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 – Harris Kagan
   FAB – Ann Christy
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
       MSE – Yogesh Sahai
       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 – Chelsea Setterlin (Not present Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Carolyn Merry, Nikki Strader

2. The minutes from the 9 February 2011 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Rita Alevriadou made a motion that the course change requests for ENG 510 and ECE 702, 706, 730, 734, 735, 736, 759, 765, 766, 800, 801.01, 806, 807, and 859 be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The committee was informed that ENG 510 was being changed to so that the description would better reflect that it had a distance learning section while all of the ECE course changes involved changing course prerequisites.
   3.2. The question was asked as to whether we could still submit course proposals. The response was that while we could not submit new quarter course requests that course changes, group studies, and withdrawals were still allowed.
   3.3. The question was asked as to why the course prerequisites for the 800 level courses are being changed. The response was that the content in the prerequisite courses has evolved and the ones currently listed no longer cover the needed material.
   3.4. The question was asked as to why ECE is making so many course changes when we will be switching to semesters. The response was that we have over a year left in quarters and having the correct prerequisites for the courses is important.
   3.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
4. 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 untabled. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.  
4.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. 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. Yogesh Sahai seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. Carolyn Merry informed the committee that a few years ago during an academic progress review it was recommended that the Geodetic Science be elevated. However, this was not possible as it had been merged with Civil due to its small size. Then, about four to five years ago, about half of the faculty left CEEGS with the idea that the graduate program would be shared between CEEGS and MAPS. However, this has not worked out but, we still have the majority of the graduate students as they like having engineering in their degree. It was also decided to phase out the undergraduate degree. As a result, the department is requesting the name change to emphasize the Engineering aspect of all three programs in the department.

5.2. The question was asked as to what the benefit was to keeping the geodetic program. The response was that the department’s three research focus areas are infrastructure, environmental, and geodetic information. There is a large amount of research money available for geodetic and OSU is known as one of the experts in this area.

5.3. The question was asked as to how many graduate students are in the Geodetic program. The response was about 35. The Center for Mapping, which used to be a university center, is now integrated into the department for administrative services.

5.4. The question was asked as to whether there is any thought of bringing the Geomatics BS degree back. The response was no as in the past they were lucky to have a dozen students in the program. They will be keeping the surveying minor as it allows a student with a Civil degree to take the Professional Surveyor exam.

5.5. The question was asked as to what other Big 10 schools have a program in Geodetics. The response was just Purdue but they also eliminated their undergraduate degree in this field.

5.6. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. Hal Walker made a motion that Aviation’s semester proposal for their BS program and undergraduate minor be approved. Seth Young seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The committee was informed that this is the third version of the proposals as the first one was not in the proper format while the second one had some issues that needed to be addressed.

6.2. The question was asked as to why students are required to take Aviation 3300, Aviation Human Factors and Safety, when they could be taking a similar one in ISE. The response was that this course is a combination of two existing quarter courses and the policy for the switch to semesters has been that turf issues would not be raised on existing courses that are being converted to semester courses. Aviation is combining a lot of courses to eliminate duplication.

6.3. The question was asked as to who will be administering the degree and minor when Aviation becomes a center. The response was that the center would be as the instructors would be part of the center.

6.4. The question was asked as to whether Aviation should be an Engineering program. The response was that Aviation could become an ABET accredited program but that currently Engineering is not part of its name or part of the name of the degree. Still, all Engineering Aviation students take the Engineering Core. In addition, all Engineering Aviation students must take 27 technical elective hours from a list of Engineering courses.

6.5. The question was asked as to how long Aviation has been a program. The response was that OSU has had an Aviation program since 1917.

6.6. A friendly amendment was made that the BS proposal be approved contingent upon the semester course numbers being included on the list of technical electives. The friendly amendment was accepted by proposers of the motion.

6.7. The question was asked as to whether Aviation is considering applying for ABET accreditation. If so, the curriculum should be designed so that it meets ABET standards as there is not enough basic math and science in the proposed curriculum. The response was that there has been talk about this but no action.

6.8. The question was asked as to how many required courses in the program will be taught by tenure-track faculty. The response was about one or two of the required core courses and about one or two of the electives. The problem is that there is a limited number of tenure-track Aviation faculty. The capstone course would be taught by tenure-track faculty and that tenure-track faculty from other programs could teach some of the other required courses.

6.9. Seth Young informed the committee that Aviation tried to make its core curriculum so that it would work for all of their students as they have degree programs in Business, SBS, and Engineering. The idea was to make the degree programs as flexible as possible for those students who wanted a degree in Aviation that did not include flying.

6.10. The comment was made that this should not be a reevaluation of who is to offer Aviation’s courses as there are no new turf issues involved. As Aviation’s degree program and the new center have already been reviewed and approved by CCAA we should not be discussing old issues.

6.11. The question was asked as to what happened to the Aero courses that use to be in the required curriculum. The response was that they have been moved to the technical elective list.
6.12. The comment was made that the number of engineering courses has been diluted between quarters and semesters. The comment was made that Engineering is not in the name of the program or degree and that Aviation would be willing to consider adding additional Engineering courses to its list of technical electives.

6.13. The comment was made that the proposal maps the Aviation courses to ABET’s A-K and that all outcomes are covered.

6.14. The comment was made that although Aviation may not have labs where the students design and conduct experiments that they do have a number of labs for flying.

6.15. The suggestion was made that more Engineering courses could be added to their list of technical electives. The comment was made that Aviation students would have problems meeting the prerequisites of most of the higher level Engineering courses.

6.16. The suggestion was made that on page 9 of the BS proposal that the T shown on “AVN 3101T” be dropped as it is not a proper designation.

6.17. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 11 approved, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingency passed.

7. George Valco made a motion that CSE 1110, 1221, 2194, and 2194H be approved. Rita Alevriadou seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. The committee was informed that these four courses have been reviewed by Subcommittee A and are ready to be approved by the full committee.

7.2. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. George Valco made a motion that CSE 1222, 2193, and 2193H be approved contingent upon correction of some administrative problems. Ann Christy seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. The question was asked as to why 1221 states “scientists and engineers” in its title while 1222 states “engineers and scientists”. Is there a reason for the order? If not, should the titles be consistent? Paul Sivilotti stated that there was no deliberate reason for the difference but that he would prefer to keep the titles as they are as it would take some time to get CSE faculty approval to make a change. Further, when listing student audiences CSE lists "engineers" first but when listing disciplines CSE lists "science" first, as in the department name, CSE.

8.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingency passed.

9. George Valco informed the committee that Subcommittee A had sent some other courses back to CSE for revision and should have additional semester courses for the full committee at its next meeting.

10. Ann Christy informed the committee that Subcommittee B did not have any semester courses for the full committee to consider at this time.
11. Hal Walker informed the committee that the Course Proposal Subcommittee did not have any semester courses for the full committee to consider at this time.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10.