Agenda, February 16, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/2/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Engineering 150 Discussion (Continued)
4. Student Evaluations (Time Permitting)

CCGB Minutes
February 2, 2001

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

Absent:  F. Gouldin, J. Herrera, J. Hopcroft, D. Worley

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

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

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of January 26th were approved with a slight modification.

Undergraduate Announcements:  R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) welcomed E. Giannelis (MS&E) to the CCGB.

D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that his office has become more aggressive in targeting troubled students and helping them early in the semester. The Advising Office is also currently encouraging students to affiliate; approximately 90 students have not yet affiliated.

Engineering 150 Discussion:  D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) distributed and explained the “Advisor Distribution Algorithm – Spring 2000.” He emphasized that the algorithm has worked well, with advisors being assigned fairly. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that, although the formula appears fair, it does not work well in CS due to the disproportionate number of transfers and double majors. CS would like to see more flexibility in the algorithm. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) mentioned that fewer advisors would be required this year due to Admissions meeting their target class size. S. Wicker (ECE) stated that there will be 9 faculty members on sabbatic in Spring ’02 and that, due to leaves, there is often a discrepancy in faculty numbers between fall and spring. He wondered if that was factored in to the algorithm. D. Maloney Hahn responded that spring leaves are not considered a deduction because the fall semester is considered as the heavy time. C. Van Loan stated that, according to the algorithm formula, seniors don’t appear to matter. The faculty in CS deal with many student problems in the 8th semester and are incredibly busy with their seniors, but they are still required to have a full advising load which detracts from the time they could be spending in assisting their seniors. J. Stedinger (CEE) observed that seniors matter very much, and this was considered when the formula was adopted. M. Duncan (ChemE) mentioned that, due to a lack of advisors, faculty in his department have a double load of senior advisees. Also, the 8th semester lasts forever as students write back for recommendations and career advice. The ratio of students/advisors is 40-45/1. C. Van Loan added that the ratio of students/advisors in CS is 30/1, but 4 of the advisors have 45 student advisees.
J. Stedinger (Faculty Coord. For ENGRG 150) gave a summary of the Fall 2000 surveys from ENGRG 150 and distributed a handout of the slides associated with the presentation. He has been the ENGRG 150 Coordinator for the past 5 years and, according to the ENGRG 150 evaluations that are done every year, the students and the instructors are satisfied with the course. The results of the survey indicated that the two main objectives (freshmen meeting w/their faculty advisors in a friendly and supportive atmosphere on a regular basis AND to provide freshmen with an introduction and orientation to engineering activities and the College of Engineering) of the course are being met. Attempts will also be made to increase the involvement of Peer Advisors in Engineering 150 sections. The policy for passing Engineering 150 was reviewed, with 62% of the instructors approving the one unexcused absence policy. The instructors are also discussing the possibility of including heterogeneous sections of limited scope of various segments of engineering in their 150 classes to provide for a more unified engineering freshman experience. This would expose students to all of the engineering majors. F. Wise (A&EP) asked whether 150 sessions are currently homogeneous. D. Maloney Hahn responded that approximately 50% of them are, and that 60% of the students are matched with advisors who share similar interests. F. Wise expressed his surprise that students would want homogeneous 150s and stated that his department does not do A&EP-slanted 150s. D. Cox stated that because a high percentage of students enter Cornell undecided and 40% of them change their majors anyway, a heterogeneous 150 would likely be beneficial for them. J. Stedinger concluded that ENGRG 150 in the form created by CCGB five years ago is now an established success that is supported by both freshmen and ENGRG 150 faculty instructors.

C. Van Loan expressed his views regarding the 150 classes (handout distributed). Although he likes the 150s, he feels the program guidelines are inflexible. The fields should have more decision making on handling the 150 courses. He indicated that many CS faculty members feel overburdened with advising.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m.