Agenda, October 22, 2004
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Results of Spring 2004 PCA Review
4. Physics Courses and AP Credits
5. Letter Grades for Minors
6. Minors Outside the College of Engineering

CCGB Minutes, October 8, 2004

Members: J. Bartsch, A. Center, D. Grubb, B. Kusse, M. Louge, C. Seyler, L. Trotter, A. Zehnder
Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, M. Spencer
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the October 1, 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: M. Spencer stated that on 10/17/04 the Admissions Office is hosting 450 people for their open house, with a URM hosting dinner on 10/16 for approximately 40 students, and with other programs on 10/17 with URM students and other students.

D. Grubb said that the interaction of faculty w/undergraduate students survey was received. He wondered if the Advising staff examine the survey results. B. East said that Susan Murphy’s office originated that survey, and we should all look at the results to see if there is anything to act on. J. Bartsch said that Engineering didn’t seem to be listed as either good or bad in the survey. There were some interesting comments, with some fairly negative, i.e, faculty wondering why they are forced to advise students when a central office could take care of that. The survey is worth looking at. B. East added that Dean Fuchs might want to discuss some of the survey topics in a college-wide meeting.

Motion Regarding Physics Courses Prerequisites: Motion from the Math & Science Committee: Whereas all freshmen entering the college of Engineering have had a calculus course, students with a score of 5 on the AP Physics B exam may receive credit for Physics 112 without having credit for Math 191. Background: Previously credit was awarded for AP Physics B (a non-calculus based Physics course/exam) only if the student had calculus credit. Now that the Math curriculum changed such that Math 191 is essentially a second course in calculus, and the first level of calculus is required for admission, the Math credit requirement is no longer necessary.

M. Louge said that the motion is a way to recognize what changes are occurring in the College. J. Bartsch said that it seems possible that some students might not have the required calculus upon their arrival at Cornell University. B. East said that there are occasions where Admissions admits a student with only pre-calculus. The student would take calculus during the summer elsewhere or at Cornell during the summer, so every entering student would have a calculus background. B. Kusse expressed his view that the motion reads that students had Math 191 in high school. B. East suggested that the CCGB get the full details of the intent of the motion from D. Maloney Hahn and D. Gries. B. Kusse said that the College gave advanced placement exams and the students didn’t know the calculus. There was too much credit given for the exams. J. Bartsch said that the motion is fine if the student qualifies for Math 191 from the beginning, using the pre-placement guidelines. B. Kusse responded that students are getting credit for differential calculus by taking an exam, but they are not able to do differential
calculus with physics. M. Louge resigned his position as Chair of the Math & Science Committee, effective immediately. D. Grubb replied that the resignation could not be accepted by the CCGB until the end of the semester, at the very earliest. He also stated that the CCGB needs to know how many students the motion would affect. The issue will be revisited at the next meeting.

**Charges to the Committees:** D. Grubb stated that the CCGB was reviewing the committee charges because it hadn’t agreed as a body that the committees were to do the things listed. **D. Grubb made the following motion:** That the Draft of requests to the CCGB Committees be approved by the CCGB. A. Center requested that the list of committee members be circulated to the CCGB again. D. Grubb agreed to do that. **Vote: 6 in favor, 1 abstention.**

**Revision of the Bylaws:** D. Grubb said that the Bylaws were revised yet again because it became clear that some assumptions regarding the limits of the CCGB were implied but not expressed. They are now expressed. Making major changes to the common curriculum would require approval from the full engineering faculty. Major revisions were done under the heading of “specific responsibilities.” The language of the subgroups was made more consistent. A. Center said that for #5 under “specific responsibilities” he wondered how it would be determined that courses met guidelines that were set up. D. Grubb explained that this would be done via a self-assessment conducted by the faculty member and assessments done of the course by the students. L. Trotter said that the changes in math during the last year is another example of CCGB noting a required change and implementing it. B. East asked what was meant by “service courses.” B. Kusse replied that those are chemistry and math courses that are taught by some other faculty within other departments. B. East said that it should be clear that those are courses taught outside the college. D. Grubb agreed to change the language to match up with that in #3. He will prepare a cleaned-up version of the Bylaws and circulate it to other people in the college.

