CCGB Meeting Agenda, November 13, 2009

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. New Biology Curriculum (Ron Hoy)
4. Independent Major

CCGB Minutes, October 23, 2009

Ex-Officio: K. Dimiduk, B. East, R. Evans, L. Schneider, F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 9/4/09 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East stated that the Hosting Programs went well this past weekend. A substantial number of students came for the programs and they seemed to have had a great time. L. Pollack said that parents told her that they were impressed with the event, and they raved about how great their experience had been.

F. Shumway said that Advising is into early intervention now. They are getting information from instructors and reaching out to students. She also mentioned that Parents Weekend is 31 Oct -1 Nov. The majors fair will be held in Duffield on Monday, 2 Nov, from 4-5:30pm in the Duffield Atrium. Everyone is welcome.

Liberal Studies Subcommittee Report: F. Shumway presented a report of the Liberal Studies Subcommittee’s activities for the 2008-09 academic year. David Gries created an extremely useful online tool to assist students in making sense of the liberal studies requirements. The committee reviewed 71 petitions, met 3 times to discuss those petitions where opinions were split or unclear, and contacted the home colleges (CALS or A&S) regarding petitions for new courses that had not yet been given liberal studies designations. F. Shumway said that the students seem to be adjusting well to the liberal studies guidelines that became effective March 2008. Adherence to CALS and A&S liberal studies designations has streamlined the process and provided consistency. Committee members L. Lee and A. Ruina have replaced W. Philpot and S. Marschner for AY 2009-2010.

D. Gries said that the post-course assessments need to be looked at to determine whether things need to be changed. We currently have 23 post-course assessments. We still need to receive them for 19 courses. Either CCGB members can get them from the instructors for last year or we can obtain them for this academic year. He wants the CCGB members to obtain them from the course instructors. The Engineering Courses Committee can then get the review of the post-course assessments done. W. Philpot asked if an assessment would be needed for a course that has completely changed (except for the course number). D. Gries replied that we should just have a post-course assessment for the new course. He will email all the CCGB representatives about post-course assessments.

Physics Liaison Subcommittee Report: L. Pollack said that the committee members have been trying to figure out good rules for the prerequisites for substitutions for common curriculum courses. They have been evaluating the existing structure of prerequisites and will work with Physics to see if they are on the same page; they will have to make this work. Physics and AEP have different math prerequisites for the physics courses. The prerequisites are different for ARTS students and ENG students. Physics controls the courses of study for physics. Our prerequisites don’t fit into their curriculum. They don’t feel that Math 191 is a prerequisite for Physics112; they are happy to list it as co-requisite.
A. Ruina said that a watered down physics course like Physics 112 is neither useful nor important for engineering students.

A. Zehnder said that the Engineering Math Liaison Subcommittee met yesterday and decided that small section calculus won’t be offered anymore. The Math Department Chair discussed this issue with people in Engineering and said that Math 191 and Math 192 will be taught in 4 lectures of 100 students each, to be offered at the same time slots of the current small math sections. There will still be 2 recitation sessions per week, and they will do workshops in Math 191. We don’t know if we’ll need supplemental resources; a lot is still to be determined. There has been some interest in extending the workshops to Math 192. We hope to have continuing financial support from Engineering as leverage to continue to be involved in the math courses.

D. Gries said that the math workshops need to continue. A. Ruina stated that we care about the curriculum in these courses and it is better to have both ownership and influence in them. L. Pollack stated that some ARTS students are taking engineering math; particularly the Physics students, although it is not a huge number of students. There are also ARTS students in Physics 112. She is curious about the math enrollments and wonders if there were some changes made in the ARTS math. The Physics DUA mentioned that something was removed from the ARTS intro to math sequence; she thinks it was differential equations. She wants to know the ratio of ARTS students to Engineering students in the math courses.

A. Zehnder said that it is his impression that linear algebra is not required for ChemE students. R. Bland stated that, in light of the budgets for instruction, partial ownership of the math courses gives us stronger influence in how the courses are taught. We need to find a way to exert greater influence in the courses.

Communications in Engineering (CE) as a separate liberal studies category: R. Evans stated that historically ENGRC 3350 and ENGRC 3500 have fulfilled the technical writing requirement as well as the liberal studies requirement. He spoke with E. Fisher a lot about what types of categories the courses would fit in. Then he suggested the creation of a new category. He and W. Philpot worked on this during the summer. The motivation of having the ENGRC courses double-count encourages students to take more communications courses, which is a good thing.

B. East asked what the purpose is of making a new category. The students can already take the courses as liberal studies. F. Shumway said that the courses are popular and taken as liberal studies all of the time. They meet the technical requirement and also count as liberal studies. The new designation won’t change anything. R. Evans said that with the ENGRC 3350 course, it fulfills the organizational behavior requirement for OR and fulfills the technical requirement, but it can’t fulfill all 3 things (i.e. including liberal studies). The turnout in the courses from the OR students has been great. Engineering will have 2 sections of ENGRC 3350 each semester and more sections of ENGRC 3500. W. Philpot said that the proposed change is a by-product of the shift from having our own liberal studies courses and going with what CALS and ARTS have.

