1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Not present (Mark Ruegsegger)
   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 – Not present (Chelsea Setterlin & Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Nikki Strader, Bruce Weide

2. The minutes from the 3 May 2011 meeting were approved as written.

3. John Lippold informed the committee that Subcommittee A is making progress on ChBE’s, Environmental’s, and CSE’s courses. They recently received FABE’s worksheet but only a few of FABE’s courses have been approved by the department.

4. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that ChBE 3508, 3521, 4998, 4998H, 4999, 4999H be approved and that 4760 and 4764 be approved contingent upon changing the type of conversion to a type 2. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   4.1. The comment was made that the committee secretary has previously been authorized to make changes to the type of conversion that is being made.
   4.2. The comment was made that ChBE will not care whether the conversion type is 2, 3, or 4.
   4.3. Paul Sivilotti withdrew the contingency. Blaine Lilly concurred.
   4.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

5. John Lippold made a motion that Environmental Engineering 5110, 5120, 5130, 5170, 5180, 5194, 5210, 5410, 5430, 5850, and 5980 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
5.1. The committee was informed that all of the concerns the subcommittee had with these courses have been resolved.

5.2. The comment was made that it would be nice to have the titles of the courses and the type of conversion that is being made on spreadsheet that the committee is viewing to make sure that there are no concurrence issues. Hal Walker stated that all of the courses being considered today were straight conversions.

5.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. George Valco made a motion that CSE 5231, 5232, 5241, 5321, 5331, 5341, 5421, 5431, 5461, 5521, and 5541 be approved. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. Bruce Weide briefed the committee on the rational behind these courses.

6.1.1. These courses are 2-hour courses while their 3000 level equivalents are 3-hours. The plan is that undergraduates will take the 3000 version while graduate students will take the 2-hour version. CSE currently has a similar setup under quarters.

6.1.2. The courses will be taken by graduate students to make up for any deficiencies in their knowledge and the assumption is that they will need less out of class time to complete the assignments. Graduate students will only be able to count six hours of these courses towards their degree.

6.1.3. The question was asked as to whether these courses would be considered remedial courses for CSE’s graduate students. The response was yes.

6.1.4. Both undergraduate and graduate students will be in the same classroom and be taught the same material. This is done as there have not been enough graduate students to fill a section.

6.1.5. The fact that there will be a 5000 level of the course could be a benefit to CSE’s undergraduate students if they are close to going over the 18 hour limit. Besides that exception there is no reason for an undergraduate to take the 5000 level version for fewer hours.

6.1.6. The comment was made that CSE will need to be careful about assigning TAs to this course. The response was that there are no TAs with this course and that it is taught by faculty.

6.1.7. The comment was made that this arrangement will make for some interesting advising discussions.

6.1.8. The question was asked as to whether an undergraduate or graduate student from outside the department could take one of these courses. The response was yes if they meet the prerequisites.

6.1.9. The comment was made that an issue is if a course number represents the difficulty of the material how can a 3000 level course be the same as a 5000 level course. Are these real graduate courses? The response was that this is what CSE is currently doing with 600 level courses.

6.1.10. The comment was made that the new system is forcing us to do this.
6.1.11. The comment was made that rather than the graduate students being responsible for more material they are getting credit for fewer hours.

6.1.12. The comment was made that these courses seem a reasonable solution for graduate students who are lacking some knowledge.

6.1.13. The question was asked as to whether this will impact a BS/MS student. The response was that only seniors can apply to become a BS/MS student and that they should have already taken the 3000 level version of the course.

6.1.14. The question was asked as to how many hours of this type of course under quarters can a graduate count. The response was that currently they can only count three courses which, under semesters, works out to be the same percentage of the program.

6.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

7. John Lippold made a motion that CSE 4221, 4254, 4521, 4901, 4902, 5243, 5245, 5234, 5236, 5343, 5351, 5433, 5471, 5472, 5473, 5501, 5522, 5524, 5525, 5531, 5532, and 5526 be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. The committee was informed that 4221, 5421, 4901, and 4902 are marked as graduate courses as they are designed to be taken by graduate students from outside of CSE. CSE students are excluded from taking these courses.

7.2. The question was asked as to what a proseminar was. The response was that proseminar implies outside speakers while seminar implies internal speakers. This course is cross listed with linguistics and psychology and this is the terminology they use.

7.3. The question was asked as to why the Lisp computer language is still being taught. The response was that while it is an old language that it is still being used by industry.

