To: University Senate Steering Committee

From: Susan Awbrey, Chair
University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction

Re: School of Engineering and Computer Science Proposal for IT Bachelor

On January 9, 2004 UCUI met with Dr. Ishwar Sethi to discuss the committee's questions regarding the proposed SEC IT program. The major issues discussed included:

1. The seeming business focus of the program
2. How the proposed program compares with CIS and MIS majors
3. How the program compares with IT majors at other institutions
4. The numbers of new vs. current students who will take the program
5. Detail of the budget from the university perspective
6. Adequacy of the library request for the program
7. New vs current courses
8. The number of electives for students
9. Inclusion of RHT 160 and discussion of general education
10. Interest in the program by area firms
11. Options (graduate study and occupational) for graduates of the program

Dr. Sethi arrived at 2:30 to discuss the proposed BS in Information Technology.

1. Dr. Dr. Sethi was more than willing to change the tone of the discussion to downplay the business focus in the proposed program
2. Dr. Dr. Sethi handed out a table that compared the proposed program with the CIS and MIS major. He agreed to include the table in the proposal. The table showed some additional tracks besides the 3 being proposed. The committee thought that more discussion of the other tracks was necessary or they should be deleted. Dr. Dr. Sethi had no problem with this suggestion.
3. Dr. Dr. Sethi said that comparisons with other schools was already part of his supporting materials and agreed to move this information into the proposal once he understood that committee members do not see the supporting material. He also understood the concern the committee had between new students versus drawing students from the CIS and MIS programs. He said that he would contact other schools to see what their experience was. When the CMU program was brought up, Dr. Dr. Sethi suggested that the proposed program was considerably better than CMU's,. Penprase said that this type of comparison should be in the proposal with supporting evidence.
4. Dr. Sethi believes that both new and current students will use this new program. He will create a table in the discussion on how other programs have grown with special attention to new vs. current students. (see 3 above).
5. Dr. Sethi has no problem changing the title of IT 337 so that the word "business" or "management" are not used.

6. Dr. Sethi said that a new budget, showing much more detail, is being worked on. He would include the new budget in the revised proposal. He understood our confusion about the budget. He thought that both a budget from engineering and from the university could be included but that he would need to talk to the person doing the budget for the school.
7. Dr. Sethi agreed to talk to Millie Merz in the library about a library budget for the new program that recognizes the historical inflation for books and journals.
8. Dr. Sethi agreed to clear up which courses are new versus which are replacing current courses. The revision will also make it clear when each of these courses will generally be taken within a student's program. He agreed to show a proposed student schedule. The committee thought this would make it clearer when part-time, graduate assistants, and new tenure track faculty would be needed.
9. Dr. Sethi agreed to make the number of electives clearer and will provide a sample student schedule (see 8 above).
10. Dr. Sethi was unaware that RHT was not included and would make sure that the current General Education program was covered in the revised proposal. He will work with Pat Bennett, the head advisor for engineering, on this issue. The proposed student schedule (see 8 above) will make this clear. He will also work with Pat to show how the proposed program would work with the proposed General Education program. An additional student schedule may be used to show the new General Education program.
11. Dr. Sethi mentioned that the backup materials contain letters from CIOs and CFOs in support of the new program. He agreed to move these materials into the proposal. The revision will also discuss arrangements that have already been made with firms in support of the new program.

UCUI voted to endorse the program with the proviso that the proposal would be revised to reflect the January 9th discussion. Stafford Rorke of UCUI agreed to monitor the revision. Dr. Sethi resubmitted the proposal with UCUI's changes and the program was endorsed by UCUI.

Respectfully submitted
Susan Awbrey