1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger and Rita Alevriadou
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Not present (Hal Walker)
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
      MSE – Kathy Flores
      WLD – John Lippold
   MAE –
      Aero – Mei Zhuang
      ME - Not present (Marcelo Dapino)
   Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri
   Undergraduate Student – Not present (Anchie Huang, Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – none

2. The minutes from the 1 September 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. BME’s BS/MS, MS, and PhD Semester Proposals were presented to the committee. Mark Ruegsegger made a motion that the proposals be approved. Bruce Weide seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The committee was informed that BME is planning on following the college’s guidelines for their BS/MS program.
   3.2. The comment was made that on page 2 of the PhD proposal that the wording under the second part of BME Domains is confusing and that it should be reworded. Mark Ruegsegger accepted this as a friendly amendment and stated that he would reword this section to make it clearer.
   3.3. The suggestion was made that the table on pages 4 and 5 of the MS proposal be changed so that the table is not broken and is on one page. The comment was made that a page break could be inserted before the table. Mark Ruegsegger accepted this as a friendly amendment and stated that he would change it.
   3.4. The question was asked as to why the MS degree required 31 hours rather than the 30 required by the Graduate School. The response was that because of the number of hours in the required courses it is not possible for a student to hit 30 hours exactly. The question was asked as to what will happen if a student takes some other courses and does hit 30 hours exactly. The response was that they would then be required to take one credit hour of independent study. The
comment was made that we should not get too fixed on the number of credit hours as long as a program meets the minimum number of hours.
3.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendments passed.

4. ECE’s BS Semester Proposal was presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposals be approved. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
4.1. The comment was made that on page 3 outcome n is poorly worded and really should be worded something like “Our graduates have achieved academic abilities such that they are aggressively recruited by both industry and graduate programs.” The comment was made that each program’s outcomes are voted on by its faculty and we really should not be editing them now. The comment was made that each program will have to defend their outcomes with ABET and that we should not determine what a program’s outcomes should be.
4.2. The comment was made that on page 11 in Table 11-1 there is a math error. Correction of this math error was accepted as a friendly amendment.
4.3. The comment was made that ECE has a transition plan that is more complex than anyone else’s.
4.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion with the amendment passed.

5. It was decided that the committee would meet again on Thursday the 16th of September at 1:00. The committee secretary was asked to reserve a room and to send a message out to the committee reminding them of the meeting and what room it will be in.

6. Subcommittee A made the following report:
6.1. The Chemical Engineering proposals have been reviewed by the subcommittee and are now with the department for revision.
6.2. The CEEGS proposals are at the department for revision.
6.3. The CSE graduate minor is at the subcommittee and in the process of being reviewed
6.4. The revised FABE graduate proposals are at the subcommittee and are being reviewed.

7. Subcommittee B made the following report:
7.1. The subcommittee has received the revised Aero proposals.
7.2. The ECE graduate proposals are at the department
7.3. The Engineering Physics BS proposal has been revised and is being reviewed by the subcommittee. It should be ready for next week’s meeting.
7.4. The ISE graduate proposals are at the department
7.5. The MSE revisions have been received and are being reviewed by the subcommittee
7.6. The Welding revisions have been received and are being reviewed by the subcommittee.
8. The status of most of the proposals being reviewed by the Course Proposal Subcommittee is unknown but the subcommittee has received BME’s PhD/MD proposal.

9. The committee was informed the ISE is waiting until Business submits their semester proposals before submitting their MBLE proposal as both ISE and Business are involved with this degree.

10. The committee was informed that the CSE UG Minor in Computational Science & Engineering has not been received as the minor has a number of universities in the state involved in the minor. This minor will take quite a bit of coordination.

11. Ann Christy informed the committee that while the Graduate Handbook is still a draft it is close to being published. It may be possible to anyone who needs a copy of it to get a draft copy.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 PM.