7.4. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. John Lippold made a motion that CSE 5239, 5249, 5329, 5339, 5349, 5359, 5429, 5439, 5449, 5469, 5479, 5539, and 5559 be approved. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

8.1. The committee was informed that all of these courses have “intermediate studies” in their title.

8.2. The question was asked as to whether there are equivalent introductory and advance courses. The response was that while there are similar introductory and advance courses there is not a one to one correspondence.

8.3. The comment was made that these are core courses for CSE.

8.4. The question was asked as to why these courses went from 700 level to 5000 level. The response was that undergraduate students can currently take 700 level courses and CSE wants them to continue to have the opportunity to take the courses.
8.5. The comment was made that some of the categories need to be switched from 3 to 2 as some of the courses are not a direct conversion.

8.6. The question was asked as to what the prerequisites were for these courses. The response was either graduate standing or having completed the CSE core foundation courses.

8.7. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

9. John Lippold made a motion that CSE 5544 and 5545 be approved contingent upon the correction of the distribution of contact hours. Hal Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

9.1. The question was asked as to why it was important to change the contact hours. The response was that the lab contact hours are marked but do not show up in the time distribution section. This is important so that students know what the time distribution of the course will be. This is very different than indicating how many hours will be spent on each topic.

9.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingency passed.

10. John Lippold informed the committee that comments were sent to Dave Tomasko concerning the Semester Honors Proposals and that Dave has responded to those comments. The subcommittee has not had the time to review the revised proposal.

11. Ann Christy made a motion that the page and a half of ECE’s semester course proposals passed out to the committee be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

11.1. The question was asked as to whether 5759, Optimization for Static and Dynamic, needs to have ISE’s concurrence. The response was that it is a revision of an existing course and that a number of programs have courses that deal with optimization. The decision was that ISE’s concurrence was not necessary.

11.2. The question was asked as to whether 8101, Advanced Topics in Networking, and 8201, Advanced Topics in Signal Processing, need to have concurrence from CSE. Paul Sivilotti stated that CSE’s concurrence was not necessary. However, it was decided to pull 8101 from the list as there are some other issues with it.

11.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

12. Yogesh Sahai made a motion that all of the ISE courses from 5610 through 8999 be approved with a contingency upon 6820 that concurrence be received from Economics. John Lippold seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

12.1. The comment was made that ISE’s special topics course numbering does not follow the registrar’s guidelines but the registrar’s office has not been enforcing the guidelines. Blaine Lilly stated that ISE is using a logical internal
numbering system for these courses. It was decided to approve the courses as they are numbered and if OAA does not like it they will send the courses back.  
12.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the contingency passed.  

13. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the page and a half of MSE courses shown on the handout be approved. Yogesh Sahai seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.  
13.1. The committee was informed that MSE has made all of the changes recommended by the reviewer.  
13.2. The committee was informed that MSE took their current numbering system and added a digit in front of the number.  
13.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.  

14. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the three pages of Welding courses shown on the handout be approved. Yogesh Sahai seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.  
14.1. The committee was informed that Welding has made all of the changes recommended by the reviewer to include changing the number of repeatable credits and how many times it could be taken for 7999.  
14.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.  

15. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the proposal from ISE to withdrawal their Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Engineering Management be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.  
15.1. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.  

16. The chair stated that it appears that the committee will need to meet over the summer to deal with issues that may come up. He asked the committee if a reduced quorum would be in order again this summer. The floor was opened for discussion.  
16.1. The comment was made that while a reduced quorum would be acceptable that only semester conversion issues should be considered.  
16.2. George Valco made a motion that during the summer the committee’s quorum be reduced to five members and that summer meetings only deal with issues concerning semester conversion. Jen Ping Chen seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.  
16.3. There being no discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.  

17. Hal Walker made a motion that the page and a half of Mechanical courses shown on the handout be approved. Shivraman Giri seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
17.1. The committee was informed that all of the issues with these courses have been resolved and that the new courses deal with Mechanical’s core interests.

17.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 8 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

18. The chair asked whether ECE’s issue with the new numbering system has been resolved. The issue is that the rules for the new numbering system were changed after they were first announced and ECE developed their course numbers based on the original rules. The biggest impact is the change that undergraduates and graduates can both take 5000 level courses. Also, undergraduates can now view graduate courses if they click the graduate career box and can register for them if they meet the prerequisites. These changes, if announced earlier, would have allowed ECE to structure their course numbering system differently but they should be able to work with the system as it is now structured.

19. The committee was informed that at the next meeting a new chair for 2011-2012 will need to be elected. Clark will be contacting members to find out if they are interested in serving as chair.

20. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55.