Agenda, October 26, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 10/12/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Discussion, Possible Approval of BIO 110 as Elective for 2002
4. ABET Discussion

CCGB Minutes
October 19, 2001


Ex-Officio: P. Beebe, D. Cox, D. Maloney-Hahn, J. Saylor, T. Thompson

Other: D. Dalthorp, V. Kostroun, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of October 12, 2001 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that 10/19/01 was the last day for students to drop courses without a petition and without receiving a “W” on their transcript. He suggested that, due to the 9/11/01 tragedy, advisors be allowed to extend the drop period (only this fall) so that they can accommodate those students who need a little more time to drop and who don’t want to petition and receive a “W” on their transcript. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that, in order to be fair, all students should receive an e-mail about the extension. M. Duncan disagreed with extending the drop deadline and said that students have already had 6 weeks of classes and should know by now how they’re doing in their classes. E. Giannelis (MS&E) suggested that students be evaluated by their advisors on a 1:1 basis rather than extend the deadline to all students. D. Maloney Hahn will send a note to advisors requesting that they extend the deadline to those students who indicate a need for it. T. Thompson (Registrar) stated that pre-enrollment will begin on 10/22/01. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) said that she contacted the engineering fields to obtain the number of seniors who still need to fulfill the technical writing requirement.

Introduction to Nanoscience and Nanoengineering (Proposed ENGRI 130): F. Wise (A&EP) introduced V. Kostroun (A&EP) as the instructor for the course and then briefly mentioned the characteristics of the course. M. Duncan mentioned that he sees a lot of overlap with this course and the current nanotechnology course. F. Wise responded that there is substantial overlap in the main concepts, but this course will be taught in the spring by A&EP and the other course is taught in the fall by MS&E. E. Giannelis (MS&E) stated that he views this course overlap as an opportunity for the two departments to collaborate. Motion: To accept the Introduction to Nanoscience and Nanoengineering course as an ENGRI 130. Unanimously approved.

The History of Engineering Distributions (handout distributed): D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) consulted with various faculty (current and emeritus) to obtain the history of the engineering distribution courses. The Engineering Policy Committee created the engineering distribution courses in 1964. The Common Curriculum, which required four courses (from four out of eight areas), was created circa
In 1994 two distribution courses (from two different areas) and one introduction to engineering courses were required, and at least one ENGRD course became a part of the affiliation criteria for most fields. A motion in 1997 to allow ENGRD courses to be 3 or 4 credits failed. In late 1997 the distribution requirement was changed to allow the courses to be taken in the first four semesters rather than three.

E-Mail Response from M. Saltzman to T. Jordan: M. Saltzman (ChemE) wrote that he believes that the best option is for students to take BioG 110/ENGRG 110 as a basic science course, taken in place of either a chemistry or physics course. He is in favor of having BIOG 110/ENGRG 110 serve as a substitute for Physics 214. He also wrote that he believes that the two biomedical engineering majors will likely co-exist for a period of time. L. Lion (CEE) mentioned that the environmental option in the CEE field requires an introductory bio course. Having BioG 110 as a distribution course would give students the choice of taking bio instead of a third physics course. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that many departments have very full curriculums, and he wondered where another distribution course would be located and what course this new one would displace. He added that the enrollment in Physics 214 is way down, and it was suggested a while ago that BioG 110 be substituted for it. T. Healey (T&AM) said that he doesn’t think that BioG 110 should be 4 credits because the other sophomore-level courses are only 3 credits. He knows of some T&AM courses that, given their intensity and workload, could easily be 4 or 5 credits. F. Gouldin (M&AE) suggested that this course be allowed to substitute for a physics course on a trial basis for a couple of years and then the CCGB could re-evaluate the situation. He stated his concern that the course is 4 credits and questioned whether the course could be done in 3 credit hours. C. Van Loan responded that actual courses should be counted, not credit hours because he has found no real correlation between the number of credit hours and the workload required. S. Wicker asked if bio should be offered as a core science or a distribution course. L. Lion replied that he thinks it could be both. D. Maloney Hahn reminded the CCGB that CALS will still offer their version of BioG 109 & 110. S. Wicker summarized the discussion by stating that all are in favor of the core science option but that some disagreements about distribution status remain.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.