1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Keith Gooch (for Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Paul Sivilotti
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
      MSE – Kathy Flores
      WLD – John Lippold
   MAE –
      Aero – Not present (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 – Dave Tomasko, Bob Gustafson, Shaun Rowland

2. The minutes from the 25 October 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. Shaun Rowland briefed the committee on the college’s course approval tool.
   3.1. Once a course has been approved by a department it will become a CCAA proposed course. After the subcommittee approves the course it moves to the recommended/recommended with contingency level. It is then ready to be considered by CCAA. Once CCAA approves it the course will be uploaded to the university’s system. There is also a text box for comments for each course.
   3.2. Our tool is only designed for course requests not curriculum requests. Curriculum requests will need to be initiated in the university’s system.
   3.3. The floor was opened for discussion.
      3.3.1. The comment was made that this system can be used to implement what we currently do.
      3.3.2. The comment was made that anyone who makes a comment on a course needs to indicate who they are.
      3.3.3. The question was asked as to whether this system will merge the role of the Course Proposal Subcommittee with the full committee. The response was no as a course would need to be recommended by the subcommittee prior to it being addressed by the full committee.
      3.3.4. The question was asked as to how a viewer will be able to differentiate between a course that has been approved at the department level versus
one that has been approved by CCAA. The response was that a course that has been approved by CCAA will be marked as CCAA approved.

3.3.5. The question was asked as to how a viewer will be able to tell if a course has been edited. The response was that this information could be shown in the comment box.

3.3.6. The question was asked as to whether this system is ready to go. The response was yes.

3.3.7. The question was asked as to whether a course will be sent to the university if there are contingencies to it. The response was no as only Ed McCaul and Dave Tomasko can move a course out of the college’s system to the university’s.

3.3.8. The comment was made that due to prerequisites we need to first approve lower level courses and work our way up to higher level ones.

3.3.9. The question was asked as to whether subcommittees will be able to directly communicate with the programs on their courses. The response was yes. Hal Walker commented that the Course Proposal Subcommittee currently does this with course requests so that most issues are resolved prior to a course coming to the full committee.

3.3.10. Shaun Rowland informed the committee that some of the syllabi in the college’s system have some problems dealing with limits on the number of characters that are allowed in a box. When he set up the system some boxes had no limit but the university’s system does. So, if a box that is over the limit is uploaded to the university’s the written comments will be cut off at the limit. Currently, there are 219 out of 1,219 syllabi in our system that have this issue. Subcommittees need to be aware of this so that the program can make the appropriate changes rather than have the last part of their statement cut off.

3.3.11. The committee chair announced that each subcommittee will review the three lowest courses for any or all of the programs that they have been responsible for during the Q2S approval process. We need to start out small to check the system out and to let everyone get familiar with it.

4. Bob Gustafson provided a handout (attached) to the committee which discusses the possibility of creating a Curriculum Committee for EEIC. Bob stated that he is seeking input from the committee, prior to creating a proposal, as it is one of the three entities in the college that can create committees. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The question was asked as to why the Core Committee, which is currently acting as a curriculum committee for EEIC, is not sufficient. The reply was that they are too busy with other issues.

4.2. The question was asked as to why the Core Committee does not create a subcommittee which would exclusively deal with EEIC curriculum issues. The response was that this was an option.

4.3. The comment was made that as the Engineering Core is getting smaller the Core Committee should have more time to spend on EEIC curriculum issues.
4.4. The comment was made that faculty are on the Core Committee but that EEIC is not a TIU and thus does not have any permanent faculty. Where would EEIC get faculty to serve on such a committee?

4.5. The comment was made that if a curriculum committee was created for EEIC it would begin to look like the old Engineering Graphics Department, where faculty had difficulty getting tenure because of its mission. The comment was made that this is irrelevant to the issue being discussed.

4.6. The comment was made that if such a committee is created that the relationship between it and the Core Committee would need to be defined.

4.7. Bob Gustafson was asked to come back with a formal proposal. Bob stated that if anyone is interested in giving input to the proposal to let him know. It was suggested that he should definitely consult with the Core Committee in developing the proposal.

5. John Lippold made a motion that ChBE’s BS/MS, MS, and PhD semester proposals be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The committee was informed that there were only minor issues with these proposals and that these issues have been taken care of.

5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. John Lippold made a motion that FABE’s BS/MS semester proposal be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The committee was informed that Sudhir Sastry sent the letter as FABE’s BS/MS program was not fully covered in his original cover letter.

