Agenda, January 28, 2005
CCGB Meeting

1. Congratulations on Coming to 5130 Upson and not Carpenter
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Undergraduate Announcements
4. Math 190/191
5. Summer Course Credit
6. Committee Assignments and CCGB Plans for the Semester
   a. Liberal studies list
   b. Biology course(s) for engineers
   c. Engineering distribution courses (interacts with b)

CCGB Minutes, November 12, 2004

Members: J. Bartsch, A. Center, D. Grubb, B. Isacks, B. Kusse, M. Louge, W. Philpot, K. Pingali,
C. Seyler, L. Trotter, A. Zehnder
Ex-Officio: B. East, R. Evans, D. Maloney Hahn, R. Robbins, L. Schneider
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 29 October 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved with 2
minor modifications.

Undergraduate Announcements: R. Robbins announced that Fran Shumway would begin her new job
as Associate Director of Engineering Advising on 12/6/04. There will be a transition period, during
which time she will help Mark with whoever is hired as her replacement in Engineering Admissions.
B. East stated that Sheila Hemami received an NSF grant having to do with teaching. She will bring
Richard Felder to campus on 1/20/05 & 1/21/05. He’s a chemical engineering professor at N. Carolina
State University. He was here in 2000 and got great faculty reviews. While at Cornell he will do a
seminar on effective college teaching and effective mentoring of new faculty. L. Schneider and C.
Carick will help S. Hemami set up the sessions.

Motion to Approve Revised CCGB Bylaws (Grubb): D. Grubb stated that the revised Bylaws will go
to the full engineering faculty for a vote. The changes were made to clarify the language and update
information in the Bylaws. There were no serious changes. The revised Bylaws need a 2/3 vote (8 votes
in favor) by the CCGB, then need to be circulated to the engineering faculty, and finally need to be
voted on at the next engineering faculty meeting. Vote in favor of approving the revised CCGB By-
laws: 11 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstaining.

Proposed Changes to Liberal Studies Requirements: L. Trotter listed the proposed changes to the
liberal studies distribution requirements: 1. Deleting the second bullet “At least 2 courses must be from
the first three groups (CA, HA, LA)” from the Liberal Studies Distribution Requirements. 2. Moving
ENGRC courses to the Literature and Arts category in the Liberal Studies Distribution Requirements.
B. Kusse wondered how he would find out what courses are in which category. He said that there
should be references in the Courses of Study catalog about where the list of courses could be found. He
couldn’t decipher which category language courses fit in. B. East suggested that the location for that
information be included in the future editions of the Courses of Study and the Engineering Undergraduate
Handbook. D. Maloney Hahn replied that Engineering Advising is working on updating the hand-
book now. D. Grubb said that students want to know which courses are being given each semester that
fit into these categories. L. Trotter replied that if the second bullet is deleted, the issue of which group the courses fall into doesn’t matter. The proposed change simplifies the requirements for students who want to take foreign languages. A. Center said that making it easier for students to take foreign languages is a good idea, but some foreign students come in and get 8 language credits, which satisfies the liberal studies requirement. L. Trotter agreed that this is difficult issue, and some students get 4-8 language credits. D. Maloney Hahn said that a policy change on language credits has been done. What the proposed change is doing is putting a priority on the first 3 groups, which was the original spirit of the requirements. But the first three groups were changed, and there is no philosophical basis for the second bullet like there used to be. B. East asked if students receive credit for their native language. D. Maloney Hahn replied that the people with a native language could get 3 credits. A. Zehnder stated that he likes simplification, but he suggested that a policy to not give either AP credit or language credit might be good so that students would need to take the credits at Cornell. One of the students in his department placed out of several courses by taking AP exams. D. Maloney Hahn said that receiving AP credit can really open up a student’s schedule. L. Trotter added that a student’s point may be that tuition dollars are real dollars, and if other students can place out of math courses, etc., then they should be able to do the same. He added that the second proposed change is to move ENGRC courses to the Literature and Arts category in the Liberal Studies Distribution requirements. D. Maloney Hahn said that ENGRC was originally in the Expressive Arts category, but now it sits in the Social and Behavioral Analysis category, which appears to be a misalignment because courses in the SBA category are more data-driven. C. Seyler asked whether approvals would go into effect for the next graduating class. D. Maloney Hahn replied that students who entered Cornell University in 2003 are on the new guidelines, but anyone who entered prior to that can use the old or new guidelines. In some ways there are advantages to the new ones because there is no sequence. The new guidelines can be used by anyone. If approved, the proposed changes would be grandfathered in because they are loosening the rules which only benefits the students. The only disadvantage might be if a student only took the courses in one category. J. Bartsch suggested that the Advising impact would be minimal. **Motion to approve both changes to the Liberal Studies Distribution Requirements. Vote: 10 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstaining.**

**Change in Petitions to ASPAC - Discussion:** R. Robbins said that the ASPAC Committee met to discuss the academic petitions process. The current practice for issues relating to the College Core Requirements is for R. Thorpe to first review them. If a student is affiliated, Ray refers the issue to the student’s department, unless it is a core curriculum issue. It is rare that a student feels that their faculty advisor does not support their decision. ASPAC feels that an appeals process is already in place. D. Grubb said that the students are not aware of the appeals process, but it should be listed somewhere. J. Bartsch asked if the CCBG would handle appeals from the ASPAC board. R. Robbins replied that the CCBG would handle ASPAC appeals. Any appeal would first go to R. Thorpe, then to ASPAC, then to the CCBG. M. Louge said that the appeals issue arose with two students in his department. The students would up going to the University Ombudsman, which was when he realized that there were no people in his school to which students could appeal. It is useful to have a procedure in place where students can appeal things. It isn’t fair if students don’t know about the existence of an appeals process. It would be better for the college and departments to keep appeals situations within the departments or college. R. Robbins responded that ASPAC doesn’t want to get involved in department course issues. Each major department should handle issues within their own department. D. Maloney Hahn added that issues relating to department majors and minors aren’t ASPAC issues; the core curriculum issues are. B. East suggested that the appeals process be listed within the handbook and in other places where students can find it. D. Maloney Hahn said that ASPAC should only be used for unusual cases that do not have a precedent. D. Grubb added that there have been discussions at the CCBG about what problems people have been having, and most of them were within the majors. M. Louge suggested that it be
stated in the handbook that students can appeal to their departments/schools. R. Robbins agreed to put the appeals information on the website and in the next handbook. A. Zehnder added that he always thought that when he signed a petition it meant that he approved it. R. Robbins agreed to refine the wording/format of the note on the petitions and would bring it to a future meeting for CCGB approval.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 am.