CCGB Minutes
October 16, 1998

Members: M. Duncan, F. Gouldin, D. Gries, R. Kay, P. Kintner, L. Lion, D. Shmoys, F. Wise

Absent: J. Jenkins, J. Hopcroft, M. Thompson, M. Walter

Ex-Officio: T. Cookingham, D. Cox, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway, T. Thompson

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of October 9, 1998 approved as read.

ABET: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, all addendum and updated materials will be sent to ABET when they have been collected from departments. A checklist of common curriculum material, that needs to be collected for the ABET review, was distributed (attached). Please review and send the course materials to the Undergraduate Programs office.

Enrollment Capping (Limits): D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, currently the college does not have limits for labs and sections. Consequently, the course balancing occurs post facto, which causes conflict and problems for students. These conflicts increase the number of add/drop forms as students try to resolve them alternately. A realistic limit could be set in course enroll for labs and sections. The disadvantage is accurately determining limits. The average number (over 3 years) for labs and sections has been set, these numbers have been sent to the field coordinators. None of the course limits are set in stone and can be changed to accommodate the needs of the professor and departments. Setting limits appropriately will help reduce the frustration of students at the beginning of the semester. If you have a course with fluctuating numbers you will need to look at the course limits that have been set.

Course Evaluations:
Discussion:
- The charge to the CCGB should be do-able and have value.
- The assessment system is left open, will the data go to the department chairs?
- There is an unevenness across the college regarding access to course evaluations.
- In the charge the department chairs can be removed so that it is worded (section 2.e.) “procedures for returning data to appropriate recipients on a schedule that permits effective use of the result.”
- The charge is not intended to override the department’s current procedures.
- How widely course evals are distributed throughout the college, for example should students have access to them? Should the charge contain this issue?
- In surveying the field coordinators, the course evaluation procedures vary widely from department to department.
- In section 3.g “distribution” should be added to the wording.
- Section 3.e. is for appraising the faculty so the department chairs should be receiving the materials.
• Sections 3.e. and 2.e. are general procedures for returning the data to the appropriate recipient on a schedule.
• An interim report by the close of this academic year would be an appropriate deadline. Is it realistic that a recommendation would be forthcoming by the end of the year?
• There is a lot of work involved in this charge. Flexibility of the committee is needed to complete this work.
• Will there be some administrative support for the task force?
• If the recommendations were made by the end of the academic year it could go to faculty vote in the fall semester.
• The draft charge has been shown to the Dean in order for the CCGB to determine if a. this is something that needs to be done, b. CCGB is willing to do this, and c. this will benefit the community.

Resolution:
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, the Dean will write the cover letter to the CCGB with the charge attached. The motion was moved and seconded ask the Dean to charge the CCGB with review of course evaluations with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention.

Minors: L. Lion, CEE, Chair of Minors ad hoc committee, the proposal on the minors, which was voted and passed by the faculty, was distributed to members of the CCGB (attached). The ad hoc committee began by talking to the people that were instrumental in putting together the original proposal. Attached is the format for the systematic review and approval of minors. This is a format, not a form, to be used. The approval process has not yet been tried so this format has not been tested. The format is to be followed in the respect to the request of minors. This format deals with three issues, list of courses, specific requirements, and the minimum academic standard. Procedures would be for the departments to send proposals to the CCGB for distribution to departments for review. The departments would submit feedback to the CCGB, who will then either approve the minor program or make recommended changes to the initiating department. The minimum number of course is six (6) with eighteen (18) credits total.
• The requirements should not be too specific and built case by case, similar to the law.
• There are too many options to determine all the scenarios.
• Can a department double count courses, as there is nothing in the legislation that answers this?
• As the virtual statistics department is part of the whole university, i.e. a university wide department, can they propose a minor?
• Is it the responsibility of the CCGB to consider which departments are considered part of the college?
• A university department does not constitute an engineering department as the legislation states.
• ORIE and EE are planning to develop a minor program but courses for the minor program are also used for many of ORIE core courses so double counting becomes an issue.
• Double counting should be a judgment call made by each department.
• Double dipping was purposely removed from the resolution so it is more flexible for departments, which then involves more judgment from the departments.
• Do ORIE and EE have to develop individual minor programs so those ORIE students take a statistic minors in EE and visa versa?
• The validation process will be more difficult if lots of rules are implemented.
• Intercollegiate minors program is an eventual goal but we first want to implement them in the engineering college. If it works well here then maybe it will be broadened to include departments throughout the university.
• EE and ORIE could both offer minors to students in other departments or the minors program could be co-offered in both EE and ORIE.
• The out-of-college department issue could be solved by either amending the resolution or create a new proposal.
• Administration of the minors program should be done in the Engineering College. The format could include a section for the field offering the minor and a separate entry for the field administering the minor.
• It might be better for ORIE and EE to work out two proposals for minors. This may create more offerings for students. Some amount of double counting would be OK but it is a fuzzy issue.
• Cross-listed courses could become another issue.
• The minor approval format, developed by the minors ad hoc committee, may be fine to use once the minor approval process has become routine so the CCGB could approve these. Initially the approval should come from the ad hoc committee.
• Do the list of courses available for the minor program need to be complete or can a department list any course in the department over the 300 level?

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am

**********************************
CCGB Agenda
October 23, 1998

1. Approval of September 4 and October 16 minutes (5 min)
2. ABET announcements (5 min)
3. Minors (15 min)
4. Liability Issues (15 min)
5. Response to Dean’s charge (20 min)
6. Undergraduate announcements (5 min)