Agenda, November 2, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 10/26/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Status of Communications Requirement
4. Paul Kintner on Illinois ABET Visit

CCGB Minutes
October 26, 2001

Members:  J. Bartsch, M. Duncan, E. Giannelis, L. Lion, C. Van Loan, S. Wicker, F. Wise


Ex-Officio:  P. Beebe, D. Maloney-Hahn, F. Shumway (for B. East), K. Smith, T. Thompson

Other:  D. Dalthorp, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of October 19, 2001 were approved with the following change in the final paragraph: “L. Lion (CEE) mentioned that the environmental option in the CEE field requires an introductory bio course.”

Undergraduate Announcements: F. Shumway (Admissions) mentioned that the Women in Engineering Hosting Day would be October 27th and invited the CCGB members to attend the events that were planned. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that attendance was poor this year at the ChemE field information session for freshmen. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that maybe the ENGR 100’s are so good that the information sessions are no longer needed. E. Giannelis suggested that the information sessions be moved to the spring semester, and several CCGB members agreed that it made sense to do so. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) will work on arrangements to move the sessions to the spring semester.

Discussion, Possible Approval of BIO 110 as Elective for 2002 (handout): S. Wicker (ECE) mentioned that M. Saltzman revised his proposed 1-hour addition to BioG 110 so that it could be offered simply as an elective in the spring semester. Once the course has been taught in the spring, the faculty could be approached about offering the course as an alternative core science course or as an engineering distribution course or both. Motion: To offer the 1 credit add-on to BioG 110 as an elective. This motion was unanimously approved by the CCGB members.

ABET Discussion (handouts): S. Wicker (ECE) displayed a list of ABET objectives and outcomes that he had prepared and explained that the objectives basically cover what students are prepared to do after graduation, while the outcomes incorporate A-K. C. Van Loan (CS) asked why engineering doesn’t just utilize what other schools have successfully used for ABET. M. Duncan (ChemE) recommended that engineering use the simplest wording that ABET will accept when writing the objectives and outcomes. He also suggested that engineering look at the websites of the schools who have already had ABET reviews to see what has worked for them and what has not. S. Wicker suggested that objectives that have already been achieved be used for the ABET wording. J. Bartsch (BEE) said that he likes the objectives and outcomes that ChemE has drawn up. He thinks that they could be revised slightly for BEE and other engineering departments. M. Duncan responded that, when
outlining their objectives and outcomes, ChemE took the best responses of a dozen schools that are accredited, including those schools that were required to publicly display their objectives and outcomes. S. Wicker agreed that ChemE’s information could be used as a good starting point, and he suggested that the CCGB members pull it off the web, present it to their departments, and then fine-tune it for their individual fields. M. Duncan stated that every department will need administrative assistance with feedback surveys, and he suggested that the Dean be asked for help in providing this assistance. S. Wicker said that a good feedback tool would be the exit interviews that almost every field in engineering does. He requested that each field send him a copy of their exit interview form. F. Wise (A&EP) questioned the need for an ABET review, stating that whether a school is accredited or not will not likely affect the number of students who want to attend it. S. Wicker will bring up the ABET issues with P. Kintner (ECE) and T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) next week. They will then tell the Dean how the CCGB members feel about ABET.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 a.m.