1. Attendance:
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Derek Hansford
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEG – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker: Chair
   CSE – Paul Sivilotti
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)
   FAB – Not present (Gonul Kaletunc)
   ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell
   MSE –
      MSE – John Morral
      WLD – Dave Farson
   MAE –
      Aero – Jen Ping Chen
      ME – Blaine Lilly (ASAP Rep)
   Graduate Student – Kevin Disotell and Sushma Santapuri
   Undergraduate Student – Dominic Labanowski (Not present Chelsea Setterlin)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Nikki Strader, Holly Griffen, Jason Kentner, Suzanne Dantuono, David Williams.

2. The minutes from the 7 November 2011 meeting were approved as corrected.

3. Dean David Williams was introduced to the committee and committee members introduced themselves to him. The dean thanked everyone for their service on the committee. He is trying to meet with key committees in the college and learn how they operate. The dean stated that he is here today to listen and learn. It has been about seven months since he has become dean and he continues to be impressed by the faculty, staff, and students. Our graduates are well received and valued by industry and we need to continue graduating well prepared students. The dean stated that he wanted to know what issues the committee has and the needs he should be aware of. The floor was opened for discussion.

3.1. The dean was informed that the committee reviews and approves all degree programs and courses and any changes to them. In addition, the committee approves academic policies for the college. For the past two years the committee has been concentrating on our conversion to semesters. Recently the committee dealt with the dissolution of the Aviation department and the creation of the Aviation Center. The Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of CCAA. This subcommittee oversees academic probation and dismissals.

3.2. The comment was made that dean needs to be aware that turf battles between colleges can get intense. There has always been some tension between
Engineering and the rest of the university especially Arts & Science. The current budget model has intensified some of the turf battles.

3.3. The dean commented that turf issues are not limited to this university. We need to emphasize that Engineering requires its students to take courses outside of the college. What we do not have is an Engineering component requirement in other colleges. We need to try and create an Engineering equivalent of English 110 which could be taken and possibly required by other colleges. We, as Engineering, have not been strong enough in our statements about the need for technical education. He is prepared to bring this issue up at the appropriate level when possible.

3.4. The comment was made that there will probably be some pressure from the university for us to reduce our number of hours once we switch to semesters.

3.5. The dean commented that the conversion to semesters was used as an excuse by a lot of people to kick issues down the road. Reducing our hours to degree should not be an issue especially as we can get data from Engineering programs in other university’s to justify our requirements.

3.6. The dean stated that he liked seeing a representative from KSA being at the meeting. Jason Kentner commented that the degree programs in KSA are facing the issue of the conflicting demands between the requirements of their accreditation boards and the university’s general education requirements. KSA plans on offering some general education courses under semesters that will be taken by their students and open to students throughout the university.

3.7. The dean stated that KSA will be staying as part of the college. Having a school such as KSA as part of an Engineering College is not very common and is new to him. We need to use this association to our advantage by making maximum use of KSA’s expertise in design, presentation, and creative ideas.

3.8. The dean stated that one issue that has been discussed a lot lately is increased enrollment. Everyone needs to be aware that increased enrollment does not automatically mean that we will hire more faculty. Enrollment varies with increases and decreases and hiring more faculty to take care of a possible temporary increase is not a sound business model. We need to be open to hiring temporary clinical faculty and using emeritus faculty. Short term growth in enrollment should not become a long term personnel problem.

3.9. The dean asked the student representatives if they had any issues. The reply was that they are here to represent the students and want to stay clear of any turf issues. The question was asked that as interdisciplinary engineering is becoming more important what his vision was towards interdisciplinary courses.

3.10. The dean stated that his vision should not drive this as it is a faculty decision, but that in his opinion the world is very interdisciplinary and we need to value interdisciplinary education. However, we need to teach the fundamentals of Engineering so that our students can become a professional in their discipline. An interdisciplinary education is important but a student first needs a solid grounding their discipline.

3.11. The question was asked as to what the dean thought about interdisciplinary hires across multiple departments. The dean responded that this is a good discussion to have. For the faculty that were hired this year, the
prime consideration was did they help fulfill one of the college’s strategic goals. Second consideration was if the person could be hired in multiple departments. Currently about 6% of our faculty have joint appointments but we need to do better and get this number up to between 25 and 30%. Once we reach those numbers interdisciplinary hires will be part of the norm and not an anomaly.