B. East said that the last sentence in the 4th paragraph (“The CCGB was also given responsibility to provide general oversight and leadership on educational issues, college-wide programs, and curricular organization.”) seems like quite an extensive assignment for the CCGB. D. Grubb replied that the same wording had already been in the Bylaws. That was put in as a catch-all phrase, so we should leave it in. L. Trotter added that the wording allows majors to appeal to the CCGB for changes in their department. D. Grubb requested that people email him with comments one final time. He wants to then produce a clean copy for other people within the college to view.

**Appeals Process for Students:** D. Grubb stated that currently no clear path exists for students to follow when they want to appeal something. There are two possibilities for handling this: The Student Experience Committee or ASPAC. This issue should be resolved prior to lawsuits being filed by the students. B. East said that it is hard to know how big an issue this is because some students don’t go somewhere else when their advisors tell them “no.” M. Louge stated that he brought this issue up because the question has arisen of what role Associate Directors have in each department when rejecting a student request regarding a minor. Some of these cases have been brought up to the ombudsman. MAE has an academic committee to look at this type of case. The Ombudsman says the university and legal system will defer to the individual academic units when making these types of decisions. We shouldn’t second-guess the ability of units to award degrees. A. Center said that he believes that no appeals process on grades exists. C. Seyler said that a situation occurred when a student’s advisor wouldn’t sign a transfer credit form for a course taken online. He wondered whether he should override the decision or get the instructor to sign the form, but then the instructor signed the form. M. Louge said that it is easy to make enemies by making some decisions, but things would work easier if a clear process were in place. A. Center suggested that it might be worthwhile to have the University Ombudsman to talk with the CCGB about this issue. D. Grubb replied that he thought that was a good idea. J. Bartsch stated that
the goal is to have something in the undergraduate handbook that defines the appeals process. L. Trotter suggested that the CCGB define the appeals process. There is value to having a college committee to oversee units when this type of thing is happening. This is a college-wide issue. B. Kusse stated that it would be a big mistake if students felt they could appeal their grades. D. Grubb said that the Ombudsman could tell us what other colleges are doing regarding this issue. L. Trotter wondered if the Associate Director would have the ultimate authority if conflicts exist within a department. B. Kusse said that if an advisor is willing to approve something, the Associate Director shouldn’t be able to override it. M. Louge said that it makes no sense to involve people with no insider knowledge and there could be several layers of appeals. D. Grubb stated that there is a grievance committee in the college, primarily for faculty. A. Zehnder suggested that the college have something at the department level, because that is where most of the problems would occur.

B. Kusse said that faculty at the department level are in charge of approving all AP credits. M. Louge said that his department sends the student to Advising for credit approvals or transfer credit requests. J. Bartsch added that he sends students to Advising and that Ray Thorpe reviews and approves these types of things. ABET looks at this type of process and it needs to be done appropriately. C. Seyler said that departments need to review all of the courses for transfer students. B. Kusse said that it seems that a student would have a real case in appealing when an engineering department reviews other courses that they know nothing about, such as history. L. Trotter stated that absolutes are a problem; i.e. when we refuse to accept certain courses with no exceptions, particularly when there are equivalent courses in other universities. There are guidelines to limit the number of credits transferred in. M. Louge stated that, as a college, we’re becoming more and more inflexible in the curriculum, so there will be more appeals in the future. B. Kusse said that if people make decisions on something in which they’re not experts, the student have a right to appeal them. D. Grubb said that he would talk with the Ombudsman, the EPC and others and get information about how to put into process the appeals process. J. Bartsch said that faculty will see more appeals with the minors, with double-counting, and that advising has become more challenging. Some minors won’t accept a course if it is cross-listed a certain way. The problem is that students are trying to cram more things into 4 years. A. Zehnder said that if we don’t know about certain courses, the students won’t know either and they can’t be advised properly.

D. Grubb suggested that the CCGB members think about the appeals question, along with the issue of better communication among departments. A. Zehnder said that it would be good to have an appeals process, but he questioned the need to keep creating committees. A. Center suggested that the CCGB become briefed by University Council about what legal issues we shouldn’t get ourselves into. M. Louge said that some of these things are done by trial and error. L. Trotter stated that some commonality would be of benefit to the students and that the students are quite strongly empowered these days. C. Seyler suggested that the CCGB define the issues and then decide what type of appeals would be addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 am.