CCGB Meeting Agenda, November 10, 2006

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Short Discussion of AEM Minor (Betsy East)

CCGB Minutes, October 20, 2006

Members: J. Bartsch, A. Center, D. Gries, B. Isacks, D. Ruppert, C. Seyler, A. Zehnder
Ex-Officio: F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 9/8/06 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: F. Shumway stated that the upcoming weekend was First-year Family Weekend and that Engineering Advising would be hosting a light breakfast in Olin Hall followed by a Student Services Panel on Saturday morning, 10/21/06. She predicted that as many as 400 people would come for the events in Engineering. J. Bartsch added that CALS was also having the students’ families come for campus events.

D. Gries said that the Engineering Ethics play would be performed the next weekend, with shows on 10/28 at 7:00 and 9:00 PM and a show on 10/29 at 7:00 PM. He encouraged faculty to come to the play and spread the word amongst their colleagues.

A. Center asked if there were any more information regarding the math test results. F. Shumway said that she has the information from the first prelims, but she hasn’t finished compiling it because her office is short staffed.

Syllabets and Post-course Assessments: D. Gries said that the submission of syllabets and post-course assessments for the core engineering courses needs to be done properly this year. He is asking each CCGB representative to take care of the syllabets and post-course assessments for the core courses offered by their department. He gave each department representative a list of courses that need post-course assessments. There are syllabets for each of the courses; some may need to be updated, some may not. He will email them to each person also. Each course needs a post-course assessment, which shouldn’t take more than 1 hour to complete after a course is finished. Instructors should look at the outcomes of the course (usually there are 3-4 outcomes), and there needs to be some instrument to assess how well an outcome was achieved (a question on the final or an essay, etc.). If an assessment is poor, the instructor needs to write something to indicate how the course could be changed to become better. We will do this same thing in the spring. A. Zehnder asked if a post-course assessment is required for every course. D. Gries replied that a post-course assessment is required for each of the core courses, and it should be done each year. It is important to talk to the faculty now so they can have some assessment method for each outcome. There needs to be something to measure whether an outcome was achieved. Maybe the number of outcomes in a course needs to be reduced. It would be nice to have syllabets in a couple of weeks, and good to have post-course assessments prior to Christmas. J. Bartsch asked if the assessment materials need to be saved for the courses. D. Gries replied that they do not need to be saved. A. Center asked if accreditation benefits us or our students. D. Gries replied that this process, if streamlined, can benefit the courses and our instructors as well as ABET. A. Center stated that
we should be doing this as part of our normal course of business, not because of ABET. If it is a normal course of business, we shouldn’t have to remind people to do it.

**ENGRI Courses and Requirements:**  A. Zehnder said that he had a sense that possibly the ENGRI courses have strayed from being introduction to engineering courses. D. Gries stated that he looked for the ENGRI guidelines but couldn’t find them. They were apparently discussed in a June 1981 CCGB Meeting, but those minutes are in archival storage and could not be readily accessed. There were 7 areas listed in which students had to take a distribution course; 1 was introduction to engineering. A. Zehnder said that ENGRI’s courses began in early 1990s. A. Center said that it was his impression that the Engineering Curriculum Committee was looking at the ENGRI courses. C. Seyler said that the ECC is looking at the ENGRI courses, among other things. D. Gries said that the ENGRI courses need to be looked at prior to the end of October.

A. Zehnder asked if there were any other issues that the CCGB should be worried about. C. Seyler said that the CCGB should look at the issue of advisor-approved electives. D. Gries said that some advisors are stricter than others when approving the electives. D. Ruppert stated that the list of courses for major-approved electives has vastly expanded. There are a wide number of courses in the Hotel School, AEM, etc. that have been added. C. Seyler said that there is some confusion in departments because they utilize terms differently. People aren’t aware what some terms mean and what they can do. It needs to be clear to departments what they can do with certain courses and what constraints exist. A. Zehnder stated that consistent terminology would be good.

A. Center said that he raised a point about students taking 128 credit hours and early graduation, how many came in with AP credit, and how many could take classes outside the box. F. Shumway said that B. East spoke with D. Bell about this, but she hasn’t heard anything about this. A. Center said that some ChemE students take a lower number of credits in their senior year or begin the MEng then. He wondered if we impose a burden on students by saying that if they want to take a real estate course or something outside of engineering, they need to take it outside the box. If the students graduate with hours to spare it isn’t as big an issue as if they graduate with a bare minimum of credits.

J. Bartsch stated that last week CALS approved a list of communication courses which means that there are a number of communication courses for engineering students starting this spring. These are Department of Communication courses in CALS. CALS adopted the same cataloguing system as ARTS. F. Shumway said that Advising would like to add them to the engineering database. D. Gries stated that the CCGB should look at the list and officially recognize the courses. What they have done in Engineering Student Services is go through the courses and slot them into each category. J. Bartsch said that he showed the list to D. Maloney Hahn and R. Robbins. D. Gries said that the CCGB should look at the list and vote on it. F. Shumway stated that she thought that engineering adopted the Arts and Sciences courses and figured we would go along with whatever changes they made.

D. Gries stated that AEM has a minor that engineering students can take; it is 18 credits. One difficulty is a limit on how many engineering students can get into the minor because there is a cap. F. Shumway said that the announcement was put in the Sundial. The hope is that interest amongst the engineering students will increase the money being put into the minor and that it can be expanded to include more engineering students. A. Zehnder requested that J. Bartsch provide a list of the communication courses for the next CCGB Meeting. J. Bartsch agreed to send the list to D. Gries prior to the next meeting. A. Zehnder said that the CCGB would look at advisor approved electives, liberal studies courses from CALS, how many credits students need to graduate, and the ENGRI courses.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 a.m.