Agenda, November 12, 2004
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Motion to Approve Revised CCGB Bylaws
4. Proposed Changes to Liberal Studies Requirements
5. Change in Petitions to APAC - Discussion

CCGB Minutes, October 29, 2004

Ex-Officio: B. East, R. Evans, D. Maloney Hahn, R. Robbins, L. Schneider, M. Spencer
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 22 October 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East said that the new engineering website has additional information about undergraduate issues.

Report from ASPAC: R. Robbins distributed a data sheet covering the spring semester; he had difficulty getting fall data out of the system. He will get fall information out as soon as possible. There was a higher ratio of females than males receiving ASPAC actions. A meeting will be held on 10 November to discuss changes to ASPAC. D. Maloney Hahn said that ASPAC issued about 100+ warnings to students; the figures on the handout were for the more serious actions that went to the committee for their review.

Report from Student Experience Committee: D. Maloney Hahn said that the Student Experience Committee has been trying to address issues that arose from surveys during the years. The committee met 10 times during the last academic year and reviewed summaries of surveys done over the last 10-12 years and recurring themes. Three major themes were: The students want more faculty-student interaction, less unhealthy competition and stress, and the ability to take more courses outside engineering.

The committee focused on unhealthy competition and stress for the semester. L. Schneider said that the committee concluded that they should have a teaching resources website, which would emphasize interactive strategies. The website would have two main purposes: a mechanism for getting feedback from students and a way for instructors to monitor the progress of student learning without formal tests or homework. It would be a great tool for instructors and for students who want instructor feedback via a method other than tests or homework.

R. Evans handed out a preliminary draft of a call for cooperation and said that it is likely that many faculty members are doing this type of thing already. The teaching resources website could be a place to find out what other people are doing. The website would be a way to take advantage of what we’re already doing within the college. He requested that people send the draft to faculty within their departments and provide him with feedback.

W. Philpot mentioned that this issue would be better coming from the Associate Directors in each department, as a way to make it more personalized.
D. Gries said that this would be a good way to make people more aware of what they can do in order to improve teaching. He suggested that first a website should be created with some examples; then ask for input from faculty. That way, there would be something to show to faculty.

L. Schneider said that there are tools and resources that other universities are using and we can put them together in a usable way. The website would be a good way for the students to communicate their depth of knowledge to the instructor. D. Gries said that anything we can do to improve student participation is a good thing.

D. Maloney Hahn stated that it is up to faculty to decide what fits them best, and the committee is only advocating feedback. Students want this type of feedback to help decrease competition and stress.

Post-Course Assessments of Spring 2004: D. Gries mentioned that he had spoken about the post-course assessments the previous week. None of the reviewers found anything wrong with the courses themselves, but some of the assessments were not sufficient. CCGB members were requested to give the letters to people in the departments and talk with the instructor — explain that we are only trying to seek improvement with the post-course assessments. This is part of the (ABET-required) feedback process. A. Center wondered how a loop closure should be demonstrated. D. Gries replied that we don’t have to show closure beyond the letter that is being sent to the faculty. K. Pingali suggested that the website where the model PCA’s are located be referenced in the letters. D. Gries agreed to do that for future letters.

Motions of the CCGB: D. Gries distributed a handout that listed all the motions considered by the CCGB since it began. B. East mentioned that the list provides a good index of the minutes. M. Louge requested an electronic copy of the list.

ENGRI101. D. Maloney Hahn said that some students have been confused about the use of ENGRI 101 as an introductory course. The CCGB passed a couple of years ago a requirement that Bio 110 be taken in conjunction with ENGRI 101. In 2004 that clause was inadvertently removed from the Engineering Undergraduate Handbook. Students need to include ENGRI 101 with Bio 110 to make it an intro to engineering course. We haven’t clarified the whole bio issue well. R. Robbins agreed to let freshmen and freshmen advisors know of the requirement.

Minors in Engineering. D. Gries distributed a sheet giving the numbers of students taking each Minor in the past two years. The list is for information only. M. Louge requested an electronic version of this.

Bylaws. D. Grubb stated that he is finalizing the bylaws. Someone questioned what service courses are, and someone else said that those are courses not given with the college of engineering. He deleted the sentence about service courses in the bylaws. Regarding ASPAC responsibilities, the bylaws said, “set policies for the award of advanced placement credits.” Such changes are normally brought to the CCGB, so he listed this to reflect that this is a CCGB responsibility.

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 a.m.