1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger (for Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – 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 – 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 – Nikki Strader, Dave Tomasko

2. The minutes from the 9 March 2011 meeting were approved as written.

3. The committee was informed that Seth Young had been accepted into Civil and
   Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science. Consequently, the contingency
   that the committee put on the proposal to make the Aviation Department a center
   has been fulfilled.

4. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the college’s revised Probation, Dismissal, and
   Reinstatement Policies be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor
   was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The committee was informed that policies for Engineering Physics and
       Environmental Engineering have been added. The Engineering Physics policy
       was modeled after Mechanical’s while Environmental’s was modeled after
       Civil’s.
   4.2. The question was asked as to whether the changes recommended by the ASAP
       Committee were incorporated into the Engineering Physics policy. The
       response was yes.
   4.3. The comment was made that as all of these policies will need to be changed
       when we switch to semesters that we will need to be very careful making the
       changes so that students will not find any loopholes that they can take
       advantage of. The response was that in the worse case we will not be able to
       dismiss a student but that the policy could then be changed to get rid of the
loophole and the student could be dismissed the next semester if needed. The comment was made that ultimately students need to meet our graduation standards.

4.4. The question was asked as to what “WPHR” on page 28 in the Engineering Physics policy towards the bottom of the page means. It was determined that this was a typographical error and should read “CPHR”. A friendly amendment was made that the policy be approved contingent upon this mistake being corrected. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

5. John Lippold made a motion that CSE’s Undergraduate Minor in Computational Science and Engineering Semester Proposal be approved. Yogesh Sahai seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The committee was informed that this proposal has been through a couple of iterations and that Subcommittee A is recommending that it be approved.

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

6. George Valco, Subcommittee A, made a motion that CSE 3231, 3232, 3241, and 3321 be approved. Paul Sivilotti seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. All of these courses are category 2 courses, a modified or re-envisioned course that includes substantial parts of the content and learning goals of one or more quarter courses.

6.2. The question was asked as to whether committee members can see where a course proposal is in the system. The response was yes but that once a proposal reaches a certain level only a few people can modify it.

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

7. Jeff Chalmers, Course Proposal Subcommittee, made a motion that BME 2193, 2194, 2700, 3702, 3703, 4110, 4193, 4194, 4210, 4310, and 4410 be approved contingent upon the addition of the necessary exclusions. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. BME’s semester course worksheet was projected onto a screen for the committee to view.

7.1. The question was asked as to where exclusions can be placed in the system. The response was that there is a section in the college syllabus tool for exclusions.

7.2. Mark Ruegsegger stated that he would add appropriate exclusions to those courses that needed them.

7.3. The question was asked as to why BME has two Introduction to Biomedical Engineering courses with one numbered 2000 and one numbered 3000. The response was that this is due to the fact that BME had an introductory course for students in their minor and a different one for the students in their major. The comment was made that unless courses are cross listed they cannot have the
same name especially if they are in the same course offering unit. Mark stated that he would check into this.

7.4. The question was asked as to why BME had multiple xx93 and xx94 courses. The response was that these courses are independent study and group study courses and that they are needed at multiple levels just like we have in quarters.

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

8. The chair informed the committee that he is meeting will all of the department chairs to let them know about the amount of work that is being done and still needs to be done. He is asking them to get a faculty member other than members of CCAA to review all of their department’s courses to ensure that errors are caught and corrected before the course is reviewed by CCAA.

9. The committee was informed that four people at OAA are reviewing all of the courses in the university. Of the ones that have been reviewed to date about two thirds of them have problems. Ann Christy is one of these four people. Due to the work load on Ann the chair asked for someone else on Subcommittee B to become subcommittee chair. Blaine Lilly volunteered.

10. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on various academic issues.

10.1. A semester appeals process proposal should be given to CCAA by the end of this quarter.

10.2. Our proposals are moving through CAA fairly smoothly. Some of our graduate proposals in ISE, Welding, and FABE still need to be revised but, overall we are in good shape in regards to our semester proposals.

10.3. Preparation for our upcoming ABET review is well underway. Self Study Reports are due to ABET by the end of June. Dave Tomasko, Dan Mendelsohn, George Valco, Mark Ruegsegger, and Ed McCaul will be attending an ABET Symposium next week.

10.4. Eight students, four undergraduate and four graduate students, in the college just received NSF Research Fellowships.

10.5. Employer interest in hiring our graduates has recently increased.

10.6. Honors needs more judges from Engineering for the Denman competition. If you can please consider volunteering.

10.7. The question was asked as to what was happening to honors status at the university. The response was that the requirements are increasing and as a result the number of students who qualify will decrease over time. The college is working on a proposal to revamp honors status in the college and it should soon be ready to present to CCAA. One objective of the revamping is to have our students do more work in honors rather than just use it as a means of registering early.

10.8. The question was asked as to whether there will be an honors research distinction and a non-honors research distinction. The response was yes that there would be two different categories.
11. The meeting was adjourned at 3:25.