CCGB Meeting Agenda, November 30, 2007

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. Discussion of proposed protocol for parental notification of academic trouble for affiliated students (B. East)
4. Feedback to D. Gries / D. Cox on streamlining the ABET course assessment process (CCGB members involved in ABET course review)

CCGB Minutes, November 16, 2007

Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, F. Shumway, M. Spencer
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 11/2/07 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: F. Shumway announced that today is the last day to drop the fall semester classes, and the Advising Office is expecting lots of business during the day.

Report on ABET Review of ENGRI Courses: B. Isacks said that the Minors Committee had 12 ENGRI post-course assessments to review. Five of the assessments weren’t mapped to the ABET A-K outcomes. Some need more detail about grades, etc. L. Lee said that we should be able to streamline the assessment process by having a standard form. L. Pollack said that it would be helpful to have course syllabets when reviewing the assessments. E. Fisher said that we give out a sample syllabet and their previous one to faculty members to try and help them, but this doesn’t seem to help much. R. Bland said that he believes that part of the problem is that some of the instructors aren’t paying attention to their assessments until their courses end. We should implement this process when a course begins. M. Duncan suggested that we examine why instructors are hesitant to do this. We should see if the course is better after the ABET analysis. It didn’t help his class at all. The ABET processes seem to be a time sink. Does ABET improve our educational system? We should examine ABET. E. Fisher said that perhaps there is a way to make the assessment less onerous and more useful. J. Bartsch said that the feedback and continuous improvement is good. It gives instructors a chance to look at their courses and note things that are working or need to be fixed. The ABET stuff is not fun.

E. Fisher said that we need to decide how the feedback from this gets back to the instructors. Maybe the instructors could get comments from the committees about how things should improve. We should save the comments and pass them on the next time we request ABET reports. B. East said that for the feedback loop, even if people don’t revise their reports, we need to show ABET that we gave the instructors these comments. L. Pollack added that we need to show ABET that the reports were submitted, looked at and commented on. E. Fisher said that the feedback should be more substantive. If nothing happens with the comments, they are not useful. B. East said that she will report back to D. Gries about this issue and maybe have him and D. Cox come to the next CCGB Meeting.

B. Isacks said that it is hard to look at ENGRIs to determine which are suitable and which are not. They are both introductions to a major or aspects of a major. E. Fisher said that they were supposed to have a substantive open-ended design experience, and that a task for CCGB from the curriculum reform task force is to determine how well ENGRIs are fulfilling this mission. B. Isacks said that he would need to see a syllabus and talk to the instructor to determine that. S. Baker said that a substantial change to the ENGRIs was proposed by the task force, but faculty liked how they were currently being taught. We never really got a good grip on their original mission. The task force’s concern was not about the open-
ended design experience – it was that the ENGRIs were supposed to be a general introduction to the broad areas of engineering but that they now seem to provide introductory material for subsequent courses or serve as a way to recruit students into a major. They should be opportunities for students to look at different areas of engineering without committing to anything. Some majors depend on ENGRIs to pull students into their major. B. Isacks said that in EAS certain ENGRIs are not required but recommended. S. Baker said that ENGR courses shouldn’t become uniform. Students need to know what different engineering fields are like. E. Fisher stated that she and S. Baker will decide how to address this issue.

Vote on ChemE Proposal to Allow CEE 304 as an Alternative to Math 294: First there was a discussion of whether the motion should be amended to include ENGRD 270 as well as CEE 304 as possible substitutions to Math 294. R. Bland said that ENGRD 270 requires Math 294 as a co-requisite. The original reaction of ORIE was that the co-requisite couldn’t be dropped. Some of the things students need to do are to solve equations and work with matrix inverses. However, as several ChemE courses use matrix algebra, and the ORIE faculty will allow ChemE’s to take ENGRD 270 without 294. ORIE would probably change the course description to say that the course requires (1) Math 294 as a co-requisite or (2) the combination of Math 192 and ChemE 219 as prerequisites, possibly together with satisfactory performance on an assessment exam. ORIE would administer the exam. ENGRD 270 is offered in spring also, which might give ChemE students some flexibility. M. Duncan said that ChemE would welcome that option and allow their students to take ENGRD 270 or CEE 304. L. Pollack expressed the concern that if ENGRD 270 can substitute for Math 294 it would also count as a distribution course. M. Duncan said that the issue wouldn’t arise in ChemE because they do not allow double-counting. L. Pollack said that this course could be taken in the fourth semester. She wondered if students would be committed to ChemE by the time they take this or whether they could go into another major. M. Duncan said that students could go into another major and, in fact, ChemE loses about 10 students from their major per year by the fourth semester.

