Agenda, February 22, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/15/02 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Minors Legislation
4. College Program

CCGB Minutes
February 15, 2002


Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 8, 2002 were approved with minor corrections.

Undergraduate Announcements: T. Jordan thanked faculty members for sending their nominations for the Merrill Scholars Awards.

Subcommittee Charges: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) spoke about the 3 subcommittees that will be resurrected: Math and Science, Liberal Studies and the Student Experience. Each of the subcommittees will need at least 1 CCGB member. J. Bisogni (CEE) volunteered to chair the Math and Science subcommittee which will consider the following issues: 1) Current Physics 214 graduation requirement, possible future biology requirement or environmental science requirement. 2) Review of student evaluations of existing required math, physics and chemistry courses, and faculty perceptions of whether student outcomes from those courses are sufficient for advanced coursework. 3) Suggestions for improving the math, physics and chemistry courses/requirements based on #1 and 2.

F. Gouldin (M&AE) volunteered to chair the Liberal Studies subcommittee which will consider the following issues: 1) Comparing how the new and old ABET criteria pertain to non-technical parts of the curriculum. 2) Determining whether the existing Liberal Studies requirement serves the college faculty’s curricular objectives well, the students’ educational objectives and the ABET criteria well. 3) Recommending changes (if appropriate) to the liberal studies requirement that optimize the purposes explored in #2. F. Gouldin envisions the committee soliciting liberal studies objectives from individual units in the college. T. Healey (T&AM) asked if the faculty should be doing what they want and doing what’s best for the students or doing what ABET dictates. F. Gouldin replied that the ABET requirements should be taken into consideration along with flexibility and the needs of the faculty and students.

J. Bartsch (BEE) volunteered to chair the Student Experience subcommittee which will do the following: 1) Review Student Experience Committee findings of recent years so that all members are acquainted with the documented areas in which Engineering College students express dissatisfaction. 2) Review ABET outcomes in non-technical themes (i.e. teamwork, ethics, professionalism, communications, global and societal context). 3) Review the college’s programs that enhance the formal curricular requirements, both co-curricular programs (AEW’s, peer advisor training, TA training programs, etc.) and Engr 150. 4) Identify opportunities in the co-curricular programs, communications program, and Engr 150 to improve problem areas of topic #1 while fulfilling ABET outcomes of #2. 5) Recommend to Student Services and CCGB changes or improvements in co-curricular programs, Engr 150, and the Communications Program. J. Saylor (Eng. Library) requested that library resources and services be added to #4.
T. Jordan requested that each committee prepare and submit a preliminary recommendation to the CCGB by April 1st.

**Discussion of Enabling Majors to Take a Minor in Their Department:** T. Healey (T&AM) stated that there are certain minors that majors would like to take, and the laws governing the minors should be more flexible. R. Kay (EAS) added that in some cases it makes sense for majors to take a minor, given the criteria. C. Van Loan (CS) said minors increase the breadth of a student’s education, and that the act of approving a minor should include who can take it. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that originally minors were for students who took additional courses (and often stayed for an extra semester) in order to fulfill that minor. C. Van Loan said that the whole idea of minors is to give students guidelines to focus on and allow them to go into a 2nd or 3rd area of study. F. Gouldin responded that the original minors legislation discussed additional courses and the issue of double-counting a lot, and also mentioned that 3 of the 6 required courses could be double-counted but that the remainder would be new. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) said that there are lots of opportunities for double-dipping already, and the faculty needs to look at the educational worth of minors. E. Giannelis (MS&E) suggested that the CCGB focus on what a minor needs to be and then discuss flexibility. M. Duncan (ChemE) said that the fields determine the content of their minors, and that some minors are very broad-based and more like concentrations and should be treated differently than minors. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the evolution of minors is fairly rapid and that flexibility is becoming more important. She suggested that the CCGB decide who determines a general approach to minors of interdisciplinary nature, determine a means to designate whether they are open to all Engineering students or remain closed to those in the department offering the course, and define what the legislation should say. R. Kay added that the minors procedures should be well defined, as they were in the original legislation. D. Maloney Hahn said that he approves of the minor concept and recommended that fields decide on what is acceptable for students to take. He also agreed to unearth the original minors legislation and pass it along to the CCGB members. C. Van Loan asked what could be done if the original legislation prohibits majors from taking a minor in their department. T. Jordan replied that perhaps the wording in the original legislation would be flexible enough to allow for it.

C. Van Loan proposed the following motion: **With CCGB approval, a department may allow a major to take a minor that is sponsored by their field.** R. Kay seconded the motion. The motion will be voted on at the 2/22/02 CCGB Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 a.m.