CCGB Meeting Agenda, March 16, 2007

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Update on Math 191 Placement Exam
4. Report from Liberal Studies Committee
5. Update on Curriculum Transformation Actions
6. Proposed Aerospace Minor
7. ORIE Physics Substitution

CCGB Minutes, February 16, 2007

Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, R. Robbins, F. Shumway, M. Spencer
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 2/2/07 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Gries said that the Office of the Cornell Commitment was soliciting nominations for the Cornell Tradition Award. Nominations are also due for the Carpenter Advising Awards. It would be good to have several nominations from engineering for these awards.

Game Design Minor: Change in Courses. D. Gries stated that Computer Science had made a few course changes in the Game Design Minor. The Subcommittee on Minors of the CCGB met and did not believe that CCGB would need to vote on the changes. The subcommittee merely wanted to notify the CCGB that minor changes to the minor had occurred.

Responsibilities of the CCGB regarding the motions passed by the Engineering Faculty: A. Zehnder stated that he, D. Gries, and S. Baker met about getting moving on the motions that were passed at the Engineering Faculty Meeting. Replacing Chem. 207/211 with just Chem. 207 was approved. D. Gries said that he would discuss the issue with the Chemistry Department. Because the change makes it easier for them, they should be okay with it. L. Pollack said that a lack of lab space may be an issue.

A. Zehnder said that an appropriate committee will evaluate the content of the math courses. C. Seyler will work on that with the Math/Science Subcommittee. D. Gries and B. Isacks are also on the subcommittee. Regarding the coordination of math with chemistry, physics, and bio courses: L. Pollack said that she will organize a discussion with the Physics Department, and she is not expecting too much difficulty. A. Zehnder said that Lyndon Archer will address the chemistry issue. The College has decided not to do anything with incorporating biology into the curriculum yet. Physics 213 and Math 192 are paired, so maybe professors can talk about this. L. Pollack stated that part of the problem is that they get lists of topics that are to be covered in the classes, but then some are not covered. It would be good to have core faculty sit down and exchange syllabi.

A. Zehnder said that he gave a heads-up about the AEW-like workshops for Math 191 and 192 to the Math Department. They were fairly positive about it. S. Baker said that there was one strongly interested faculty candidate who wanted to be the leader of the project. We want to make sure we’re seeing the same picture the same way. The Curriculum Task Force will get together with the Math Liaison Committee to discuss the implementation. B. East said that L. Schneider should sit in on a meeting with
Mike Kelley to discuss the issue. D. Gries said that M. Kelley is interested in doing this with Math 191 only at the start. He referred M. Kelley to the Math & Science Committee.

**Proposed Core Computing Courses:** D. Gries distributed a handout with details of core computing courses that the CS Department would like to begin teaching in Fall 2007. They are proposing that the 1-credit courses require previous programming knowledge. They hope to have faculty to teach the courses for Fall 2007. They already have people to develop the 1-credit courses and make the changes in CS100M. Finding people to teach these in the right way in the fall may be a problem.

B. East asked if enrollments will be uneven if students can’t take 100M without programming experience. D. Gries replied that students can take 4-credit M or J without programming, but they will need programming for the 1-credit courses. All 700 students in Engineering will need to take one of the 1-credit courses. Some could take a 4-credit course in their third semester or during the summer. M. Duncan asked if students could put the one-credit course in the last 4 or 5 weeks of a term. D. Gries replied that CS may be able to be flexible; but the department needs to have experience in giving this course first.

CS is hoping that the courses will require programming mastery rather than allowing students to skip along with a C- or D+. B. East stated that it seems to make sense to have students take both courses as soon as possible to meet the objective, which is to have them know Matlab by the time they are juniors. E. Fisher said that there would be a problem if we have a generation of students who couldn’t take Matlab.

W. Philpot asked how this issue will be handled with transfer students. D. Gries replied that transfer students should take the 1-credit course. Students could take CS100J in their spring semester and could take Matlab in the second part of semester. They could take the 1-credit course concurrently. B. East said that we need to let the students know when they should take the courses. She is concerned about adding the 1-credit course to the 4-credit CS course in the second semester.

M. Spencer said that he sees lots of students who have taken computer-type stuff. He believes that lots of them will be able to take the mini courses in their first semester due to their backgrounds. D. Gries said that students with AP credit or who pass the placement test will be able to take the 1-credit course. He will work with the Registrar’s Office next week to put this in effect for the Courses of Study catalog.

S. Baker said that from a committee perspective, if the information they based their decision on is accurate and a student could learn to program quickly, we won’t need to emphasize that they don’t need to take the 1-credit course too early. D. Gries said that if they have to take the 4-credit course in their freshman year, it makes sense to require the 1-credit course by the end of their third semester. A. Zehnder stated that the Engineering College has voted to put the requirement in place.

