Agenda, November 8, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. On-line Grading
4. Math and Sciences Subcommittee Report

CCGB Minutes, November 1, 2002


Absent: D. Cox, K. Fuchs, J. Saylor, D. Worley

Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, P. Beebe, B. East, M. Hammer, D. Maloney Hahn, K.M. Smith

Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of October 25, 2002 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: None

Student Experience Subcommittee Report: J. Bartsch (BEE) spoke about the Student Experience Subcommittee Report. The subcommittee (particularly the students) felt that there should be more “hands-on” engineering in the first and second year courses and that students should be included on several College committees. It was also felt that class size should be reviewed and reduced, if possible, particularly in the first and second year courses. The subcommittee discussed competency-based grading of math, chemistry and physics courses. They also addressed the scope of the curriculum and how to incorporate ABET ‘D, F, G, and H’ in EngrI’s and Engrg 150. Regarding the Engrg 150’s, the subcommittee felt that the workload shouldn’t be increased for faculty or students, the things that currently work should be kept, design projects/competition (to help introduce ABET themes) should be added, and communication (the sharing of ‘best practices’ among the 150 advisors) should be improved. B. Kuase (A&EP) asked what the terms “competency-based grading” and “best practices” meant. J. Bartsch replied that “best practices” is sharing reports on what works well. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) added that “competency-based grading” is a standard of what an “A” or “B”, etc. look like in a course. R. Kay (EAS) said that the standard in courses required for Medical Schools is ingrained in terms of grade distribution, and the instructors are not at liberty to change the grade distribution. C. Van Loan (CS) asked if the subcommittee considered grading S/U only during the freshman year. J. Bartsch replied that there had been some discussion of grading in the common curriculum. K. Athreya (Minority & Women’s Studies) suggested that students be given as much time as they need to grasp concepts and that learning speed not be used as a measure of success. D. Grubb (MS&E) said that some schools tried implementing a minimum standard, but the process did not work well because students just attained the minimum. M. Hammer (Student Services) stated that an instructor determines a minimum competency every time he/she grades exams. People below a certain level fail while those above the level pass. Students are mainly interested in achieving a certain level in order to gain entry into a certain major/field. F. Gouldin (M&AE) said that affiliation is a driver of grades, but the competency issue exists, and the students’ level of competency is decided during the first two years.

T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that the students were concerned that the Engrg 150 classes didn’t give the students enough exposure to the fields. The students thought that if the classes were organized around a design project, it might be more motivating for both students and advisor and fill ABET criteria. Her current 150
group picked a design topic, and she has invited faculty to consult on the project, rather than give the typical “field introduction” presentations. It has not taken more time for students, advisor, or (seemingly) invited guests than does a traditional 150. F. Gouldin said that both the faculty and students have been experiencing an increasing workload during the years and he doesn’t want to add anything else. C. Van Loan stated that, because the field information sessions are typically not well attended, he would like the Engrg 150 sessions to include attendance at the field information sessions. M. Duncan agreed, and added that some students only come to the information sessions because pizza or some other refreshments are being served.

Electronic Add/Drop: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that basically the College has 3 options for the electronic add drop: 1) require all students to get faculty approvals for adding or dropping classes, 2) approvals be subdivided by class level and term, or 3) advisors turn on/off approvals student by student. D. Grubb (MS&E) said that the faculty members in his department are not happy with this new system and think it will be a waste of time to keep logging into it. F. Gouldin (M&AE) polled the faculty members in his department, and discovered that 80% want to meet with their students prior to giving their approval for changes. M. Hammer (Student Svcs.) suggested that faculty give blanket approval to those students they trust. For the students they don’t trust, they can require them to meet with their advisors. B. Kuase (A&EP) stated that it is difficult to determine which students can be trusted. The faculty members from most fields reported that their departments don’t want to use the electronic add/drop. M. Louge (M&AE) is concerned that the new system is actually a step backward because it doesn’t permit any flexibility. T. Jordan asked if juniors and seniors could be given more flexibility in using the system. B. Kuase replied that, because they are graduating soon and need to make well-informed choices about courses, they should be required to meet with their advisors prior to scheduling courses. J. Bartsch (BEE) said that the new system is extremely user unfriendly and creates a lot of extra work. D. Grubb suggested that the College of Engineering check with the Arts & Sciences College to determine how their faculty feel about the new system.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.