CCGB Meeting Agenda, November 19, 2010

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. ENGRD Proposal from EAS

CCGB Minutes, November 12, 2010

Ex-Officio: S. Campbell, K. Dimiduk, B. East, B. Howland, F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 10/29/10 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Gries said that emails regarding the course evaluations would be sent to all faculty members starting on Monday, 11/15. Faculty members can add 4 questions to their evaluations. He asked that the faculty forward the emails to other teaching staff in their departments. B. East introduced Scott Campbell as the new Director of Engineering Admissions.

Advisor Approved Electives: W. Philpot said that the issue of Advisor Approved Electives has come up repeatedly due to an inequity in application and confusion over the definition.

F. Shumway said that Advising has noticed this problem. There currently is a loose definition with a few caveats at the end. Advising is seeing that some faculty advisors approve some courses, while some do not. We want the students to understand what’s likely to be approved. B. Howland said that it is challenging when working with a student whose 1050 advisor is not in the department in which the student will eventually affiliate. Their new advisor might not agree with a choice made by a previous advisor. She encourages some students to petition to have courses count in this category.

L. Trotter said that the electives came in when the curriculum was revised, and he wondered what the definition was then. D. Gries said that in 1982 the definition of an elective was any course mutually agreed upon by the student and their advisor as being appropriate and contributing toward their program. The course must be technical in nature. The intent was to allow flexibility for individual goals while eliminating trivia. W. Philpot said that this issue has come before the committee several times.

B. Kusse said that if an elective is approved during the freshman year, it should stand. S. Baker said that the problem arises when a freshman advisor approves something. If there is a conflict, different advisors have a different interpretation of the rules. He tells students that if a course seems questionable, they can get him to assign a petition that says he approved it. S. Hemami said that some people are unreasonable. They decided in ECE to tell students and faculty that anything counts as an advisor approved elective except for courses on a list that they compiled.

F. Shumway suggested that we should say what courses don’t count; it would be a smaller list. Perhaps we could say something like “approved electives may not be ___.” She said that what are now approved electives used to be called free electives. Then there was another curriculum revision. We no longer have free electives; only technical and advisor-approved. B. East said that there must have been a reason to change them from free to advisor-approved. L. Trotter said that he remembers the wording “extrinsic value”, which must have meant something.

W. Philpot said that he likes the idea of an approved electives exclusion list. S. Baker said that the exclusions list needs to be complete. An advisor approved elective should be anything that supports an engineering education. S. Baker asked what the basis is for excluding some courses. S. Hemami replied that some courses have overlapping material, some are AEWs, and some are ROTC classes that are not on the approved list. M. Duncan said that CBE students have 5 electives and ABET says that at least 2
of them need to be engineering classes. This reduces flexibility in CBE. D. Gries said that we will need to have an exclusion for CBE if we come up with a new definition.

W. Philpot suggested that the electives be called approved electives and that we let Advising or the DUS approve because they end up dealing with the petitions anyway. This is a major issue. An advisor could still discuss class choices with the student. F. Shumway said that approved electives are part of the common curriculum. Majors have some approved electives of their own. The business courses are popular as advisor-approved electives.

B. Howland said that she polled undergraduate coordinators about whether students could apply AP credit as advisor-approved electives, and they felt that students could do that. D. Gries said that some advisees are shy and won’t raise a fuss if someone doesn’t approve their courses. F. Shumway said that Advising often sees students who are ahead (with AP credits) when they arrive as freshmen. They just have the students petition to have that credit count. S. Baker said that a uniform set of standards would eliminate the need for advisor approvals. S. Hemami said that students should be talking with their advisors about their courses. B. East said that the problem is that students don’t know what department they’re going into when they arrive. L. Trotter said that the value of these courses is to let students explore several areas.

B. East suggested that the CCGB obtain the wording about advisor-approved electives from ECE and reword it as necessary. D. Gries said that the Committee on Liberal Studies and Electives would work on this.

**ENGRI Distribution:** W. Philpot stated that there are more ENGRI courses offered in the fall than in the spring. He didn’t realize that this was an issue. B. Howland said that there were 13 ENGRI courses offered this fall, and 6 in the spring. With math pre-requisites and an ability to take courses during the first semester, a more equitable distribution might be good. S. Hemami said that she found it interesting that there are 3 courses with nano in the title. She couldn’t tell the difference between the courses from reading their descriptions. People form ENGRIs independently and maybe they should be more coordinated. W. Philpot said that ENGRIs come up when people have an idea that they want to promote. They put it in the semester that is most convenient for them. B. East said that there are fewer selections in the spring.

B. Howland said that if an ENGRI is not taken in the fall, students need to take it in the spring. There is potentially not enough space in the spring. F. Shumway said that students are taking similar loads in the fall and spring. The Advising staff work with students in the summer to enroll them in classes. They are told to take an ENGRI the opposite semester from the CS introductory course. D. Gries said that when a major wants more students, they sometimes introduce an exciting ENGRI. B. Howland said that an ENGRI from AEP that was removed from the spring semester was one that students wanted to take. B. Kusse said that sometimes AEP can’t get a faculty member to teach a class. D. Gries said that the Undergraduate Associate Dean gets course proposals. If he knew there was a problem with the ENGRIs, he could see what the balance is and perhaps not approve changes. S. Hemami said that the more departments know ahead of time, the more changes they can make. B. Kusse said that if departments are aware of a problem, they can take it into account when courses are being set up.

S. Baker said that there is always a problem that courses aren’t offered all the time. Students need to be aware of that and adjust their schedules. If the Engineering Dean would tell departments to plan out staffing 1.5 years in advance, this would help. B. East suggested that this issue be brought up at the next Directors and Chairs meeting and ask them to think about it.

**Biology Courses for Engineers:** W. Philpot said that some biology courses were approved as 1 option for the ENGRDs. Most of the approved biology courses (BIOG 101-104) no longer exist. Biology stu-
Students need to take 2 of the top 3 courses (BIOMG 1350, BIOG 1440, BIOEE 1610, BIOEE 1780 and BIOG 1500), plus a lab. BIOG 1500 was suggested as a course that might be good for engineers. Should we continue to have bio as an ENGRD? Should the BIO courses be in the science curriculum rather than in the ENGRD curriculum? Science is an important issue for CEE because they will need to include it in their curriculum for ABET.

F. Shumway said that the old sequence (BIOG 101-104) is gone. BIOG 105-106 contains the same content but is an auto-tutorial with some labs. The other courses are new. K. Dimiduk said that BIOG 1140 is designed for non-science and non-technical majors. W. Philpot suggested that it would be simplest to pick a set of bio courses to allow as ENGRDs.

S. Baker said that we now have a definition of an ENGRD and wondered if the bio courses would satisfy the ENGRD requirement. S. Hemami asked if ABET will have a problem with them as ENGRD courses. D. Gries replied that ABET will not have a problem with them if they satisfy our definition. We need to decide if these are ENGRD courses. S. Hemami said that we should allow them some place in the curriculum. F. Shumway said that allowing them as ENGRDs would help out the pre-med students. W. Philpot said that it would also help BEE and ENVE out. We need to get this set before pre-registration for the fall. We also want to have any changes appear in the Courses of Study and Engineering Handbook.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 a.m.