Replacing multiple, relatively-specific objectives with fewer, more broadly-worded objectives? That does not sound particularly good.

I was counseled to give up on entering the CSE program since my GPA was too low at the time. Instead, I raised my GPA and am now very happy in my career. If a passing grade is not viewed as sufficient for success in the field, then the college is inflating grades. We have seen proof that students perform in proportion to the expectations set for them; try raising expectations by deepening the curriculum, and increasing the grading difficulty. And remove the GPA requirements, students who don't have the will to persevere will leave the field anyway; why discourage someone who despite their grades is showing interest? Instead the college should be figuring out why that student is underperforming.

I'm not even sure I entirely understand what the above objective question is trying to state, but I think I am opposed to this change because it is making a distinction between undergraduate CSE work and graduate study work, which I do not believe should be separated. There is enough diversity in computation available at Ohio State that each student should be able to target what he or she wishes to focus on either in the workplace or in graduate school. Distinguishing these only complicates things for the student and does a disservice to his or her degree. Spending time learning specific technology as an undergrad is a waste of time. Applying new technologies and ideas as the field evolves is something that is generally done at a workplace. Fundamental concepts and ideas of computation will NOT be picked up in the workplace the way new technology and ideas can be. Without the current type of curriculum that was given at OSU I would not be the quality of engineer that I am now. If I look at most of the engineers around me they all have a similar learning background. Please leave targeting the computing profession to the technical schools and continue to give undergrads a solid foundation in computing. Do not change the core focus for undergrads!

The CSE degree is a theory-based degree. While this is markedly better than an applied degree, I am concerned that the lack of applied experience many CSE graduates have can make transition into the working world difficult. Here in theory classes, we deal with ideal systems and requirements that never change. The real world is completely unlike this, but students rarely get a feel for that. Employers may someday shun hiring CSE grads from OSU because they expect them to be naive about actual practices in the field. Perhaps we should require that students take at least one class with a strong applied character, that actually teaches them what real-world computing is like. But there are very few classes like this currently offered in the CSE department, and none are required for the major.

I think the first thing to do is decide upon and improve the core skill set (ie. understanding key principles and practices of computing, and in the basic mathematical, and scientific principles) then work with different tracks for more specialized skill sets, much like the current program. One addition I would recommend is a seminar series giving students insight into each of the paths (something around the sophomore/junior level). This would enable students to choose the skills they think they'll need based on what they wish to accomplish down the road.
The proposed changes are very vague, perhaps intentionally so. They don't relate, to me, the very large effort it takes to study and complete this program. To merely "be employed" does not seem to me to be a very good benchmark for success.

Engineering Career Services is one of the most useful programs in preparing a student for future and immediate employment. I do not feel the service was emphasized or pushed enough, and I would wager the average engineering student has little to no knowledge of what it's for. Only those who actively seek out the service will reap the benefits, and while maybe that's a true representation of the "real world", it really leaves a lot on the table in terms of more students being prepared. CSE 616, 560, and 757 were "stand-out" courses that provided above-average preparation for the real world. The principles espoused in 616 and 757 were especially useful during interviewing. All other courses were of course, great for laying down a foundation of knowledge.

Encourage students to take classes outside of Computing to tie in the business aspects of the industry. It is important to not only understand the discipline, but also how the discipline works to provide direct or indirect benefits.

I work with many graduates of Devry and I can instantly recognize them. They understand the technologies but lack any deep understanding. They also are the least "rounded" of employees. I know a lot of students complain that a CSE degree is too much theory and not enough technology, but I appreciate my education.