6.2. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Hal Walker made a motion that Nuclear’s Undergraduate Minor semester proposal be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. The question was asked as to whether there was a different standard for a change in the number of credit hours required for a minor than for a major. If a major has a difference greater than four hours it needs to be explained. Since all majors have substantially more hours than a minor does a minor have a lower threshold? Ann Christy stated that while this topic was brought up at the university level that no decision was made so the best we can do is assume that four hours is the standard.

7.2. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. Hal Walker made a motion that Nuclear’s BS/MS, MS, PhD, and the withdrawal of their Graduate Minor be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1. The comment was made that the table in Section 11 for both the MS and the PhD does not meet the standards we expect. Hal Walker stated that Nuclear wanted to keep the table that way and not follow the required format.

8.2. It was decided to withdrawal the motions and return Nuclear’s graduate proposals to the subcommittee until the table is in the proper format.

9. Hal Walker made a motion that the request to withdrawal the Engineering Mechanics graduate degrees be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

9.1. The question was asked as to whether any students are in either of these programs. The response was no and that no one has been in either one for a number of years.

9.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Hal Walker made a motion that Nuclear Engineering’s new course request for NE 777 be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

10.1. The committee was informed that this course was presented to the committee at its last meeting but that Paul Sivilotti requested that CSE be given an opportunity to review the course before the committee acted on it. However, nothing has been heard from CSE and today is the last meeting of the committee prior to the university’s deadline for submitting new quarter course requests.

10.2. Paul Sivilotti stated that CSE’s curriculum committee had met and had voted to concur with this course being offered.

10.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

11. Hal Walker made a motion that ISE’s new course requests for ISE 599.01 and 599.02 be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

11.1. The committee was informed that both of these courses are designed to be bridge courses so that current ISE students can more easily graduate after we switch to semesters.

11.2. The question was asked as to whether students who are graduating under quarters would be allowed to take and count these courses. Blaine Lilly responded that they could take them and count them as technical electives but it is doubtful that many would.

11.3. Ann Christy commented that the term bridge course has been supplanted by the term transition course. The reason is that a bridge course implies a developmental course. A friendly amendment was made that the courses be approved contingent upon changing “bridge” to “transition” in the proposal. The amendment was accepted.

11.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.
12. Hal Walker made a motion that ECE’s course change requests for 265, 508, and 561 be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

12.1. The committee was informed that for 265 the description is being slightly changed, for 508 the course is being changed from a U/G to an undergraduate course only so that a TA could teach it, and for 561 the prerequisites are being changed.

12.2. The question was asked as to whether 508 was always taught by a TA. The response was that it is typically taught by a TA and that ECE is not changing their teaching practice. ECE wants to make sure that when it is being taught by a TA that a graduate student is not assigning grades to another graduate student.

12.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

13. Hal Walker made a motion that BME’s new course request for 471 be approved. Keith Gooch seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

13.1. The committee was informed that this course was discussed at the committee’s last meeting but was sent back for clarification. The committee had two issues with this course. The first was whether it is possible to schedule a block of time for a zero credit hour course. Since the committee’s last meeting the Registrar’s Office has stated that a block of time can be scheduled for a zero credit hour course. The second issue was whether it was fair that students in the BME minor would not be allowed to take this lab course while BME majors would be required to. Would taking this lab course give the BME majors an unfair advantage over the non BME major students? BME informed the subcommittee that it would be unfair for the non BME major students to take the lab course as they would not have taken a previous BME course in which information which is critical to successfully completing the lab was covered. BME also stated that students who do not take the lab will not be penalized.

13.2. While the subcommittee is not comfortable with approving this course they are recommending that it be approved as the course will disappear when we switch to semesters and during that time BME should be able to develop a more feasible solution to how this lab should be offered.

13.3. The question was asked as to which subcommittee is reviewing BME’s courses. The response was the Course Proposal Subcommittee which Hal is chair of.

13.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

14. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45.
Discussion Outline: Creating an EEIC Curriculum Committee

As is Condition:
- Core Curriculum and College Service Committee acts as the Curriculum Committee for all ENGINEER courses. In this case it acts much like a department curriculum committee and reports actions to CCAA.
- ENGINEER courses are now the 5th largest unit for number of credit hours produced per year.
- Under semesters all EEIC courses will be under ENGINEER. (We are not going to continue EN GRAPH as separate unit for courses.)
- A small number of ENGINEER courses do not fall under EEIC; notable examples ENG 100 (17 offerings), ENG 195 Women in Engineering, ENG 689 Professional Practice in Engineering.
- First-year advisory committee does a good job for 1st yr programs, but does not cover other elements of such as multi-disciplinary capstone design, minors, history courses, TCRC, etc.
- EEIC has administrative responsibility for two minors for non-engineers – Engineering Sciences, and Technological Studies
- Growth in offerings and potential offerings both exist.

