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 – Not present (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, Shaun Rowland, Nikki Strader

2. The minutes from the 8 November 2010 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Ann Christy made a motion that ISE’s MS and PhD semester proposals be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The committee was informed that the proposals had been revised and that the subcommittee is satisfied with them now.
   3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. Hal Walker made a motion that ME’s BS/MS, MS, PhD semester proposals and the withdrawal of their AP degree be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The committee was informed that the proposals had been through three or four revisions.
   4.2. The comment was made that the tables in Section 11 for both the MS and PhD proposals are missing the rows that show the required credit hours offered by the unit and the required credit hours offered outside of the unit.
   4.3. A friendly amendment was made that the proposals be approved contingent upon correction of these tables. The amendment was accepted.
   4.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.
5. Hal Walker informed the committee that he received a message from Marilyn Blackwell, the chair of the subcommittee reviewing our semester proposals, asking him about Environmental Engineering’s additional three hour Chemistry requirement. She was wondering if there would be any three hour Chemistry courses. Hal informed her that in preliminary discussions with Chemistry they were informed that some of the chemistry courses will be 3 credit hours. Environmental Engineering also plans to allow courses in other units such as Earth Science to count toward this requirement. Earth Science currently offers a number of geochemistry and water chemistry courses and they have informed Hal that these will be 3 credit hours in semesters. So there definitely should be a number of 3 credit hour options for the additional chemistry requirement.

6. Hal Walker made a motion that the course change request for NE 735 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The committee was informed that Nuclear is combining two 3-hour courses into one 5-hour course based on input from students and data they have gathered from other Nuclear Engineering programs. In addition, this is what they are planning on doing under semesters.
6.2. The question was asked as to whether this course was required for either undergraduate or graduate students. The response was that it is not required in their undergraduate minor and is an elective for their graduate students.
6.3. The comment was made that as we will be switching to semesters very soon that at most they will only offer the 5-hour course once or twice.
6.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. The updated CCAA Handbook was presented to the committee. The handbook contains all of the policies approved by CCAA to include the recently approved revised ASAP policies. Administrative changes have been made to the handbook to include updating CCAA responsibilities, as well as the order of items. Once approved the revised handbook will be placed on the college’s webpage. George Valco made a motion that the updated handbook be approved and published. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.1. The comment was made that the ASAP policies are very important as they determine whether or not a student will be retained or dismissed.
7.2. The comment was made that the ASAP committee has done a good job updating those policies.
7.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. The issue of how to proceed with approving semester course requests was discussed.
8.1. Ann Christy stated that Subcommittee B had not met yet to review any of the requests.
8.2. The chair stated that an e-mail message from John Lippold stated that his subcommittee had not yet met either.
8.3. Hal Walker stated that he had looked at some of the ENG courses and could discuss the issues he found with them.

8.3.1. Hal found that the time distribution of one of the courses did not seem to be in line with the credit hours for the course. It would seem that the course should be worth more credit hours. Hal’s question was how does one determine the correct relationship between time distribution and credit hours.

8.3.2. Ann Christy stated that the rule is that one hour of lecture equals one credit hour, two to three hours of lab equals one credit hour, and that two hours of practicum equals one credit hour.

8.3.3. It was pointed out that based on the topics listed for the course in question and the hours associated with those topics that the students should only be meeting twice a week and not three times as stated in the time distribution section. The time distribution is probably incorrect and EEIC should be asked about this.

8.3.4. Hal feels that prerequisites will be a problem as they refer to quarter courses or the semester course number for the prerequisite has not yet been published. The question was asked as to when we will have all of the course numbers that we need? The response was that we will probably need to do some revising of prerequisites after the initial submission.

8.3.5. Hal stated that some of the descriptions under the course topics are too long and have been flagged. Shaun Rowland stated when the college’s syllabus tool was created the university’s tool had not been. Now that the university’s tool has been created there is a limit on descriptions. All of ours that do not meet that limit have been flagged so that the creators can make changes to the description rather than have the description truncated.

8.3.6. The question was asked as to who can make changes to a course proposal. The response was that the person who approved it.

8.3.7. The suggestion was made if a description is too long that the topic in question could be broken into two topics which should make the description within the limit.

8.3.8. The question was asked as to when we will be able to get course numbers from Physics, Chemistry, and Math. While no one knew the answer it was pointed out that committee members can see all of the courses that have been approved at the various colleges on our syllabus tool.

8.3.9. The comment was made that as reviewers the committee needs to be aware of turf issues. If an existing course is just being converted to a semester course there should not be any problem with turf issues but, if a new course is being created then it may become an issue.

8.3.10. The comment was made that reviewers need to make sure that course requests for required courses mesh with the program’s semester curriculum proposal. The committee secretary informed the committee that they can view all of our semester curriculum proposals on OAA’s webpage.

8.3.11. The comment was made that we need to get departments to start marking courses as approved so that the committee can review them.
9. Blaine Lilly made a motion that departments be given a deadline of the end of autumn quarter to mark as approved their required undergraduate courses and that all courses be marked as approved at the department level by the end of January. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
9.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
9.2. The committee secretary was asked to inform all department chairs of these deadlines.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 3:35.