CCGB Minutes
October 23, 1998


Absent: M. Duncan, J. Hopcroft, R. Kay, F. Wise

Ex-Officio: K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn
Others:  S. Dennis-Conlon

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 4, 1998 approved as read. The minutes of October 16, 1998 will be approved next week.

ABET: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, an updated (as of 10/22) checklist of common curriculum material, that needs to be collected for the ABET review, was distributed (attached). Associate Directors, although not directly responsible, should ask faculty members to submit their materials to the Undergraduate Programs Office.

   D. Gries, CS, the CS department course materials should be arriving next week.
   F. Gouldin, MAE, the MAE course materials will also be arriving soon.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, the college has freedom to schedule the Monday, November 9th 8:00 am kick off meeting and the lunch at noon. The 8am meeting is followed by the evaluators meeting with departments so it may be a good idea for the department chairs to attend this meeting so they could escort the evaluator’s back to the departments. The heads of the department that support engineering; such as math, physics, and chemistry will attend the luncheon. The lunch will run from noon to 1:30 pm followed by a half-hour meeting with one evaluator meeting with one department head.

F. Gouldin, MAE, a tentative schedule has been set in Mechanical Engineering; Nanette Peterson will forward that to the Undergraduate Programs Office.

   K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, we will send the tentative overall detailed schedule of the ABET visit to each department’s associate director.

Minors: L. Lion, CEE, the minor’s sub-committee recommends the following procedure. First distribute the proposals to departments in order to solicit feedback. Then feedback will be communicated back to the CCGB. If there are no significant problems the CCGB will decide if the minor should be approved. If there are significant problems in the minor proposal then the proposal will be returned to the originating department to correct if they choose to do so.

There was slight modification to the original format in that a line is to be added for the initiating department in addition to the line for the administering department. The requirements for the minor (section a) was changed so a menu is not necessary but rather a description of which courses would be approved in the minor’s program (i.e. any course 300 level or above).

J. Jenkins, T&AM, T&AM has a minor program (Applied Math) that is ready to be approved by the CCGB. The proposal will be sent to CCGB members prior to the next meeting.

L. Lion, CEE, the minor sub-committee felt that the departments should have an opportunity to review the minor proposal prior to the approval of the proposal by the CCGB. The recommendation is to have the originating department submit the proposal to the CCGB who in turn take the proposal for feedback to their departments. The departments must decide two things: 1. Are there any problems with the minor proposal and 2. Is the department willing to let their students participate in this minor program?
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, the requirements for EE’s minor proposal are two sophomore level courses, two out of three junior level courses and one course at least at the junior level, and one course at least to be at the senior level.

D. Gries, CS, the requirements for CS minor proposal is CS211 and at least four courses of 300 level and above. A student could take a 100 level course for the sixth course but not CS100.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, the minors program has checks and balances in place. One check being the minor program will have to be approved by the faculty in the originating department. In addition, the minor program will be on the student’s transcript so the originating department will want to make sure the minor program is a strong one.

J. Jenkins, T&AM, departments will generally approve the minor program proposal then specifically approve for students in their fields.

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, students can have more than one department when registering for interviews through career services so they could indicate both their major and minor program.

D. Shmoys, ORIE, the minor proposal could be jointly offered by the statistics department and ORIE but administered by ORIE.

P. Kintner, Chair, EE, maybe it would be best to review some straight forward minor proposals then review the problematic ones.

F. Gouldin, MAE, uncomfortable with the CCGB acting as a secretary and exploring what minors really intend. Should the initial correspondence between the departments regarding the minor program also be sent to the CCGB for reference?

D. Gries, CS, should the minors sub-committee review the first couple of minor proposals?

L. Lion, CEE, the minor sub-committee is recommending, at this time, to have the approval process within the CCGB.

D. Gries, CS, the minimum requirements should be met before the minor proposal is sent to the CCGB for approval.

D. Shmoys, ORIE, should the CCGB review and approve the proposals first, then send the proposals out to the departments? The departments would then have the right to approve or reject the minor program for students in their field.

R. Pitt, ABEN, the CCGB may need to do some preliminary review of the proposal before sending the proposals out to departments for feedback.

L. Lion, CEE, a draft of the proposal could be sent to departments prior to the proposal review by the CCGB.

F. Gouldin, MAE, the CCGB could ask for responses from the departments first, if problems arise then the proposal would be sent back to the originating department and the cycle starts again.

