COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Meeting Minutes 12 January 2011

1. Attendance:
   AVN – 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 – Yogesh Sahai
      WLD – John Lippold
   MAE –
      Aero – Jen Ping Chen
      ME – Blaine Lilly (ASAP Rep)
   Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri (Not present Cherian Zachariah)
   Undergraduate Student – Chelsea Setterlin (Not present Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Nikki Strader

2. The minutes from the 6 December 2010 meeting were approved as written.

3. Hal Walker made a motion that Nuclear’s semester proposal for their PhD degree be approved. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The committee was informed that the proposal was sent back to Nuclear as the table in section 11 was not correct. The table has been corrected. No other changes were made in the proposal.
   3.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

4. The committee discussed the process that will be used to approve semester course requests.
   4.1. Two possible check lists were distributed. Members were informed that subcommittees could use either check list, a combination of the two, neither, or create a different one. How each subcommittee will work through their courses is up to each subcommittee chair.
   4.2. The question was asked as to how detailed each course should be checked. The response was that this would depend on whether the course is a new course, being converted, being substantially revised, or a bridge course. In addition, whether the course is a group studies, seminar, or research course would be a consideration.
4.3. The question was asked as to how CAA will be reviewing the courses. The response was that CAA will not be reviewing the courses rather they will be reviewed by a small group of people from OAA. This group will include Randy Smith, Alexis Collier, Ann Christy, and Melissa Soave.

4.4. The comment was made that subcommittees need to be alert for potential turf issues with new courses or courses that have been substantially changed.

4.5. Everyone was reminded that they need to make sure that their program has gone into the ECA Export Check part of the college’s syllabus tool to make sure that there are no administrative issues with their courses. Right now a number of courses do have administrative issues such as descriptions being too long.

4.6. Everyone was shown how to get the college’s syllabus tool to show them all programs’ syllabi. The comment was made that the “Show all course subjects in filter” description is confusing and should be changed. Dave Tomasko stated that he would get with Shaun Rowland and make the description clearer.

4.7. Everyone was informed about the additional information needed in the university’s syllabus tool that is not included in the college’s syllabus tool. This information is only being requested during the switch from quarters to semesters. Ed McCaul will enter this information for everyone but he will need all programs to provide him the needed information. The suggestion was made that a spreadsheet template be created and distributed to programs to complete. Such a spreadsheet would also be useful to the subcommittees as it will give them important quarter to semester information on the courses. Dave Tomasko stated that he would get the needed spreadsheet created.

5. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A has received CSE’s UG Minor in Computational Science & Engineering Semester Proposal. They are in the process of reviewing it and have noted that a cover letter from the department chair is missing.

6. Ann Christy informed the committee that while there is nothing to report from Subcommittee B that she has some information from the university. CAA has approved a number of our semester proposals and that the subcommittee responsible for reviewing them is ready to send some more to the full committee. The subcommittee plans to start work on our graduate semester proposals.

7. Hal Walker informed the committee that the Aviation semester proposal is back with Aviation for revision. The subcommittee has received a possible solution from BME on their domain courses. These courses are the ones that the committee had some concerns about as students in the major were taking a zero credit hour lab that is associated with a course but that students in the BME minor who were taking the same course were not taking the lab.

8. George Valco was asked about the status of ECE’s BS/MS semester proposal. George stated that ECE is still waiting to find out what the Graduate School’s policy will be for BS/MS programs. The suggestion was made that ECE may want to send
their BS/MS semester proposal forward using the college’s rules as it may be a while before the Graduate School publishes anything.

9. The committee was informed that ISE has not submitted their MBLE Semester Proposal as they are waiting on Fisher.

10. The committee chair decided that the CEEGS name change proposal will be reviewed by Subcommittee B.

11. Enrollment caps were discussed by the committee.
   11.1. The committee was informed that the message from Greg Washington on enrollment caps came about because the Provost did not understand that our enrollment caps have been in place for quite a few years and all of them were approved by CAA. What the college is trying to do now is to justify our enrollment caps. Consequently, department chairs has been asked to determine their true enrollment capacity based on staff and physical limitations. We can continue to expect more new students than in the past years especially if the university plans on increasing enrollment while increasing the quality of our incoming students. While some majors may not be able to handle more students others can and we need to find out what our true enrollment limits are.
   11.2. The question was asked as to whether there has been talk of Saturday classes. The response was yes but that it this would be a unit by unit decision.
   11.3. The comment was made that lab classes, especially computer labs, are the normal physical constraints. The comment was made that we could probably get money from the university to build more computer labs if we really need them.
   11.4. The question was asked as to whether it will be possible to create common instructional computer labs at the college level. The response was no as we have regional computing facilities.

12. The committee was informed that programs being withdrawn will need to have a two to three sentence rational justifying the withdrawal. If a rational has not been included in the original proposal one will need to be created when the proposal is submitted electronically. The question was asked as to how we will deal with withdrawing our AP degrees as they are not currently on the university’s proposal system. The response was that we will need to contact OAA to find out how they want us to deal with these degrees.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10.