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 – Harris Kagan
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
      MSE – Yogesh Sahai
      WLD – John Lippold
   MAE –
      Aero – Not present (Jen Ping Chen)
      ME – Not present (Blaine Lilly (ASAP Rep))
   Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri (Not present Cherian Zachariah)
   Undergraduate Student – Not present (Chelsea Setterlin, Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Nikki Strader

2. The minutes from the 26 January 2011 meeting were approved as written.

3. Ann Christy made a motion that the proposed name change of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science to the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The question was asked as to what FABE’s view of Environmental Engineering was. Ann Christy replied that the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences does a version of it under their ABET accredited Biological Engineering program and that CEEGS’s BS in Environmental Engineering is accredited by ABET under ABET’s Environmental Engineering program criterion. Both degrees can lead to careers in the environmental field.
   3.2. The question was asked as to whether the name change will have an impact on the faculty. The response was no. Fourteen years ago Geodetic moved from MAPS to Engineering but about three to four years ago half of them went back to MAPS. When they went back the idea was that there would be a joint Geodetic program between Engineering and MAPS but it has not worked out. All of the Geodetic courses are being switched to Civil courses with the idea that, along with the name change, the remaining Geodetic faculty will become more integrated into Engineering.
   3.3. The question was asked as to why Geodetic is being kept in the department’s name. The response was that the department still has a strong identity with
Geodetics. In fact, the Surveying Minor is required for any student who wants to take the professional surveying exam.

3.4. John Lippold made a motion that the proposal be tabled until the committee’s next meeting so that Carolyn Merry, the department chair, can be present to discuss the proposal with the committee. George Valco seconded the motion.

3.5. The question was asked as to why this was necessary. John Lippold replied that he would like to find out what the strategic plans are for the department – will the department submit another name change in a few years?

3.6. The comment was made that we have never previously asked a chair to be present for a name change. The reply was while that was true that we have asked chairs to be present for other proposals.

3.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken on whether the proposal should be tabled until the committee’s next meeting: 8 approved, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried.

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

4.1. George Valco informed the committee that ECE was told by the Graduate School that the Graduate School is only changing one section of their combined programs rules but that this change is not relevant to BS/MS programs. The college’s semester limit for double counting hours in a BS/MS program is 12 while the Graduate School has no limit. Under quarters ECE had a lower double counting limit than the college’s and decided to make the limit 9 hours under semesters. While this is less than the college’s limit it is a 50% increase in hours for ECE.

4.2. The question was asked as to why ECE decided not to go with the college’s limit of 12 hours. The response was that ECE feels that students should have more hours and courses after they receive their BS degree than they would if the college limit was followed.

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

5. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A has not yet received a revised UG Minor in Computational Science & Engineering from CSE.

6. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A is moving forward with reviewing their assigned semester courses.

7. The floor was opened for a discussion of semester course proposals.

7.1. The comment was made that the committee needs to start approving courses so that advisors can properly advise their students.

7.2. It was pointed out that only five programs have submitted the required excel worksheet.

7.3. The question was asked as to what a person who is reviewing the semester course requests should be looking for. The response was that if it is a new
course the issues are the same for any new course – appropriateness of hours, title, description, prerequisites, as well as turf issues. If the course is being converted the issue is whether the conversion is equivalent as turf issues do not need to be considered.

7.4. The comment was made that we may need to process the courses in small batches rather than wait until all of the course requests in a program’s listing have been reviewed by the subcommittee.

7.5. George Valco commented that he has reviewed 15 CSE courses so far and that he is finding issues with many of them.

7.6. The question was asked as to whether we should have a deadline and what the deadline should be. The decision was that each subcommittee should have a couple of batches ready for consideration by the entire committee by the end of February.

8. Ann Christy stated that Subcommittee B should have at least one batch ready for consideration at the committee's next meeting.

9. Hal Walker informed the committee that the Course Proposal Subcommittee has received a revised semester proposal from Aviation and that it may be ready to present it to the full committee at its next meeting. The subcommittee is still waiting on a reply from BME on its solution to their domain course issue.

10. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on various academic issues.
    10.1. Our ABET Request for Evaluation has been sent in.
    10.2. How long each of the two semester sessions should be is being debated. One proposal has both sessions being the same length while another has the first session being longer and ending on a Friday. There are a number of issues with both proposals and there is no set deadline on when a decision will be made.
    10.3. A proposal will be made that all semester bridge courses will automatically be withdrawn by the university after two years. The question was asked as to whether the two years would begin in the summer of 2012 or when the course was first offered. The response was that the assumption is that the two years would begin in the summer of 2012. If a course was offered anytime during the first year we are in semesters that it could be offered a second time during the second year. It is doubtful if there will be much demand for bridge courses after two years. The few students who will still need a bridge course could take an independent study course.
    10.4. The question was asked as to how long before a course number could be reused under semesters as currently it is five years under quarters. The response was that the Registrar’s Office does not want a course number reused at all under semesters as DARS will not recognize the difference between the two courses. With all of the course numbers we will have available under semesters this should not become an issue but if it does the Registrar’s Office should be able to work something out.
10.5. The question was asked about what will happen to students who have completed Chemistry 121 but not 125, has a transition plan been developed for them. Dave Tomasko replied that Chemistry has not been very responsive but that he would check on it.

10.6. Dave informed the committee that an issue has come up concerning Math’s transition plan for students who have completed 153. Right now they will have to take an additional math course, which is unacceptable. This issue is being discussed with Math and is one that will need to be resolved.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05.