Agenda, February 23, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/16/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Proposed Change to ENGRI 116 (attached)
4. Student Evaluations/Electronic Evaluations
5. Minors in Biological and Biomedical Engineering and the Bioengineering Option (Spreadsheet attached)

CCGB Minutes
February 16, 2001

Members: J. Bartsch, R. Cleary, E. Giannelis, T. Healey, R. Kay, L. Lion, C. Van Loan, S. Wicker

Absent: M. Duncan, F. Gouldin, J. Hopcroft, F. Wise

Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, T. Bennington, D. Cox, B. East, B. Grant, D. Maloney Hahn, T. Thompson, D. Worley, S. Youra

Other: S. Barnett, S. Leibovich, C. Pakkala, J. Stedinger

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 2nd were approved with minor modifications.

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that his office was distributing the 3-year cycle upperclass advising evaluations to each field. Although each field does them with a different process, the returns have been very high. T. Thompson (Registrar) mentioned that a test of the electronic course enroll had been done, which quadrupled the load on the university’s computer system. More testing will be done by C. Cox’s (Assoc. Univ. Registrar) office to see what issues arise and to determine whether the electronic add/drop program will be implemented in the fall.
J. Bartsch (ABEN) thanked Steven Youra for his help in making ABEN 489 a very successful course.
R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) reminded the CCGB members that the nominations for the Merrill Scholars Award are due. He also mentioned that the Phoenix Society is still searching for a tall space in which to build their creature for Dragon Day.

Engineering 150 Discussion: R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) emphasized that the expectations needed to be clear regarding the 3 motions from CS. He suggested that, since Motion 1 appears to be too big a change for the CCGB to vote on, it be forwarded to the Student Experience Committee so they could work on developing ENGRG 150. He also proposed that Motion 2 be discussed immediately but voted on later, and he suggested that the CCGB members discuss ways to push the date on Motion 3 back.
C. Van Loan (CS) requested that ALL motions be discussed. He spoke about the CS version of the 150 course, emphasizing that it meets all of the requirements of the program, and offered to share the comments on the course evaluations with the CCGB members. He also mentioned that the advisor algorithm doesn’t take into account students on leave, double majors, students with a minor, transfer students, or seniors. This causes faculty to be over-burdened. C. Van Loan proposed that four small
group sections be held in September and the College could coordinate field information sessions after that. J. Stedinger (Faculty Coord. For ENGRG 150) asked why all of the CS 150 sections focused on CS topics and wondered why people from the other engineering fields were not encouraged to give presentations. C. Van Loan responded that the focus of the CS 150 sessions was made clear on the syllabus, and was similar to other 150 syllabi. L. Lion (CEE) stated that because ½ of the engineering students change their minds about their major, having a field-focused 150 doesn’t satisfy the purpose of the course, which is to expose students to different fields in engineering. C. Van Loan replied that some of the ENGRG 150 presentations in CS covered areas in other fields, i.e. artificial intelligence. S. Leibovich (M&AE) asked what the goals in ENGRG 150 are. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) replied that the ENGRG 150 classes are meant to get advisors and advisees better acquainted and to expose students to the breadth in engineering so they can decide on a major by the end of their first year at Cornell. C. Van Loan stated that advisors need the freedom to do the course the way they feel comfortable doing it, as long as they satisfy the basic requirements of the course. K. Athreya (Women’s Programs) suggested that a more uniform course structure be defined in which both goals would be maintained. She also mentioned that discussions held after trips would reinforce concepts and increase advisor/advisee interactions. **S. Wicker (ECE) seconded Motion 1.** L. Lion asked if Motion 1 should be forwarded to the Student Experience Committee. C. Van Loan replied that, in his opinion, sending topics to subcommittees takes too much time, and he suggested that the motions all be seconded and then discussed by the CCGB members and their colleagues. **R. Kay seconded Motions 2 and 3.** R. Cleary stated that the CS ENGRG 150 motions would be on the agenda for the 3/2/01 CCGB Meeting. In the meantime, the CCGB members are encouraged to discuss the motions with their colleagues and send any comments to the CCGB mailbox.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m.