Agenda, February 1, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 12/7/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Vote on Proposal to Change ENGRD 231 to 4 hours
4. MAE request to have MAE 423 approved for satisfying the computer applications requirement
5. Presentation on Info Science Minor (Bill Arms, CS)

CCGB Minutes
December 7, 2001


Other:  C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of November 30th, 2001, were approved with minor modifications.

Undergraduate Announcements:  S. Wicker (ECE) stated that faculty members should be very careful when approving waivers for courses. Occasionally a student will be denied a waiver by a program, but then the student will take the waiver to a faculty member who approves it without knowing about the previous denial.

Proposal for AEW Credit for ENGRG 112 and ENGRG 211:  F. Gouldin (M&AE) spoke with the faculty members in M&AE about the motions to grant credit-bearing status (one credit) to ENGRG 112 (an Academic Excellence Workshop for Physics 112) and to ENGRG 211 (an Academic Excellence Workshop for CS 211). The faculty members did not think that three AEW’s should be allowed to be combined to make one 3 credit elective. They were also concerned that granting credit would increase the workload in the courses, and they wondered if the work involved warranted credit. T. Shapiro stated that the AEW’s are conducted during a two-hour period once a week and contain additional problem sets, collaboration, and group work with facilitators who ensure that the content is relevant to engineering. The S/U credit would be based on attendance. L. Lion (CEE) spoke with faculty members in his department, and they stated that, although they believe that AEW’s are basically good, they don’t approve of adding 3 of them up to make an approved elective. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) stated that the AEW’s can potentially fulfill some of the A-K criteria for ABET because they involve skill sets and collaborative work. F. Gouldin agreed that the AEW skills are important for ABET, but that 3 1-credit courses focusing on skill sets is much different than 1 3-credit course which focuses on 1 subject.

Motion:  Grant 1 credit to ENGRG 112.  Motion passed with 7 approvals, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

Motion:  Grant 1 credit to ENGRG 211.  Motion passed with 4 approvals, 1 opposed and 3 abstentions.
Discussion on Proposal to Change ENGRD 231 to 4 hours: S. Wicker (ECE) stated that ENGRD 231 and 232 are now taught by a new computer engineering faculty member. The goal of combining the 2 courses is to reduce the workload for the students and reduce the teaching load for the faculty. F. Gouldin (M&AE) said that he had spoken with the faculty members in M&AE, and they expressed concern about having ENGRD courses for 4 credit hours. They feel that approving this as 4 credits sets a precedent, and they want to know the effect of adding 4-credit distribution courses. D. Ruppert (OR&IE) mentioned that when OR&IE asked for a course to be increased from 3 to 4 credits, it was voted down. He believes that a consistent policy should be maintained. T. Healey (T&AM) pointed out that some of the courses offered by other colleges which we accept as Distribution courses are 4-credit courses (ie, Biology and Physical Chemistry). L. Lion (CEE) asked how students would be prevented from co-registering for both the course and the lab and receiving credit for both. S. Wicker stated that ECE is working on ways to prevent that. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) asked if many students would miss out if ECE 231 were not a distribution course. S. Wicker replied affirmatively that 50 CS students per year would lose an ENGRD opportunity that they would have to replace with an added course. F. Gouldin suggested that everyone review their department’s ENGRD course offerings and ask faculty members how they feel about increasing this course to 4 credit hours. He feels that students are still learning to manage their time, and they need to be helped rather than being overwhelmed with work. T. Jordan suggested that ChemE be consulted about this issue because they did a study on 3-credit distribution courses and the amount of work involved in the courses. F. Wise (A&EP) suggested that courses be counted rather than credits because many courses have heavy workloads which don’t relate to the credit hours. S. Wicker stated that this proposal will be voted on in February.

Planning for Next Semester: S. Wicker (CCGB Chair) asked if some standing committees should be resurrected. F. Gouldin (M&AE) replied that the standing committees are important for ABET because they provide a feedback structure, but in recent years the momentum of the committees has been lost. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that the Student Experience Committee is responsible to assess and report to the CCGB “on a regular basis” student evaluations of classroom experiences and the overall academic experience. She added that it is important that ways be discussed to add ethics into the ENGRG 150 classes, as well as discussing other content-related issues with the 150 classes. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) said that committees are good for dealing with issues that the CCGB doesn’t have time for. S. Wicker stated that he would be willing to staff committees if necessary, and it is his impression that liberal studies, math and science, and the student experience committees are viewed as the most important. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) added that the College Program has issues that also need to be addressed. S. Wicker stated that the committee discussion will resume in February.

L. Lion (CEE) mentioned that he will be going on sabbatic in the spring.
S. Wicker (ECE) wants the bio issue resolved soon.
F. Gouldin (M&AE) wants ABET to be worked on during the spring.
D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that the sophomore year in engineering is the largest attrition year and suggested that causes be examined. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) added that there has been no progress in overall attrition, although the retention of women in engineering has become better. Of those students who enter engineering, 73-74% graduate from engineering, 17-18% move to other colleges at Cornell, and 91% of them graduate from Cornell. The attrition rate within the Engineering College is higher than within any other college at Cornell University.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.