Agenda, February 15, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/8/02 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. CCGB Subcommittees
4. Discussion of Enabling Majors to Take a Minor in Their Department

CCGB Minutes
February 8, 2002


Ex-Officio:  D. Cox, B. East, D. Maloney-Hahn, T. Shapiro, T. Thompson

Other:  C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of February 1, 2002 were approved with the following correction: Vote on Proposal to Change ENGRD 231 to 4 hours: Passed with 4 in favor, 2 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Undergraduate Announcements:  D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that approximately 120 second semester sophomores are still unaffiliated, and under-enrolled departments will be asked to contact those students. He added that his office only withdrew 6 students last semester.

B. East (Admissions) announced that student applications have increased by about 300 this year, which is very promising.

T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) had a list of announcements, beginning with a call for nominations for the new university-wide Kendall S. Carpenter Memorial Advising Awards. Four awards of $5,000 each will be given to senior lecturers or professorial faculty and will be based on advising contributions. Nominations are also being sought for another Engineering College advising award, the McCormick Advising Award, which is given to faculty members for excellence in freshman advising. T. Jordan also spoke about the grade inflation report that was distributed to the associate deans of each college, which indicates that Engineering has inflated grades 9% during the past 12 years. J. Bartsch (BEE) asked if the median grades are listed online, next to each of the courses. R. Kay (EAS) responded that David Yeh and the EPC was working on this but they haven’t managed to do it yet. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) added that PeopleSoft is helping with this project, and they’re looking at a 6-year timeframe. T. Jordan also mentioned the study conducted by an ILR group (at the request of Civil and Environmental Engineering) on undergraduates’ attitudes during affiliation with a major. The results of the study are interesting, and indicated that students need to be better informed about majors prior to affiliation. She questioned the need for the names of majors to change to correspond with the change in department names. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) stated that although the Admissions publications indicate both departmental names and the degrees that they confer, both students and their parents find the complexity of a department’s name and differing degree name difficult to understand. T. Jordan stated that changes made to the Courses of Study catalog are due to the College by 3/12/02. The new College Program guidelines will appear in the catalog. R. Kay asked how many major and minor course credits are in the College Program curriculum, and T. Jordan replied that there is a minimum of 32 credits for the major and 16 credits for the minor. S. Wicker (ECE) said that he tells his students that the College Program is for better students, not for those in academic difficulty. D. Maloney Hahn stated that the original program was originally for honors students who wanted an unconventional twist on the major, but now it is commonly used by students who do not have GPAs suitable to honors. J. Bartsch said that the College Program seems like a general studies program more than anything else, not a program for honors students.
Proposed Minor in Information Science: C. Van Loan (CS) spoke about the proposal by the Department of Computer Science to create an Engineering Minor in Information Science. An analogous minor has been approved in CALS and is midway through the approval process in Arts & Sciences. Although there are slightly different rules for completion in each of the three colleges, the basic structure of the minor is the same, and students would graduate with the minor from their colleges. Engineering students would take ENGRD 270 or CS 304 for a statistics course. C. Van Loan asked if CS majors could participate in the minor if it were approved by the CCGB. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) suggested that the minors legislation be changed to indicate that a student with a major in a given department could take a minor offered by the same department if the major and minor were in different fields. S. Wicker (ECE) said that, although changing the minors legislation is a separate issue, it should be addressed soon. R. Kay (EAS) suggested that approvals be done on a case-by-case basis because he sees limited demand for majors wanting to take a minor that is offered in their department. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) said that the reason T&AM took over the Biomedical Minor was so every field could take it without a conflict. J. Bartsch (BEE) asked if the minor would be noted on the student’s transcript. C. Van Loan replied that the notation would appear the same on each student’s transcript, no matter the college. Motion: To accept the Proposed Minor in Information Science. Passed with 9 approvals, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

Request to Approve MAE 423 to Satisfy the Computer Applications Requirement: F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that MAE 423 had been extensively revised to incorporate more computing applications (50% of the course) and asked that the course be approved as satisfying the Engineering College’s computer applications requirement. Motion: To approve MAE 423 to Satisfy the Computer Applications Requirement. Passed with 9 approvals, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

CCGB Committees: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) recommended that 3 subcommittees be resurrected: Math and Science, Liberal Studies and the Student Experience. Each of the subcommittees will need at least 1 CCGB member. For consideration by the Math and Science subcommittee there are issues of substituting biology or chemistry for the third physics requirement, and possibly requiring an environmental component in the curriculum. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that adding environmental courses would be good and suggested that someone on the committee have a biology, EAS, BEE or CEE background. D. Cox suggested that T. Shapiro be put on the committee, due to the strong interweaving of the AEW program with the science and math courses. T. Jordan suggested that the Liberal Studies subcommittee reconsider the requirements so that the liberal studies courses better map onto the ABET A-K requirements. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated the need for courses to contain an appropriate sequence and depth in order to satisfy old ABET requirements, and said that more flexibility in the curriculum should be balanced by the new ABET requirements. T. Shapiro (LIFE) mentioned that a not insignificant number of students are resistant to taking courses perceived as non-relevant to satisfy liberal studies requirements. T. Jordan stated that the Student Experience subcommittee should focus on how teamwork, communication and ethics, ABET issues, may be effectively addressed while simultaneously improving the student experience, especially in the areas of major concern expressed in the most recent report of the Student Experience subcommittee. More specifically, faculty-student interactions and stress are important issues that can be improved through the Communications Program, AEW’s and the T.A. Training Program. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that he finds the Student Experience charge very fuzzy and suggested that students and faculty reduce stress by doing less. S. Wicker (ECE) said that he would draw up the committee charges during next week and discuss them at next week’s CCGB Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 a.m.