4. Blaine Lilly presented two new CCAA voting options to the committee. One option is based on undergraduate degree programs and the other is based on faculty groups with distinct areas of expertise. The difference between the two options is that Nuclear Engineering is not included in the first but is included in the second. The idea behind the options was to be more expansive in who can vote. The downside to increased voting membership is that we may have problems getting a quorum. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. The comment was made that if the three KSA degree programs are included that another problem would be dealing with issues that either the KSA representatives or the Engineering representatives have no contributions to make to or expertise in.

4.2. Jason Kentner stated that the degree programs in KSA are under different accreditation rules than those in Engineering. In addition, as a school KSA is self governing and the faculty may not want to give that up.

4.3. The comment was made that we are looking at two different issues. The first is how to allocate votes and the second is whether KSA should be part of the committee. Both of these issues should be considered separately.

4.4. The comment was made that if we increase the number of voters that we risk Balkanization where programs may want to break away from departments and become their own department.

4.5. The comment was made that voting by percentage of students in a program was not listed as one of the options. The reply was that this would be hard to administer and that Mechanical, even though it has most students in the college, does not want this option.

4.6. The comment was made that any voting proposal needs to be sure to differentiate between our ABET programs and our degree programs.

4.7. The question was asked as to whether Environmental is a separate group in CEEGS. The reply was yes even though until recently they were one degree but two ABET programs. Both Civil and Environmental have distinctly different interests.

4.8. The comment was made that in the past there have only been a few disagreements within the committee but that those disagreements were not programmatic. If there are more votes on the committee will we have more disagreements? The common response was no.

4.9. The committee was informed that if the second option was used that there would be four more votes on the committee.

4.10. The comment was made that they did not see how adding votes would hurt or help anyone.

4.11. The comment was made that “group” needs to be defined since some undergraduate degree programs do not have associated graduate programs
and some graduate programs do not have an associated undergraduate program.

4.12. The question was asked as to why a center with a degree program gets a vote on the committee but a degree program that is in a department, such as nuclear, does not. The response was that this is how the faculty rules are currently written.

4.13. The comment was made that a program feels like a second class citizen when they do not have a full vote.

4.14. The question was asked as to why the voting rules are written like they are. The response was that the change occurred when various programs were merged in 1994.

4.15. The chair asked as to what our next step should be.

4.16. The comment was made that we need to develop a philosophy on faculty governance and be as inclusive as possible. We could leave voting as it is and give programs that do not have a vote or a full vote the option of petitioning the committee for a full vote.

4.17. There was general support for a broader voting membership on the committee.

4.18. It was decided that Blaine Lilly with the help of Hal Walker, J.P. Chen, Dave Tomasko, and Ed McCaul would draft a proposal that will be presented to the committee at its next meeting.

4.19. The committee was informed that any changes to the voting rules would need to go to the full faculty for a vote as it would involve changing the faculty rules.

5. Paul Sivilotti made a motion that FABE 2111 be approved contingent upon removal of 325 as the prior course number. Blaine Lilly seconded the motion. The reason for the contingency is that 325 is shown as the prior course number and the prerequisite. 2111 is a bridge course as two FABE quarter courses are being combined. The floor was opened for discussion.

5.1. The question was asked as to whether any concurrences are needed as a Civil and a Chemical Engineering course are shown as exclusions. Both the Civil and Chemical representative stated no.

5.2. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 10 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

6. Blaine Lilly presented a proposed semester admission criteria for OSU students who want to transfer into Engineering. The proposal has been approved by the Core Committee and has been reviewed by Subcommittee B. The policy is for internal OSU transfers and does not mean that a student will be accepted into a major only that they will be accepted into the college. The floor was opened for discussion.

6.1. The question was asked as to why Biology 2100 was on the list and not the semester version of Biology 113. The response was that 2100 is the quantitative version of 113 designed for Engineers and that there would be a non-quantitative version. The question was asked as to why the non-
quantitative would not be acceptable. The response was that it could be included but that Engineering programs would prefer the quantitative version.

6.2. The question was asked as to whether this policy would apply to KSA. The response was no. The request was made that this be specified on the policy.

6.3. The comment was made that it would be possible for a student to get a D in Math 1151 or a D in one of the science courses and still meet the admission criteria. Should the policy be tightened up so that the student would need to get a C or better in the courses?

6.4. The comment was made that if we require a C or better it would made the admission criteria stricter than the admission criteria for our majors.

6.5. It was decided that Suzanne Dantuono and Blaine Lilly would rework the proposal and present the revised version at the next committee meeting.

7. Blaine Lilly made a motion that Clark Mount-Campbell be recognized for his service to the committee as he is retiring in December. Jeff Chalmers seconded the motion. The motion was approved by acclamation.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:02.