1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – 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 – 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, Shaun Rowland

2. The minutes from the 22 November 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. Hal Walker made a motion that Nuclear’s semester proposals for their BS/MS program, MS degree, PhD degree, and the withdrawal of their graduate minor be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The comment was made that the last table in Section 11 of the PhD proposal has some problems. A friendly amendment was made that the PhD degree proposal be dropped from the motion and sent back to the program. The amendment was agreed to.
   3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.

4. The committee was informed that four semester course proposals will be presented to it today for approval. Three of the courses are generic group study courses while the fourth is an undergraduate professional development seminar. The reason for this request is to upload some actual courses from our system to the university’s and then process the courses through the university’s system to the registrar’s office. We want to do this over the break with a few courses so that any problems with the systems can be discovered and fixed before we begin to submit large numbers of courses in January.
5. Hal Walker presented ENG 1194 to the committee. This course has been approved by the Core Committee and the Course Proposal Subcommittee has reviewed it. Hal Walker made a motion that ENG 1194 be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The comment was made that the proposal does not have any topics and the university’s system requires that all course proposals include at least one topic. A topic needs to be added to the form or it will be rejected by the university’s system.

5.2. A friendly amendment was made that the course be approved contingent upon addition of a topic. The amendment was accepted.

5.3. Shaun Rowland stated that he would change the college’s syllabus tool so that including a topic would be required.

5.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.

6. John Lippold asked whether the committee would be approving all of the courses one by one or will batch approval be allowed. If we approve the courses one by one it will take the committee a long time to approve all of them. The chair stated that these few courses are a special case as they are test cases for the course approval software.

7. The comment was made that we may want to approval all of the courses listed under a program at one time. The comment was made that if we did this we will have to wait until all of the courses in a listing were ready and one course could delay approval of an entire listing.

8. The comment was made that a program’s core courses should be reviewed as a group but that their elective courses can be reviewed individually.

9. The question was asked as to how the committee should deal with inter college service courses such as ECE’s circuits course, CSE’s programming course, ISE’s economics course, MSE’s materials course, and ME’s statics/dynamics/strength course(s).

10. The suggestion was made that these service courses along with program’s core courses should be the first ones that are reviewed. This suggestion was adopted by the committee.

11. Civil Engineering’s 2194 and Environmental Engineering’s 2194 semester course requests were presented to the committee.

11.1. The comment was made that neither of these courses have a topic as required.

11.2. The question was asked as to why the course offerings for these two courses included May+Summer. The response was that the programs were just covering every possibility even if they decide not to use that option.
11.3. The question was as to whether or not anyone has looked into the issue of students being in the dorms during the maymester. The reply was that it is being discussed.

11.4. The question was asked to whether it is wise to list every possibility when that gives students the idea that the course is being offered each of those times. The response was that this information is no longer available to the students.

11.5. The question was asked if this information is not available how can a student project when a course will be offered. The response was that they can ask their advisor or check when the course has been offered historically.

11.6. The question was asked as to whether the CIP codes were correct. Hal Walker stated that he believed so. The comment was made that the CIP code is important as it helps determine the course’s subsidy level. The committee secretary was asked to double check and make sure that they are correct.

11.7. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that the requests be approved contingent upon the CIP codes being checked and the addition of at least one topic for each course. Ann Christy seconded the motion.

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

12. FABE’s 3140 semester course request was presented to the committee.

12.1. The question was asked as to how FABE came up with the number for this course. The response was that the thousands is based on the expected level of student who will be taking the course, the hundreds indicates where it fits in the program while the tens and ones are part of FABE’s internal course designation system.

12.2. The question was asked as to what the asterisks mean under course contribution. The response was that the greater the number of asterisks the more the course contributes to that outcome.

12.3. The question was asked as to why this course would not be available for graduate students. The response was that in the past 15 years only three graduate students have taken it. The course is focused on the undergraduate experience. It is at the 3000 level as students who have taken the course felt that it would be best to take it as a junior rather than as a senior. FABE is planning on creating a similar course for their graduate students.

12.4. John Lippold made a motion that the request be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion.

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

13. The question was asked as to whether changes can be made to a course request while CCAA is considering it or after CCAA has approved it. The response was that changes can be made in our system while a course is being considered and in the university system after CCAA has approved it. Shaun Rowland stated that he could restrict access to a course request after a department has marked it as approved and it has been sent to CCAA. The comment was made that a degree of trust is
needed as it is very doubtful that people will be making changes to courses after it has left the department.

14. The question was asked as to what will happen if a program tweaks a course while CCAA is reviewing it. The response was that the subcommittee needs to inform the program that they are reviewing their courses and that they should let the subcommittee know if they wish to make changes to a course.

15. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A has nothing to report.

16. Ann Christy informed the committee that Subcommittee B will be looking at the service courses it is responsible for first.

17. Hal Walker informed the committee that the Course Proposal Subcommittee is in the process of reviewing Aviation’s semester proposal. He plans on dividing up the course review work in the subcommittee by assigning two subcommittee members, primary and secondary, responsibility for the courses in a course listing.

18. The committee was informed that DARS cannot be converted to semesters until courses have been approved and processed by the registrar’s office.

19. Being out of time the meeting was adjourned.