Agenda, December 10, 1999 (Final Meeting of the Semester!)
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes from the December 3, 1999 meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements—Student Experience Committee Report
3. C.S. 100 Proposal, continued (from CPC)

CCGB Minutes
December 3, 1999

Members: J. Bartsch, R. Cleary, M. Duncan, F. Gouldin, J. Jenkins, R. Kay, P. Kintner, L. Lion, F. Wise

Absent: B. East, M. Fish, J. Herrera, J. Hopcroft, M. Thompson, C. Van Loan

Ex-Officio: D. Cox, T. Healey, D. Maloney Hahn, M. Miller, F. Shumway, S. Youra

Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of November 19, 1999 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Maloney-Hahn (Advising) stated that Student Experience Meetings have been held. The Student Experience Committee will send out surveys to faculty, obtain the results, and present their findings and concerns to the CCGB. Fran Shumway (Advising) requested that Advisors and Field Coordinators remind their students of the need to affiliate.

CS 100 Proposal: Handouts were distributed. M. Miller (M&AE) stated that CS 100 was the main topic for 3 CPC fall meetings. An informal survey of engineering faculty and some students was conducted to determine the current level of satisfaction with CS 100 and to decide the future structure of CS 100. The current level of satisfaction with CS 100 is not high with either the students OR the faculty, so an alternative approach was discussed and agreed upon by the CPC. This alternative consists of two branches. One branch is a modified version of the current CS 100 called 100Classic. The other branch is 7 weeks of MatLab (100M) followed by either 7 weeks of C++ (100C) or 7 weeks of Java (100J) or a field alternative (100F). The main reason for the restructuring is to make students feel comfortable with the fundamentals of computer programming. Fields will not be able to require particular versions of CS 100 for affiliation. L. Lion (CEE) expressed his concern about how the Engineering faculty would handle the teaching of the new CS 100 courses. M. Miller said that the CPC was looking at who could teach it from their current faculty; they do not foresee having to hire additional teaching staff or faculty. F. Gouldin (M&AE) expressed the concern that presenting a smorgasbord of choices for the students would confuse them. The conceptual framework of CS should be emphasized because, although computer languages will continually evolve, the concepts will not. Learning the concepts will prepare the students for the future. The pedagogy of other courses has developed gradually, whereas CS courses are always evolving. J. Jenkins (T&AM) stated that the fragmentation of CS is confusing. Language has always been a problem with CS 100 because the CS faculty tend to select a language to suit their needs, which doesn’t always suit the needs of other Engineering faculty. Intellectual content needs to be in the course with the tools of the course. M. Miller stated that each departmental committee member came back with comments about what should be in CS 100. Their concern was that many Mechanical Engineering students use Excel as their primary
computer application because they feel the most comfortable with it and feel uncomfortable with other software. The computer applications course requires more than Excel. Do faculty want to take on the responsibility for ensuring that students learn other computer languages? Java and Classic (the current CS 100) primarily meet the needs of CS students. 100M and 100C would probably satisfy the needs of the Engineering students. T. Healey (Assoc. Dean) stated that 100M and 100C (C++) are highly technical and relevant for engineers. C. Van Loan (CS) is collecting data from other colleges regarding their computer languages. M. Miller will bring up the concerns of the CCGB at the next CPC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.