Proposal - Create an EEIC Curriculum Committee with voting membership on CCAA for curriculum issues.

Possible Roles and Responsibilities:
- All current and future ENGINEER courses
- Minors – Engineering Sciences and Technological Studies
- Potential Expansion and New:
  i. Service Learning courses
  ii. Study Abroad courses
  iii. Multidisciplinary Engineering Major
  iv. Courses for Engineering Education PhD program.

Membership:
- Faculty - EEIC, Other
- EEIC Staff
- UESS – Undeclared Advising?, Career Services?, WiE?, MEP?
- Graduate Student Representative(s)
- Undergraduate Student Representative(s)

Election of Members

Terms of Members

Impact on First-year Advisory Committee:

Impact on Core Curriculum and College Services Committee:

Matls from College POA
7.7 The Dean, the Faculty of the College, or the Committee on Academic Affairs may each establish or abolish additional committees and subcommittees. The individual or group that establishes a committee or subcommittee has the primary responsibility to abolish it when it is no longer needed. Ordinarily such committees and subcommittees should be established with a specific charge and for a limited period of existence, but some will be standing committees, or standing subcommittees of the Committee on Academic Affairs. Faculty members of the standing subcommittees of the Committee on Academic Affairs shall be appointed by the Dean. At least one member of each standing subcommittee of the College Committee on Academic Affairs should also be a member of the College Committee on Academic Affairs. Annually, the Secretary of the College shall distribute to each faculty member the membership of each standing committee and of each standing subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Affairs.

**Math.s College on CCAA and Core**

**CCAA**

(b) Review and approve or disapprove proposals for changes in courses and curricula which are recommended by departments reporting its decisions directly to the departments concerned and, subject to appeal as described in paragraph 5.9 (Faculty Rules, also later in this text) of these rules, to the University Council on Academic Affairs.

Responsibilities of Academic Policy: The Committee shall be responsible for making recommendations to the Faculty of the College concerning the educational and academic policies of the College. This shall include, but not be limited to, the responsibility to make recommendations concerning the establishment, alteration, and abolition of all curricula and courses offered by the College, and all departments, schools, and bureaus of the College. In carrying out its activities under this paragraph, the Committee shall, when appropriate, consult with its counterpart committee in the Austin E. Knowlton School of Architecture.

Core Curriculum and UG Services

Duties: This committee has the responsibility for the ongoing development of the engineering core curriculum, the engineering general education curriculum, College listed courses and undergraduate student services within the college. Its specific responsibilities include:

a) monitor and suggest changes to the engineering core curriculum, including the general education component.

b) establish liaisons with other units supplying courses used by COE undergraduates (i.e. English, Math, Physics, Chemistry, Statistics, Biology, etc.)

c) act as the curriculum committee for all courses carrying an ENG designation, including ENG 181 and 182 Introduction to Engineering sequence.

d) act as the curriculum committee for the Freshman Engineering Honors program.

e) act as an oversight committee for the Technical Communications Resource Center.

f) act as a liaison between Career Services Program and the academic programs of the college.

The committee is expected to work closely with the College Committee on Academic Affairs and shall make all recommendations for curriculum and policy changes through that committee.

Membership:

" Faculty membership, selection and voting rights shall be the same as those specified for the College Committee on Academic Affairs in the College Bylaws.

" Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Student Services - Ex-Officio non-Voting Member

" One staff member of AA & SS - appointed by Associate Dean AA&SS, secretary for the committee, Ex-Officio non-voting member

" One member of the Career Services Staff - appointed by the Director of Career Services, Ex-
Officio non-voting member
" One Undergraduate Student - voting member
" One Department/Program Advisor - three-year term, selected by the College Advisors, - voting member
" Others individuals appointed by the Associate Dean AA&SS as needed.

This committee may coop other faculty, staff and students for membership in subcommittees, task forces or work groups as may be established by the Committee to accomplish its mission. However each subcommittee, task force or work group should contain at least one member of the Committee at large.

Officers: The Committee shall during the spring quarter of each year elect a new Chair for the following year from the continuing members of the Committee. The College Staff representative shall serve as Secretary of the Committee.

Administrative Liaison: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Student Services
Established by: Dean