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 1:35.