1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Not present (Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Paul Sivilotti
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   WLD – Not present (John Lippold)
   MAE –
   Aero – Jen Ping Chen
   ME – Blaine Lilly
   Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri, Cherian Zachariah
   Undergraduate Student – Anchie Huang
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Pam Hussen, Nikki Strader

2. The minutes from the 16 September 2010 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Engineering Physic’s BS Semester Proposal was presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposal be approved. Richard Hughes seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The comment was made that the cover letter needs to have a more current date on it. Approval of the proposal contingent upon correction of the cover letter was accepted as a friendly amendment.
   3.2. The comment was made that the math in Table 11 needs to be corrected. Approval of the proposal contingent upon correction of the table was accepted as a friendly amendment.
   3.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with its amendments passed.

4. Aero’s BS Semester Proposal was presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposal be approved. Kathy Flores seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The comment was made that there was no cover letter signed by the department chair. Approval of the proposal contingent upon receipt of the cover letter, subject to approval by Subcommittee B, was accepted as a friendly amendment.
4.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with its amendment passed.

5. Aero’s BS/MS, MS, and PhD Semester Proposals were presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposals be approved. Kathy Flores seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.1. The comment was made that, again, there was no cover letter signed by the department chair. Approval of the proposal contingent upon receipt of the cover letter, subject to approval by Subcommittee B, was accepted as a friendly amendment.
5.2. The comment was made that Aero has stricter guidelines for its BS/MS program than the college.
5.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with its amendment passed.

6. Welding’s MS and PhD Semester Proposals were presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposals be approved. Kathy Flores seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The comment was made that there is no mention of Welding’s BS/MS program in their proposal or cover letter. Approval of the proposal contingent upon receipt of a revised cover letter or proposal discussing their BS/MS program was accepted as a friendly amendment.
6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with its amendment passed.

7. MSE’s BS Semester Proposal was presented to the committee. Kathy Flores made a motion that the proposal be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. BME’s Proposed Enrollment Management Plan was presented to the committee. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposal be approved. Richard Hughes seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1. The committee was informed that the proposal had been recommended to be approved by Subcommittee B in the summer but CCAA’s reduced quorum rules stated that only semester proposals were to be considered during the summer.
8.2. The committee was informed that Subcommittee B had its concerns about this enrollment management plan. The plan is very different than any other engineering program’s plan as it allocates 20% of a student’s admission score to be subjective. Rich Hart, the BME Department Chair, did an excellent job in explaining their reasoning to the subcommittee. His explanation and the fact that the policy had been vetted by OSU’s legal department convinced the subcommittee to recommend its approval.
8.3. The question was asked as to where the plan goes after CCAA approves it. The response was that it will go to CAA for its approval.
8.4. The comment was made that while the proposals states that Greg Washington, Dolan Evanovich, VP for Strategic Enrollment Planning, and Michael Layish, Assistant General Counsel, support and approve the plan that there is no written documentation of their support attached to the proposal. Having written proof of their support and approval can become crucial if the plan even ends up in court.

8.5. Approval of the proposal contingent upon receipt of documentation from Greg Washington, Dolan Evanovich, and Michael Layish expressing their support and approval of the plan was accepted as a friendly amendment.

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

9. The committee was updated on the status of the proposals being reviewed by Subcommittee A.
9.1. Revisions have been received from Chemical Engineering but they still need to provide a summary letter discussing the changes.
9.2. The revised Civil Engineering proposals should be back to the subcommittee sometime this week.
9.3. The revised Surveying minor is being reviewed by the subcommittee.
9.4. The CSE graduate minor proposal should be ready for presentation to the full committee at its next meeting.
9.5. FABE’s graduate proposals should be ready for presentation to the full committee at its next meeting.

10. The committee was updated on the status of the proposal being reviewed by Subcommittee B.
10.1. The subcommittee is waiting to receive a revised proposal from ISE.

11. The committee was updated on the status of the proposals being reviewed by the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
11.1. The Aviation proposals are back at Aviation being revised.
11.2. The BME MD/PhD proposal is being revised by BME.
11.3. The Mechanical and Nuclear proposals are in the process of being revised.

12. The committee was asked if anyone had any problems with the subcommittee that reviewed a program’s semester proposal reviewing that program’s semester course proposals. No one had a problem with this and it was decided that this is how the semester course requests will be reviewed.

13. The committee was reminded about the 15 November new quarter course deadline that the university has imposed. CCAA needs to create an earlier deadline so that any new quarter course can be approved prior to that date. It was decided that Friday the 5th of November would be the deadline.

14. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on semester conversion issues.
14.1. We will need to input all of our semester proposals on the university’s new PACER system once they have been approved. We did not have to do this initially with our proposals as the system was not operational before our proposals were ready to be submitted. If revisions are requested programs will be encouraged to put their proposals into PACER at that time. If needed, the college will assign one of our student workers to assist with inputting the proposals. We will continue to use our syllabus tool to create course syllabi and, on a regular bases, it will upload to the university’s PACER system.

15. The meeting was adjourned at 3:25.