1. Attendance:
   AVN – Seth Young
   BME – Not present (Mark Ruegsegger)
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Not present (Paul Sivilotti)
   ECE – Not present (George Valco)
   ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)
   FAB – Mike Lichtensteiger (for Gonul Kaletunc)
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
   MSE –
     MSE – Kathy Flores (for Yogesh Sahai)
     WLD – John Lippold
   MAE –
     Aero – Not present (Jen Ping Chen)
     ME – Blaine Lilly (ASAP Rep)
   Graduate Student – Not present (Shivraman Giri & Cherian Zachariah)
   Undergraduate Student – Not present (Chelsea Setterlin & Anchie Huang)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko

2. The minutes from the 6 July 2011 meeting were approved as written.

3. The committee was informed that the registrar’s office has processed a large
   number of our semester courses. The committee secretary was asked to send a
   message out to all members and advisors informing them of this and asking
   everyone to check and make sure that their courses have been properly posted.

4. The committee was informed that Paul Sivilotti is reviewing Chemical Engineering’s
   courses and as he is not present Subcommittee A is not ready to make a
   recommendation on the remaining Chemical Engineering courses.

5. John Lippold made a motion that the FABE courses on their spreadsheet be
   approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
   5.1. The committee was informed that the courses have been reviewed by
        Subcommittee A and that FABE has made all of the changes the subcommittee
        requested.
   5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 7 approved, 0 opposed,
        and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

6. John Lippold made a motion that the Semester Honors Proposal be approved. Hal
   Walker seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
6.1. The committee was informed that the proposal had been reviewed by Subcommittee A and had been revised based on its recommendations.

6.2. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that honors had requested additional changes to the proposal. The proposal currently has two different sets of requirements but honors wants only one set based on the number of honor courses the student has taken. The college is currently gathering data on whether all of our students who did honors’ research would have meet the course requirement. If they did then the proposal will be changed but if not, Dave will argue with honors to get them to allow us to have two tracks. Our problem is that some of our students become honor students after their first year and miss the opportunity to participate in the Freshman Engineering Honors (FEH) program and take those honor courses. In addition, transfer students who become honor students miss taking the FEH courses. Dave would like for the committee to approve the proposal and give him permission to negotiate with honors on this issue.

6.3. A friendly amendment was made that Dave Tomasko be given permission to negotiate with honors and that he report back to the committee on the final version. The friendly amendment was adopted.

6.4. The question was asked as to whether there is an enrollment limit to honor courses. The response was yes there is a limit of 30 but that Chemistry violates this rule although the associated labs do keep to the limit.

6.5. The question was asked as whether non honor students can enroll in honor courses. The response was no unless it is a course with an embedded honors section.

6.6. The comment was made that it would be good if all of the honor parameters were included as an appendix to the proposal.

6.7. A friendly amendment was made that an appendix be added to the proposal outlining all of the honors’ information faculty and staff would need. The friendly amendment was accepted.

6.8. The question was asked as to why honors will not let us have two tracks. The response was that we currently have two types of research distinction – honors and non honors. Honors feels that students who do not complete the honors course requirement can still have research distinction on their diploma.

6.9. The question was asked as to how important this is to a student. The response was that this goes on a student’s diploma and is very important if a student is applying for graduate school.

6.10. The question was asked as to how many students we have in honors compared to the university. The response was that we have about one-sixth of all of the honor students and have a higher percentage in the college than anyone else. This does give us some leverage with honors.

6.11. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 7 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion with the amendments passed.

7. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the five remaining MSE courses be approved. Seth Young seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
7.1. The committee was informed that there are no issues with these courses and all of them are being converted from existing courses.
7.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 7 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

8. Blaine Lilly made a motion that ISE 3990.01, Foundations of Production System Design, be approved. Seth Young seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
8.1. The committee was informed that this course is a transition course that ISE forgot to submit earlier.
8.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 7 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

9. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that the course title abbreviation change for Chemical Engineering from CHBE to CBE be approved. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.
9.1. The question was asked as to why Chemical was doing this as the CHBE abbreviation was part of the change when they changed the department name from Chemical Engineering to Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering. The response was that the change is being requested so that the abbreviation would be three letters.
9.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 7 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on various academic issues.
10.1. The college has released a new strategic plan. While it is very similar to the previous one there are some differences.
10.2. There have been a number of personnel changes in Undergraduate Education and Student Services. We have a new director of Career Services and interviews are being conducted to find a new Director of Academic Advising. Liz Riter is the new Scholars Advisor/Coordinator and Howard Green has been hired to manage our K-12 outreach program.
10.3. The question was asked as to which Associate Dean oversees graduate student issues. The response was that Roberto Rojas does but that his appointment is a 50% appointment. The comment was made that he should be an ex officio member of this committee. The comment was made that Roberto could always be invited to committee meetings.
10.4. The comment was made that the committee may want to review the faculty rules next year to determine if there is a need to change the voting rules so that all programs would have a full vote.
10.5. The question was asked as to whether Dave could give the committee a short briefing on enrollment. Dave stated that he could arrange that.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 10:54.