R. Robbins said that Courses of Study is due by the end of April. The deadline for the Engineering Handbook is typically the end of April also. We need to get all of the information to the publisher in order to get it back by Orientation.

D. Gries asked if the College could require the 1-credit course by the end of the third semester. M. Duncan wondered what would happen if students didn’t do that. The CBE students won’t need Java ever; he can see them putting it off. E. Fisher suggested that majors be able to decide whether to make it an affiliation requirement. B. East said that we would then be telling the students that before they affiliate, they still need to decide on a major. We should not make it an affiliation requirement for some majors and not others. A. Zehnder stated that it is supposed to be a core course for the entire college. Students could take the course during the first two years to keep flexibility.

F. Shumway wondered if, for pre-enrollment, students would be told to take CS100 and then learn about options and self-select a course. D. Gries replied that pre-enrollment will be handled that way.
M. Duncan stated that every CBE student will take Chem. 207 now, but they should take Chem. 208 in the second semester. They shouldn’t have to take the 1-credit CS course in their first 3 semesters. S. Baker said that the 1-credit CS course should be taken in their first 4 semesters, but pre-or co-requisites may mean that students would have to take it sooner. A. Zehnder said that if students think about certain majors that they might want to be in, they might want to take Matlab or Java depending on that major.

L. Pollack asked if each major should figure out where the optimal place of the 1-credit CS course is and then send their flowcharts to Advising. F. Shumway replied affirmatively and added that it would be helpful to have which sequence majors would prefer on the flowchart.

**Advisor-approved Electives:** A. Zehnder said that we have three choices regarding advisor-approved electives: Leave the issue alone, liberalize it completely and make it free electives, or re-word the advisor electives so they are more flexible. This would have to go to the entire college for approval. If the CCGB decides to make changes, we should form a committee to come up with a proposal and create a motion. This issue would be addressed at a college faculty meeting. We have asked majors to discuss it with their colleagues.

S. Baker said that MSE has a fairly consistent interpretation, which is not consistently applied: if any course advisor or student agrees that it furthers their interest, it is approved. Some faculty members approve art classes and others are stricter. There was no strong sentiment on this, but some faculty want technical courses.

B. Isacks said that most people in his department were in favor of the liberal interpretation of it, but a student needs to convince them that the courses are career-related.

D. Ruppert said that the ORIE faculty interpret it liberally, the courses are not technical, and courses can meet their career objectives or their interests. The advisors are not viewed as strict by the students. They allow the students to take almost anything other than the Wines course.

L. Lee said that CS is ultra-liberal and allows students to take whatever they want. They want the students to have flexibility.

C. Seyler said that he sent an email to his ECE colleagues for comments. Five out of 7 want free electives and think the current wording makes the electives seem technical. Most want it liberalized.

M. Duncan said that his CBE colleagues approve anything that students want to take that is consistent with their career objectives. They like to see students take classes that build on their freshman and sophomore years.

L. Pollack said that in AEP the advisor-approved electives issue has been a way to get the advisors and students to discuss career goals. We need to address whether AP credits can satisfy the advisor-approved electives. We need general guidelines.

J. Bartsch said that BEE is more liberal. Their faculty tend to agree on what the advisors should approve. They have a number of pre-meds who take extra courses in chemistry and biochemistry and use these for electives. Minors also have a course or two extra.

E. Fisher stated that she polled her colleagues in MAE about this. The faculty are in favor of liberalizing the electives. They have had long discussions in the past about these to try to arrive at a uniform application of guidelines.

W. Philpot said that the CEE faculty expressed surprise that the description of advisor-approved electives has caused them to have been interpreted as technical courses. Their advisors like discussing the electives with the students. Their faculty are in favor of having them liberalized.
R. Robbins said that we often have unaffiliated students. They take the minimum number of credits to stay in engineering while they try to transfer to another college. They might have gotten electives approved by their prior advisor but their current advisor might not approve of them. He wondered how that might be handled. D. Gries said that if they were approved, there should not be any issues.

A. Zehnder asked for a straw vote on the issue of advisor-approved electives. There were 4.5 votes in favor of free electives. There were 9.5 votes to keep the electives as they are but change the wording so that they do not appear to be technical. There were 3 votes to keep the existing requirement.

B. East stated that Engineering Student Services gets a lot of requests for nominations for awards. She asked if it is best to send them to Directors and Chairs and the CCGB representatives. B. Fisher said that she feels this has never been done well, but they should be distributed as they have always been. B. East responded that we will keep sending them and hope for nominations.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 a.m.