1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger
   CHE – 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 – Not present (Shivraman Giri & Cherian Zachariah)
   Undergraduate Student – Chelsea Setterlin (Not present Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Nikki Strader, Dave Tomasko

2. The minutes from the 19 April 2011 meeting were approved as written.

3. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that ChBE 2194, 2523, 3189, 4193, and 4194 be approved and that ChBE 2200 and 2420 be approved contingent upon the words in the topics be uncapitalized. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   3.1. The comment was made that 2523 has a category of 3, semester equivalent of a quarter course, when it really should be a 2, modified or re-envisioned course that includes substantial parts of the content and learning goals of one of more quarter courses.
   3.2. The comment was made that category 2, 3, and 4 are very close to each other in how they are defined and that we should be careful on which category is chosen.
   3.3. The comment was made that 3189 shows lecture as its graded component but there is no lecture in the course as the student completes a report on their co-op or intern experience. The question was raised as to whether it is possible to select co-op/internship as a graded component.
   3.4. A friendly amendment was made that 3189 not be approved at this time until its graded component was clarified. The friendly amendment was accepted.
   3.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.
4. Jen Ping Chen made a motion that all of the Environmental Engineering courses from 2090 through 4999H be approved. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The committee was informed that the courses had been revised by the program after an initial review by the subcommittee and that all of the issues have been resolved.
   4.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. George Valco made a motion that CSE 3461 through 8194 be approved. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   5.1. The committee was informed that the only issues with these courses were in the worksheet and those issues are minor, easily fixed, and do not impact upon the course.
   5.2. The committee was informed that CSE 5463 is cross listed with ECE 5101 and its approval will lift the contingency on ECE 5101.
   5.3. The question was asked as to why CSE’s individual studies and group studies were category 2, modified or re-envisioned course that includes substantial parts of the content and learning goals of one of more quarter courses, when category 3, semester equivalent of a quarter course, would be more appropriate.
   5.4. The committee decided that all individual study and group study courses should be marked as category 3 and authorized the committee secretary to make this change if necessary.
   5.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. George Valco made a motion that CSE 4998H and 4999H be approved contingent upon adding the prior course number to the syllabus for 4998H and removing the fixed number of lecture hours from the topic list for 4999H as it is a variable credit hour course. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   6.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingencies passed.

7. George Valco asked the committee whether a 4000 level course such as CSE 4221 could be marked as undergraduate and graduate. It was decided that this was a question that Ann Christy would ask OAA and let us know what their decision was.

8. John Lippold asked how high a priority should be given to reviewing the Semester Honors Proposal.
   8.1. Dave Tomasko stated that Honors would like to send all semester honor proposals to CAA by the end of May. So, there is some urgency to reviewing the proposal.
   8.2. The question was asked as to what is different between our current honors program and the semester version. The reply was that the program is being significantly reorganized and as part of the reorganization research and honors
are being separated. We are also asking that all of our courses, to include the non honors courses, in FEH be allowed to count as honor courses for those students. This is an issue with university honors.

8.3. The question was asked as to what will happen if we do not get it reviewed and approved by the end of the month. The response was that OAA will get upset.

8.4. John Lippold stated that Subcommittee A will look at the proposal prior to CCAA’s next meeting.

9. Ann Christy made a motion that ECE 5200 through 5511 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
9.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Yogesh Sahai made a motion the ISE 2000 through 5610 with the exception of 3810 be approved. Mark Ruegsegger seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
10.1. The committee was informed that the new courses ISE is proposing deal with ISE core functions and, thus, do not need any concurrences.
10.2. The committee was informed that the categories for some of ISE courses will need to be changed.
10.3. The committee was informed that any course marked as category 5 will disappear two years after we switch to semesters as they are transition courses and are only expected to be offered while we transition from quarters to semesters.
10.4. The question was asked as to whether the courses should read “Integrated Systems”, the name of the department, or “Industrial Systems”, the name of the degree. Clark Mount-Campbell agreed that it should read “Industrial Systems” and that the wording would be changed.
10.5. A friendly amendment was made that approval of these courses be contingent upon “Integrated Systems” being changed to “Industrial Systems”. The amendment was accepted.
10.6. The committee was informed that ISE, ME, and BME are working on a blanket concurrence agreement for biomechanics courses.
10.7. The question was asked as to how concurrences will be included. The reply was that the concurrence needs to be written and sent to the committee member who is reviewing the course and the committee secretary. A comment needs to be added in the syllabus tool that concurrence has been received and what program concurred. Once CCAA approves the course and it is sent to the university’s system the written concurrence will be attached to the request.
10.8. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendment passed.

