CCGB MINUTES
January 30, 1998


Members Absent: J. Abel, J. Hopcroft, J. Jenkins, D. Ruppert

Ex-Officio: K. Braxton, D. Cox, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

As J. Abel, CEE, Chair was unable to attend, C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair lead today’s meeting.

Minutes: C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: Minutes of January 23, 1998 were distributed and approved with the following corrections: The residency requirement for engineering at this time is that students must have four semesters in the college with three of those affiliated within the field.

Electrical Engineering Proposal for Approved Electives: C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: Computer Science treats the approved electives as free electives because it is the only place in the curriculum that students can freely choose courses. If approved electives are removed or changed after the approval of the freshman advisor it will de-value the role of the freshman advisor. If a particular field has strong feelings on what an approved elective is they should publish their criteria in field literature. By looking at the student handbook it seems that Environmental Engineering was the only place that actually delineates criteria for approved electives. CS advises students that the appearance of their transcript beyond grades should be considered when choosing an approved elective. Students are graduating early, CS doesn’t feel this is necessarily a bad thing, but this comes as no surprise as when the curriculum was changed lowering the number of credits students now have the ability to graduate early. A return of the 5 year engineering program might be a result.


D. Cox, Student Services: Although it is not a reason to make an academic decision, the CCGB should consider the tie to their decisions and the allocation of funding to the college. The college is under considerable pressure from the provost to stabilize enrollment figures from year to year. Students graduating early do have an impact on the whole financial structure of the university.

K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: What are the concerns of Electrical Engineering? Are the concerns coming from students? Alumni?

R. Kay, GS: It is the understanding that EE’s concerns are that students are not taking top level senior courses to round out their education so EE would like to use the approved elective category in order to require students to take the upper level courses.
C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: What are the targeted numbers the university would like to see for the college in terms of enrollments?

D. Cox, Student Services: The numbers from the provost will be provided to the CCGB.

P. Kintner, EE: The approved electives are difficult to track from the freshman advisor to the field advisor. The paperwork is not getting transferred from advisor to advisor. Sometimes the advisor is not aware that an advisee has another advisor. It is also difficult for faculty to keep the same freshman advisees once they affiliate. It seems that the approved electives are now really free electives. EE feels that the approved electives should not be “free electives”.

C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: The approved electives are not necessarily “free” as an advisor has to approve the elective. Is the loss of control an issue?

D. Bartel, MAE: When the files are not sent on to the new faculty advisor the paper trail is lost. Isn’t there a simple form which can be sent with the student indicating what courses were agreed, by the student and the freshman advisor, as fulfilling the approved elective category?

P. Kintner, EE: There is no guidance to advisors on what constitutes an approved elective. EE would feel more comfortable with the category of approved electives is there was some guidance.

D. Grubb, MSE: How would the guidelines be written when there is such a wide variety of areas a student may choose? Students may change their minds...how can an advisor reject this?

D. Bartel, MAE: It is not so much a matter of what students have taken for an approved elective but more so what category is each course to be assigned? There is a complete disconnect between the freshman and upper level advisors.

P. Kintner, EE: Students can choose to take extra courses, which was part of new curriculum.

D. Grubb, MSE: A form could be made, just like the incomplete form, listing each course number in a category, which is then signed by the faculty advisor.

F. Wise, A&EP: A&EP has a checksheet, from the field, which shows what courses go in each category. How can this disconnect be avoided?

D. Bartel, MAE: Why should it be decided twice what courses fit into which category? A checklist would simplify this process.

F. Shumway, Advising: The transfer of folders from freshman advisors to upper-class advisor occur when the copy of the approved affiliation form is sent to the freshman advisor with a note indicating that the student’s folder be sent to the new advisor, which is also listed. The copy of the approved affiliation form is sent to the field coordinators which in turn send them to the freshman advisors. I believe that in most cases this has been occurring.

P. Kintner, EE: Would a better description of the approved electives work instead of a form?

D. Bartel, MAE: I disagree that a better description would work. A simple, formal way to figure out what course belongs in which category would help solve this problem.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Most students do not have time for approved electives in their first three semesters. Wouldn’t it be defacto that any courses the students have taken are approved electives?

D. Bartel, MAE: A form for the approved electives would alleviate the problem of trying to guess. Why shouldn’t an advisor know what was decided between the freshman advisor and the student? MAE advises students to hold off taking approved electives until their junior year.

F. Shumway, Advising: If such a form were provided would it be binding to the student? Or would an advisor be willing to re-negotiate what courses would be counted towards the approved elective? It seems that part of the population of freshman advisors are sending the student folders to the upper level advisors.

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Advising office could put a checklist with just the common courses, distribution, AP credits and approved electives on the inside cover of each student folder. During orientation of freshman advisors he will ask the advisors to fill this checklist out and remind them of the procedure for forwarding the folders to the upper-class advisors. *Suggestion to do so agreed by the CCGB.*

P. Kintner, EE: The number of students taking upper level courses are diminishing as they graduate early. A sense among faculty and alumni are that students who graduate early are not as educated as they should be. The EE faculty feels they should be more in line with the rest of the college, although it seems by adding a course or two would place EE along the same number of credit hours as Computer Science.

P. Kintner, EE: Would like to see this line of discussion regarding approved electives as a continued discussion in the review of the curriculum.

D. Grubb, MSE: By putting criteria on the approved electives it would force students, who wish to graduate in seven semesters, to affiliate early in order to take approved electives, which are approved by the fields.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Submitted in advance (attached) a follow up to the Jan. 23rd discussion of the minimum number of credit hours required in the field program by each department. Note was made that the High number indicated was 58 when in actuality it is 55 (CS). The Mean should also be corrected to 50.7, but the Median remains unchanged at 51.

**Minors Sub-Committee Report:** C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: CS would like to see the administration of the minors program centralized to the advising office with very specific, simple criteria for defining who is eligible for a minors concentration. As fields are so busy at that time of year deciding who will be graduating it would be a hardship for fields to do this additional work.

**Student Organization Liability:** D. Grubb, MSE: Met with members of the student assembly regarding the liability for advisors of student organizations. The student assembly knows of no problems with student organizations having difficulty trying to find faculty advisors.
C. Van Loan, CS, Vice-Chair: Wrote a letter to the university counsel’s office asking for outlines in which, if followed, would exempt advisors from liability. Right now the liability is at the discretion of the university counsel’s office.

**Freshman Advisor Assignments:** K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: In advance prepared a handout (attached) regarding thoughts in preparation for the discussion on Freshman Advisor Assignments for Fall 1998.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 am.

**Tentative agenda for February 6, 1998:**
1. Approval of January 30, 1998 minutes
2. Announcements (Hover)
3. Continued discussion of EE proposal on approved electives
4. Assignment of freshman advisors (Hover)
5. Selection of future curriculum issues for agenda