P. Kintner, Chair, EE, the EE department has a weekly curriculum and standards committee meeting where any minor proposals would be reviewed. The committee would review the proposal once but would not want to review the same proposal again and again.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, the CCGB reviews first then votes on the proposal to deem if ready for faculty review.

F. Gouldin, MAE, for the first round of minor proposals we are not sure how the faculty will engage them.

J. Jenkins, T&AM, the CCGB approves the minor and the department approves the minor.

F. Gouldin, MAE, the proposals will be discussed within the departments first. The response to the sponsoring department may be to change the proposal based upon the feedback from the other engineering departments.

J. Jenkins, T&AM, should a round of consideration be at the department level first?
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, for this semester only the initial review will begin at the CCGB, forwarded to the departments for feedback and then approved by the CCGB or sent back to sponsoring departments.

L. Lion, CEE, is there time constraints for getting the minors description into the course catalog?
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, November 6 is the deadline for catalog copy.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, editorial comments can be made as late as March.
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, the schedule will be to submit minor proposals next week with a discussion of ABET the week after. Three weeks from next Friday (Nov. 20), the departmental feedback for the minor proposals will be due to the CCGB.

Response to Dean’s Charge for Course Evaluation: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, a letter is forthcoming from the Dean. The Dean has the latest, Oct. 21st, version of the charge and has read and approved it. The letter from the Dean will indicate a deadline for completion of the charge by Fall 1999.
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, the hard part will be setting up the committee or task force. The make up of the committee should consist of CCGB members and others both inside and outside the college. If we come up with a list maybe the Dean can help select participants.
F. Gouldin, MAE, a meeting with the Dean with ideas of who should serve on the committee, an agreed upon list, then the Dean could be the one to actually contact these people.
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, participants should include non-tenured faculty, faculty who have received the excellence in teaching awards, someone who is an expert in assessment, members of the CCGB, Assoc. Directors, and members of previous task forces.
D. Shmoys, ORIE, student input would also be important, as in the form of Tau Beta Pi members. Tau Beta Pi is interested in participating in the task force.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, people who do the actual implementation of the evaluation should also be included on the committee. Presently there are no written policies or legislation regarding the processing of the evaluations.
J. Jenkins, T&AM, we could check with Arts & Sciences and CALS to see if they have undergone a similar process in recent years.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, who should be the chair of the task force?
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, it is important that the chair is someone who is respected by colleagues.
F. Gouldin, MAE, it would be a big commitment for someone to serve as chair. The chair would need leadership qualities as well as respect. The Dean may have ideas of who would be a good chair.
J. Jenkins, T&AM, the new Assoc. Dean, who is supposed to be picked by December, might be a good person to chair the committee.
F. Gouldin, MAE, the new Assoc. Dean may have so many things already in place that s/he may not be able to take on the chair role. Maybe Paul, Ken and one or two others from the CCGB could talk with the Dean to discuss possible committee members.
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, if anyone has ideas of someone who you think would be a good committee member send them to either Ken or Paul.
F. Gouldin, MAE, the size of the committee is an issue, need representation from the big departments.
P. Kintner, Chair, EE, all departments should feel represented in the committee.

Liability Issue: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, is there any thoughts or additions to the meeting with A. Bova, from Risk Management? A year ago the CCGB had a meeting with A. Bova regarding the alcohol issue. Ideas were put together from that meeting and now the VP’s office is interested in the draft.
D. Gries, CS, Dean Street had a discussion with the College of Engineering in which a policy was developed that no alcohol was allowed when undergraduates were to be present at an event.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, the OSHA fine in MSE now appears that the faculty member was acting responsible but ultimately the responsibility goes back to the faculty member.

M. Thompson, MSE, the MSE department is willing to forgo undergraduate research because of the liability issue. The college and university promote undergraduate research but are not willing to back it.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, what direction should we go in?

J. Jenkins, T&AM, some of the undergraduate research dollars could provide insurance for research.

M. Thompson, MSE, the MSE department wants to draft a letter to President Rawlings stating their position. The danger of this is the university calling their bluff and the faculty backing down.

D. Gries, CS, wouldn’t this issue be the policy committee’s domain?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, what idea do we have here and should it be sent to another committee? This issue effects all of us.

**Undergraduate Announcements:** D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, the field coordinators have asked that the Assoc. Directors convey to the faculty that they should not be involved in the distribution or collection of the course evaluations.

Minors issue to be discussed next week. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

************************

CCGB Agenda
October 30, 1998
1. Approval of October 16 and October 23 minutes (5 min)
2. Undergraduate Programs Announcement (5 min)
3. Consideration of Minor Proposals (50 min)