11. Yogesh Sahai asked the committee whether capstone courses, such as ISE 5910.01 and 5910.02, should be at the 5000 level or should they be at the 4000 level. In addition, what should the committee’s policy be on decimal courses
11.1. The comment was made that capstone courses should only be taken by seniors and that graduate students in that major should not be taking it.
11.2. The comment was made that ISE’s capstone course is part of their Lean Sigma Certification and that some graduate students may want to get this certification. The response was that ISE should create a parallel 6000 course for the graduate students.
11.3. The question was asked as to what the prerequisites were for ISE 5910.10. The response ISE 5810.
11.4. The question was asked as to whether it will be considered strange to have a 5000 level course a prerequisite for a 4000 level course. The response was no and that many of our capstone courses will have 5000 level prerequisites.
11.5. The comment was made that decimal courses should be the exception and should be different versions of the same course and not be sequential courses.

12. Yogesh Sahai made a motion that ISE 5910.01 and 5910.02 be approved contingent upon the course numbers being changed so that they do not have decimals and that they become 4000 level courses. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
12.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingencies passed.

13. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the proposed Appeal Process for Students during Quarter to Semester Transition be approved. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
13.1. The comment was made that the members of the appeal committee are high ranking and will this make it difficult for the group to meet. The response was that the assumption is that very few appeals will be made and so, the group will seldom need to meet.
13.2. The question was asked as to what will happen if a student appeals and their appeal is approved to the students who have the same problem but did not appeal. Will this group be making policy for the college? The response was no that any appeal decision will be for that student and will not become a policy.
13.3. The question was asked as to whether there will be an end date for the appeal process. The response was that as our student leave and then come back that it may be a long time before all of our students who start in quarters graduate.
13.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

14. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that the BME 5421 through 6934 be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
14.1. The committee was informed that these courses are straight conversions and do not have any issues.
14.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

15. Mark Ruegsegger made a motion that ENG 1110.10, 1110.15, 1120.10, 1120.15, and 1183 be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
15.1. The committee was informed that minor changes had to be made to these courses and that they are now ready to be approved.
15.2. The question was asked as to why 1183 was necessary as a bridge course. The response was that a few students may not have completed 183 and that this course is designed to all them to complete the sequence.
15.3. The question was asked as to whether everyone who has 183 or 1182 as a prerequisite needs to change their prerequisites to include 1183. The comment was made that this would involve a lot of work. The comment was made that there should only be a few students taking 1183 and that it is only planned to offer it once. Since only a few students will be impacted it will be easier for everyone if programs use permission of instructor and override the prerequisites.
15.4. The question was asked as to why EEIC did not use a number like 1182.0x as the bridge course number as that way permission would not be needed. The response was that EEIC wanted to keep the courses separate and distinctive.
15.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

16. Hal Walker informed the committee that the subcommittee is waiting to hear back from Mechanical and Nuclear.

17. Dave Tomasko updated the committee
17.1. OAA has requested that all of our course requests be sent to them by the end of May. The reason is that when our students get back in the autumn they will expect to see courses on the registrar’s website.

18. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05.
Appeal Process for Students during Quarter to Semester Transition

In the event that a student disagrees with a department or program decision during the transition and feels that the decision will cause their graduation to be delayed, that student may file a written appeal with the college. To hear appeals, an ad hoc subcommittee of the College Committee on Academic Affairs (CCAA) will be convened consisting of the following representatives: Chair of CCAA, Chair of Academic Standards and Progress Committee (ASAP), Director of Academic Advising, and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services.

To submit an appeal the following steps must be taken:

1. Write an appeal that includes the following information:
   a. A letter signed by the student describing the issue(s) and the actions the student has taken to resolve the issue(s).
   b. A copy of the student’s transition academic plan (TAP) or other quarter-to-semester worksheet used in the program.
   c. A letter or email from the program’s undergraduate studies chair acknowledging the issue(s).

2. The written appeal is to be submitted to Judith McDonald in Hitchcock 244.

3. The appeals committee will contact the student if an interview is deemed necessary.

4. A written response will be sent to the student within 10 working days of when the appeal was received by the college.