Agenda, January 24, 2003
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Motion: Science & Math Requirements
4. Motion: Technical Writing Committee

CCGB Minutes, December 6, 2002


Absent: K. Athreya, K. Fuchs, C. Seyler, D. Worley

Ex-Officio: P. Beebe, D. Cox, B. East, M. Hammer, D. Maloney Hahn, K. Smith

Other: J. Belina, C. Pakkala, J. Powell

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of November 15, 2002 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: M. Hammer (Data Mgt.) announced that the electronic add/drop information was sent out to the students on 12/6/02. He said that a template was drawn up and sent to the colleges, and the colleges made changes and/or additions prior to returning the template. Each field has appointed coordinators to function as backups when advisors are absent. The decision structure in each college varies, with advisors in a field deciding whether to see a student prior to allowing them to add/drop. F. Gouldin stated that he is surprised that some colleges wouldn’t require advisors to meet with their students prior to allowing those students to add/drop courses. J. Bartsch (BEE) said that CALS thought the new online system is so bad that they didn’t want to add too much to the administrative workload and decided to trust their students to sign up for courses appropriately.

T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the university has discontinued the Turnitin service due to legal and financial issues with it. It has been suggested that Google be used to check for plagiarism.

Vote on ENGRD/TAM 202 Motion: T. Healey (TAM) spoke about the motion to increase the number of credit hours in ENGRD 202 from 3 to 4 starting in Spring 2003. Currently ENGRD 202 covers material typically taught as two separate courses at other engineering schools within the U.S. -- Statics and Mechanics of Deformable Solids. Starting in January 2003 the number of lectures in the course will increase from 2 to 3 per week, which will enable the instructor to do a more thorough job in disseminating the course information. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that the students in his department rely on the course. He stated that there isn’t much difference between the workload in Thermodynamics and TAM 202, and suggested that M&AE approach the CCGB with a proposal to change Thermodynamics to 4 credit hours. D. Grubb (MS&E) said that the engineering distribution courses were originally strictly 3 credits to keep course loads from increasing, but that goal has apparently failed. T. Healey called a vote on the motion: To change the number of credit hours of TAM 202 from 3 to 4. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) seconded the motion. VOTE: 4 in favor, 5 abstentions, 0 opposed. Motion passed.

Technical Writing Committee Recommendations: The Technical Writing Committee brought to the CCGB proposals for two changes in the methods by which students can complete the college requirement for Technical Writing. J. Belina (ECE) stated that the Technical Writing Committee would consider substitutions for fulfilling the technical writing requirement, as long as the faculty advisor and field are supportive of the student’s choices and the agreement is done ahead of time (via a petition). He added that substitutions would be particularly good for those
students in honors programs. The petition plan would allow students to petition to meet the writing requirement with writing done in an engineering course that is not a designated writing-intensive course. B. Kusse (A&EP) asked about the number of petitions that is expected. J. Belina suggested that it would be approximately 5-10 per year. P. Beebe (Comm. Prog.) stated that last semester it was approximately 3 per day. Another option for fulfilling the technical writing requirement is the Distributed Writing Option. Under this option a field would identify a group of courses in which writing is done and specify which parts of the writing requirement are covered in each; students would be able to fulfill the requirement by taking as many of the courses as needed to meet the college’s writing-intensive criteria. Overall the faculty comments reflect approval of this option, indicating that it allows for creativity and flexibility in the fields. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) said that this option would require that faculty be qualified and available to teach writing, and there would be a responsibility to maintain the quality of student writing. F. Gouldin (M&AE) suggested that the Writing Program periodically review the writing courses for consistency and quality. P. Beebe stated that the proposal is that the Engineering Communications staff would not review the courses. In light of the long-standing charge to the Technical Writing Committee to review the Writing Intensive courses at set intervals, one option is that the Technical Writing Committee would take on the responsibility of reviewing courses that participate in a department’s “distributed writing plan.”

Summary of Pending Items: T. Healey (T&AM) distributed a list of potential future topics for the CCGB: Student Success & Faculty Success (Eng. 150, student experience and teaching evaluations) and Content of the Curriculum (technical writing, liberal studies, Chem 211, biology/environmental science, math requirements). F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that tackling the list of projects would be a lot of work, and suggested that fields prepare for ABET rather than focus on general projects. He stressed the importance of feedback loops and discovering from former students how successful certain curriculum components are. T. Healey responded that the structure of the curriculum is being stretched, and faculty need to decide what they want regarding structure and flexibility. C. Van Loan (CS) requested that the topics of the proposed January retreat be explicit, with people being assigned topics to research ahead of time. M. Louge (M&AE) agreed that a small set of relevant topics should be defined and then focused on.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 a.m.