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

2. The minutes from the 11 October 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. Civil’s BS/MS, MS, and PhD Semester Proposals were presented to the committee. John Lippold made a motion that the proposals be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1 After an initial review by the subcommittee Civil revised the proposals and the subcommittee is now satisfied with them.
   3.2 The question was asked as to why the table in section 11 does not show any hours required in the unit. The response was that while the program does not require any specific percentage of course to be taken in Civil, Tables A and B specify the courses the student must take. Currently all of the courses in Table A are Civil Engineering courses but this will change after semester courses outside of Engineering are approved.
   3.3 The comment was made that, in effect, there is a required number of Civil courses the student must take. The response was that there is not a hard minimum but that most of the courses a student takes will be Civil Engineering courses.
   3.4 The comment was made that Civil currently has similar tables and, so, they are not making any new policies except for getting rid of the required graduate minor from outside of Civil.
3.5. The question was asked as to whether there are any notes indicating that additional courses will be added to Table A. The response was yes that there is a statement in Section 8 that discusses it.
3.6. The question was asked as to whether the current Table A shows courses from outside of Engineering. The response was yes.
3.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Chemical's BS Semester Proposal was presented to the committee. John Lippold made a motion that the proposal be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
4.1. The committee was informed that the table in Section 11 that was found to be incorrect at the committee's last meeting has been corrected. Also, Section 12 has been changed as one of the rows in the table now has an hour change that is greater than four hours.
4.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. Hal Walker presented the Course Proposal Subcommittee's recommendations to the committee.
5.1. While group study requests are normally handled by Ed McCaul ECE 294, Energy and Society, cuts across a number of program boundaries and other programs have asked that it be brought before CCAA. Group study courses are only valid for one quarter and if the program wishes to offer it again they must submit another group studies request. The subcommittee does not have a recommendation for this course and wanted to get some input from the committee before making a recommendation. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.1.1. The comment was made that it is a 200 level course and is mainly designed to be taken by non engineering students.
5.1.2. The comment was made that as it is not a General Education course it may be hard to get enough students to take it. George Valco stated that ECE is aware of that risk.
5.1.3. The comment was made that we have tried to get a Technology component in the General Education listing but have not been able to with one reason being given that there are no courses in technology for the general student population. If we create some technology courses for non engineering students it will improve our chances of getting technology included in the General Education listing.
5.1.4. The question was asked as to how many times ECE is considering offering the course. The response was that it depends on demand.
5.1.5. The question was asked as to what will happen if other programs decide to offer a similar course.
5.1.5.1. The comment was made that ECE should not have exclusive rights to this topic.
5.1.5.2. The comment was made that the courses could be cross listed.
5.1.5.3. The comment was made that cross listing comes with its own set of problems and may not be a good solution.
5.1.5.4. The comment was made that EEIC could offer it.
5.1.5.5. The comment was made that EEIC is getting very big and that programs are beginning to wonder how big it will become.
5.1.5.6. The comment was made that there are enough possible variations in the topic that the courses offered by different programs would be unique.
5.1.5.7. The comment was made that if a lot of programs offer similar courses, even though they cover different topics, that most students will not have any idea that the courses are different. In the end we could be defeating our own purpose and competing for the same students.
5.1.6. The question was asked as to whether ECE plans on making this a permanent course. The response was yes but only if there is enough demand.
5.1.7. The comment was made that while a number of programs could have created this course only ECE put the time in to do so. The request should be approved with ECE knowing that they do not have exclusive rights to this topic.

5.2. Based on the discussion Hal Walker made a motion that ECE 294 be approved. Jen Ping Chen seconded the motion. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
5.3. Hal Walker made a motion that ENG 491, Current Topics Undergraduate Colloquia, Workshops, & Seminars, be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.3.1. The committee was informed that the purpose of this request is to create a seminar course for EEIC. It has been approved by the Core Committee, which acts as EEIC’s Curriculum Committee. One stipulation that the Core Committee put on the course is that the instructor of record would be required to give a presentation to the Core Committee about the seminar they wish to offer under this number. The Core Committee must approve the concept prior to it being offered.
5.3.2. The question was asked as to whether the course was repeatable. The response was yes as each seminar will probably be unique.
5.3.3. The comment was made that a program does not have to accept this course as counting toward a student’s degree.
5.3.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
5.4. Hal Walker made a motion that NE 777, Risk and Reliability for Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems, be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.4.1. The committee was informed that the course has concurrence from ECE after changes were made to the course’s title.
5.4.2. Paul Sivilotti stated that CSE would like to review the course before it is approved by CCAA. The committee secretary stated that as it is a new course request that if CCAA is going to approve it that it must approve the
request at its next meeting on the 8th of November. Paul stated that he did not know if CSE would be able to review it by then.

5.4.3. Hal and Shivraman withdrew their motion pending review by CSE with the provision that if CSE had not responded by the committee’s next meeting that CCAA would consider the course request again.

5.5. Hal Walker asked the committee that he would like a discussion on BME’s new course request for BME 471, BME Domain Course Lab, and FABE’s course change request for FABE 325, Transfer Processes in Food, Agricultural and Biological Systems, as both courses require additional lab or recitation hours from the student with no increase in credit hours. BME wants to create a zero hour lab course that students who are taking BME’s domain course will be required to take. The lab course will require them to take two weeks of lab for each domain they are working in. FABE is adding a one hour per week recitation to their course.

5.5.1. The floor was opened for discussion for BME 471.

5.5.1.1. Jun Liu stated that BME is adding the course as they do not have enough resources to keep running the lab as they currently do. Currently two weeks of the domain course is devoted to the lab but increased enrollment will make this impractical.

5.5.1.2. The question was asked as to why not just make a change to the syllabus. The response was that they want the students to sign up for an additional block of time throughout the quarter.

5.5.1.3. The comment was made that more detailed information is needed on BME’s proposal.

5.5.1.4. The question was asked as to why BME is not submitting course change requests rather than a new course request. The committee was informed that the domain course is a required course and any increase in credit hours would mean that BME would need to submit a new curriculum proposal.

5.5.1.5. Jun Liu informed the committee that the lab course would only be taken by BME majors and not students who are in the minor. The response was that this could give the students in the major an unfair advantage over the students taking the minor as information gained in the lab which may help the students in the course.

5.5.1.6. Hal Walker summarized the committees concerns about BME 471 as that the proposed change does not solve the problem and that there is a concern about students who take the lab gaining an advantage over students who do not take the lab. It was decided to return this course request to the subcommittee.

5.5.2. The floor was opened for discussion for FABE 325.

5.5.2.1. The comment was made that FABE is not the first program in the university to have a contact hour distribution like this and not give the students full credit for the contact hours.

5.5.2.2. The comment was made that FABE, while increasing their work load, will not be increasing the funding they get from the course.
5.5.2.3. Based on those comments Hal Walker made a motion that FABE 325 be approved. John Lippold seconded the motion.
5.5.2.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 3:50.