S. Baker said that the Curriculum Committee agreed that all students should take 5 math courses, but there is no place for a 5th math course. The CCGB discussed that all majors needed to incorporate statistics in their majors. All majors declare that they do this in their documentation. Many people feel this isn’t the same as a dedicated course. Some majors could substitute Math 293 or Math 294 for a statistics course. In MSE they have a problem with this. They require students to take a course with advanced math content, with Math 293 or 294 as a pre-requisite. ENGRD 270 does not count and CEE 304 doesn’t count either since they are co-requisites. M. Duncan said that CEE 304 does not have the Math 294 requirement and is 4 credits. E. Fisher said that it is not too difficult to amend the proposal and vote on it. Amended Motion: We propose that students be allowed to substitute CEE 304 or ENGRD 270 for Math 294. If ENGRD 270 is selected, it will count only as a math course and not as a distribution course. M. Duncan moved for approval of the motion. S. Baker seconded it.

The vote was 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

M. Duncan said that he would need to have his colleagues in ChemE hear the modified proposal. No proficiency exam exists yet. He wondered if we can we tell current sophomores about this. L. Pollack said that AEP had a change in the curriculum like this and it has been difficult. Some students heard about it, and some didn’t. There will be a lot of confusion generated by this. Even with changing the Courses of Study and the Engineering Handbook there will be lots of confusion. F. Shumway said that she will wait to hear from ChemE, and if people ask about it, we will say it isn’t official yet.

J. Bartsch asked how a 3 credit replacement course would work for a 4 credit math course. F. Shumway said that this is the same issue we discussed regarding the transfer students. We still require students to
transfer in courses and if a course is only 3 credits, we require them to petition to peel off a credit from another math-based course that they don’t need, and have this approved.

**Discussion of and Vote on Changes to Handbook Wording for Advisor Approved Electives:** E. Fisher proposed a change of wording in the Engineering Handbook for Category 9, Electives. She tried to address Advising’s issue with the advisor approved electives. L. Pollack stated that the wording needs to be really clear. She wondered how many courses is the minimum. F. Shumway replied that the minimum is traditionally two courses. The Engineering Handbook shows 2 courses with a minimum of 6 credits. B. East wondered if the number of courses mattered and whether a 6 credit language course would be sufficient. L. Pollack said that there are many 1 credit courses floating around which aren’t very substantive. E. Fisher said that we are trying to change the flavor of the description so advisors can be more flexible, not make changes in the number of courses at this time.

S. Baker asked if ENGRI courses would be allowed. E. Fisher said that they would need to be approved by the advisor. S. Baker asked why students can’t take less than 300 level ROTC courses. E. Fisher replied that this is a restriction the CCGB decided on last year when we approved ROTC courses. We approved the whole ROTC experience of multiple years and didn’t just want the students to be in ROTC as freshmen. L. Pollack added that we also thought that lower level ROTC courses weren’t held to any standards, but the upper level ones seemed to be okay. S. Baker said that if we’re encouraging people to take language courses, business courses, etc., that’s okay. He asked what the difference is between these courses and the ROTC communication courses. E. Fisher replied that the ROTC courses aren’t subject to any accreditation process.

L. Pollack asked if the AP courses satisfy these advisor approved electives. F. Shumway replied that they do, as long as an advisor approves that. E. Fisher said that the AP credit issue was not addressed in the modification, and she asked if other majors restrict AP credit. M. Spencer said that some advisors may restrict the AP credit, and this may make students switch advisors if their advisor doesn’t approve something. E. Fisher asked if the revision should be voted on or whether AP credit should be explicitly mentioned in the modification. L. Pollack replied that maybe it shouldn’t be listed explicitly, but perhaps guidelines would be good. She wants to know what other people do with AP credit. She thinks that students will instantly fill their electives slots with AP credit if they know about that option. *E. Fisher moved to allow the handbook change, and W. Philpot seconded it. Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.*

B. East said that at the past CCGB Meeting, we talked about notifying parents of students on leave. She distributed a proposed protocol, which will be discussed at the next CCGB meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.