## Agenda, October 8, 2004
### CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Motion: Physics Courses Prerequisites
4. Charges to the Committees
5. Revision of the Bylaws
6. Appeals Process for Students

### CCGB Minutes, October 1, 2004

Ex-Officio: D. Cox, R. Evans, R. Robbins, L. Schneider
Other: C. Pakkala

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the September 17, 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

**Undergraduate Announcements:** D. Gries stated that the ethics workshop in Eng. 150, run by Park Doing and Ron Kline, had concluded and that it went well. During the workshop the students were asked about copyrights and downloading, cheating, and how to treat other people. The workshop focused primarily on copyrights and downloading. There were many interesting student comments, particularly about downloading.

M. Louge said that the visit from the Ecole Centrale Paris representatives went well, and he emailed to several departments the powerpoint presentation that describes ideas for a strategic partnership with them. This proposed partnership will be discussed at the October 19th Engineering College faculty meeting. A. Center asked if the students would do the last 2 years of their undergraduate study overseas. M. Louge replied that it is a possibility. Another option is for them to do 2 years here, 2 years there, and 1-year M.E.ng. here. A. Center said that because all of the ChemE core courses are taught in the third year, the ChemE students couldn’t participate in this program. M. Louge agreed.

**Discussion of Revision of Bylaws:** D. Gries said that people wanted some history in the bylaws, so it has been added. The list of distribution courses didn’t belong in the bylaws. He went through the past minutes since 1981, and he found that during some years an annual report was submitted by the CCGB. It is a good idea for the CCGB to submit an annual report to the Dean, with a list of what motions were passed during the year, so this requirement is being added to the bylaws.

Other colleges offer minors, and sometimes our students take them in other colleges. Does the CCGB need to approve them? R. Robbins replied that the college’s position is that there aren’t minors in any college except for engineering. The Advising Office would need to know which minors are okay and which aren’t. D. Grubb added that we don’t want to infringe on the territory of the majors by using the terms options, concentrations, etc. An option should be called a minor and the term option should disappear. D. Cox stated that the Bioengineering Option is now offered through the Bioengineering Major. She suggested that D. Gries look at PeopleSoft and see what options exist regarding wording. D. Gries asked if the CCGB should work toward removing this option. A. Zehnder said that it would be consistent with the way things are done now. W. Philpot said that now that a minor does exist, perhaps the option is not commonly used. A. Center asked if someone wants to take the 4 courses and wants the option on their transcript, what would be a strong case for doing it or not doing it. D. Gries replied that this is another level of complexity. **A. Center moved that the subject be tabled. D. Gries seconded.**
M. Louge asked if a major could eliminate all physics courses if the CCGB approved it, because the word “terminal” indicates this. CCGB discussed it in the past, and decided that physical sciences should stay within the college. Some majors wanted to eliminate physics in favor of math courses. He suggested that the word *terminal* be kept in there to keep the physics requirement. D. Grubb said that listing a substitute physics course indicates that some type of physics sequence is required. People take 2 physics courses, but some don’t take a third course. Replacing more physics courses hasn’t been an option. M. Louge added that he is worried about physics courses becoming eliminated. All engineers should have certain requirements and, if not, the field will self-destruct. D. Grubb said that the college has an agreement about what the curriculum should contain, and right now it contains 2 physics courses. A. Center asked if it would be more appropriate to say that the CCGB sets the core curriculum to include math, chemistry and physics. W. Philpot suggested that it be said that the CCGB approves math and science courses in a major. M. Louge said that presumably a quarter of the CCGB members could meet and make some dramatic changes. A 2/3 majority of all members of the CCGB should be required to make changes to the common curriculum. A. Zehnder stated that there is no such thing as a common curriculum if majors have their own common curriculum. D. Gries said that the requirements remain the same, i.e. 4 math courses. He suggested that the issue be tabled so that people can think of what wording they desire and let him know. A. Center suggested that things be lumped into a common description so the same action is taken in all cases (i.e. chemistry, math, physics, etc.). R. Robbins asked if the intent is to allow the students to substitute any 3 physics courses if the CCGB approves or have them take the first 2 physics courses and they could substitute the 3rd. M. Louge replied that the students take 2 courses and can take another science or math course as their third physics course replacement. R. Robbins said that it might be difficult to put the requirements for each area in one sentence. D. Gries stated that the CCGB is responsible for setting the requirements; that’s the basic statement that is required. M. Louge said that the contents of a course can be approved or denied by the CGB, and he wondered what it means to have a common core. A. Center said that the CCGB could designate the science and math courses. D. Grubb stated that the college faculty decided what the common curriculum should be, and the CCGB had the responsibility in carrying out the faculty’s objectives. This was the historical view. The CCGB needs to decide when a department proposes a change whether it is important to bother the faculty with. The college faculty decided the balance of courses in each area. The level of responsibility of the CCGB should be clear in the bylaws. M. Louge asked what happened with the replacement of a third physics with a math course. D. Gries replied that it was just done through the CCGB. D. Grubb added that there were pre-existing statements about the replacement of a terminal course and when something substantial arises, the full faculty would vote on it.

**Assessing Post-Course Assessments for Spring 2004 Courses:** D. Gries requested that each of the committees give him (within 1.5 weeks) an electronic document summary of what they have done as a committee. D. Grubb said that a common remark has been that many post-course assessments didn’t meet the ABET requirements. The idea is that an individual is doing the assessment to see how a course can be improved and the committee sees how the whole thing fits together. D. Cox added that the form is geared toward an improvement plan. There should be an improvement focus, and this cycle is important because it is the freshest review prior to the arrival of the ABET evaluators. D. Grubb stated that this doesn’t help with the overall review of the curriculum. A. Center asked where the responsibility lies to look at the post-course assessments and decide if faculty are doing the right thing. D. Gries replied that the CCGB is overseeing the common curriculum, and if we think something needs an improvement, then the instructor is approached. D. Cox said that the department heads are not responsible for the common curriculum courses. A. Center said that if a department teaches a course, it would be in the department’s best interest to be involved. D. Gries said that if the review committee talks to an in-
structor, there is no need to talk to the department chair. A. Center stated that a department chair would be more interested than the CCGB would be. D. Cox said that the department chair might be interested, but they don’t view the common curriculum courses as their responsibility. A. Zehnder said that department chairs are interested in courses taught by the people in their department. D. Gries said that an instructor would likely talk to others in their department. A. Zehnder suggested that the post-course assessment checklists be made available to the chairs. D. Cox stated that if significant recommendations are made for changes, there is a process where the CCGB interacts with the instructor or department to talk about the implementation of the changes. The feedback loop returns to the origin of the department where the course is taught. D. Grubb added that assessments are being collected at the department level prior to coming to the CCGB, so people could look at them. D. Cox suggested that the CCGB have a future discussion about the process we could use to make the post course assessment process more helpful in improving the common curriculum.

Charges to the Committees: D. Grubb said that we discussed the charges 2 weeks ago, but didn’t formally charge the committees with things. This will be done during the next CCGB meeting.

Appeals Process for Students: D. Grubb stated that no clear route currently exists for student appeals and that the college should have something about this. He wondered who should do this and suggested that perhaps the Student Experience Committee, ASPAC, or some ad-hoc committee should handle this issue. The CCGB will discuss this topic during their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 am.