S. Baker stated that the topic came up of replacing the writing seminars with the ENGRC courses, and he wondered what the status of that is. D. Gries replied that the FWS is our requirement, not the university’s. The students need 2 FWS courses. S. Baker said that the students need to learn how to write, but some don’t learn that in the FWS courses. He wondered if the FWS could be replaced with good technical writing courses. B. East said that the students learn things in FWS that aren’t technical. A. Zehnder said that maybe we should push back on the FWS; the quality varies tremendously in these courses, with some easier than others. R. Evans said that there was talk about replacing an FWS with an introduction to writing course for Engineering students. He spoke with the Knight Institute about this, and they were interested in it. The Knight Institute would be interested in that type of collaboration, but staffing would be an issue. They have a model for doing things which is very different from Engineering Communications.
tions. R. Pollack stated that the ENGRC courses are at the 3000 level which would satisfy the depth requirement.

Proposal: Create a new category for the Liberal Studies requirement called Communications in the Context of Engineering (CE). Courses in this area explore communication as a way of acting in the world. The primary aim is to provide students with the opportunity to practice performing a range of engineering-related communication skills within specific genres (e.g. proposals, reports and journal articles, oral presentations, etc.). Each of these genres potentially engages a wide variety of audiences and, depending on the particulars of context, each may have multiple purposes. The secondary aim is to enable students to be aware of the choices they make as communicators and to be able to articulate a rationale for those choices. Only one course will be allowed to be counted in this category. Note: ENGRC 3500 or ENGRC 3350 are the only courses currently approved. The proposal was unanimously approved, with 10 in favor of it.

Discussion of ENGRG 1050, requested by the Dean: D. Gries stated that one of the Department Chairs wrote to C. Ober and suggested that we could save time and effort by not teaching ENGRG 1050. He thought that perhaps the Student Experience Committee should look at this issue. When ENGRG 1050 started, it consisted of 12 or 13 sessions. We now require 8 sessions. After arranging weekly sessions, here is not much for faculty advisors to do: just attend the sessions. If we eliminated this, we would still need a workshop.

S. Baker asked what it would save us to eliminate this, other than faculty time. F. Shumway said that there is a few thousand in the budget to cover expenses related to the course, so it wouldn’t save a lot of money. D. Gries added that M. Glick spends time lining up people in the spring and summer to do presentations. One of the problems is figuring out how many faculty each department should cough up. We began the ENGRG 1050 course because students felt isolated. This course gives them contact with a professor.

A. Ruina stated that ENGRG 1050, small section calculus and the introduction to engineering courses were all created to improve the freshman experience. He finds the burden of ENGRG 1050 different based on peer advisor support. With good peer advisors, the burden is much less. The peer advisors come in acting as though they are in charge, which is good. D. Gries said that he can send the annual 1050 report to everyone; it has been quite favorable except for the time factor.

L. Pollack said that she does big presentations for ENGRG 1050. If some students don’t have an interest in a topic, they don’t show up. Maybe some days should be reserved in the freshman schedule where they hear about Cornell Abroad or something to avoid the replication of topics in small groups. If group meetings were held 3 or 4 times per semester, it could replace weekly ENGRG 1050 sessions. Attendance has dropped way off in ENGRG 1050. Students don’t come to smaller meetings because they have other things to do.

F. Shumway wondered if there might be value in doing recorded session that could be downloaded by the students. L. Pollack said that she wants to get students who are really interested in a presentation topic. There is value in having small groups but fewer meetings. K. Dimiduk asked if it would be possible to have a small number of required meetings so students could pick the presentations that they want to attend. L. Pollack said that if students picked their presentations, we could trust them to go to the things they are interested in. The presentations could be held in the evenings.

S. Baker stated that there is a lot of value in having students meet in ENGRG 1050 and sit through presentations about several different majors. The person providing information about a field needs to be interesting and engaging. Students need a sense of what engineering is all about and what the different majors are about. He takes attendance in his ENGRG 1050 classes and will call or email students who are absent. He understands the time cost, but he thinks it is worth it for our students. A. Ruina said that
he thinks the complaints about ENGRG 1050 are old. The presentation part is a burden, but the meetings are not as much of a burden. S. Baker said that we can combine presentation sections easily.

B. East said that we can look at it from a scheduling perspective and see if sections can be combined. F. Shumway said that the Majors Fair is a good example of resolving a scheduling conflict. Advising tried to find a perfect time and place to offer it. They never got a good response until they scheduled it toward the end of the day on the Engineering Quad before the students go home to north campus. The time slot of 4:00-5:30pm and the Engineering Quad location were optimal. B. East reminded everyone that we can’t use the 4:30-7:00pm time slot for required things and said that it seems better to combine sections.

W. Philpot said that he would ask the Student Experience Committee to study the 1050 issue and come up with recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.