CCGB MINUTES  
February 20, 1998


Members Absent: P. Kintner, J. Hopcroft, C. Van Loan

Ex-Officio: K. Braxton, T. Cookingham, D. Cox, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway

Minutes: J. Abel: A few changes have already been noted and are reflected in the copy which was distributed. Minutes accepted as distributed.

Announcements: K. Hover: Commencement Regalia—CALS has decided to go with the university policy of recognizing students with honors/cum laude designations with a combination of cords, sashes, etc. A&S and ENGR are presently the only two colleges which are choosing not to comply with this policy. Last week, we discussed the possibility of giving orange cords to all engineering graduates. In addition, the university will also recognize members of national honor societies with a red/white cord. Connie Mabry of the Commencement Office (Day Hall) needs a list of nationally recognized honor societies; please let Sandy Dennis-Conlon know of such groups in your department. He will communicate this info to Connie, and she will then work with the presidents of each of the organizations to order and distribute the cords.

J. Abel, CEE: Is the intent that the college pay for the orange engineering cords?
K. Hover: Last year the college paid. If everyone gets them, however, they could be distributed with the caps and gowns – in this case, we could either subsidize them or ask the students to pay. Ken would like some guidance and a decision from the group on how to proceed.
K. Gebremedhin: CALS students have indicated that they do not wish to be recognized with honors/cum laude stoles.
F. Shumway: Because of the Commencement program schedule, we are no longer able to print the honors/cum laude for May graduates; for August and January graduates this is no problem.
R. Buhrman: Moved that the college should order orange cords for all Engineering undergraduates and that the college should pay.
Hover: Motion seconded.
Vote—8 yes; 1 abstention—Motion carried

AP Physics Credit Question: J. Jenkins: Current college policy is that we give credit for PHYS 112 for either a 4 or 5 on the mechanics portion of the AP “C” exam or for a 5 on mechanics portion of the “B” exam, with at least one semester of AP or transfer credit in Math. Further, we give credit for both PHYS 112 and PHYS 213 to students who receive a 5 on the electricity and magnetism portion of the “C” exam. Are we happy with this? The electricity and magnetism exam does not query mechanical knowledge. In addition, we are not in compliance with general university policy.
Motion—Change AP policy such that students will only receive credit for PHYS 213 if they receive a 5 on the electricity and magnetism portion of the “C” exam. The rest of the policy would remain the same.
Vote—unanimous yes; motion carried.

Continuation of Discussion regarding Freshman Advisor Algorithm: K. Hover: Last week Charlie Van Loan expressed an interest in extending the cut-off date for submitting advisor names to Advising; his point is valid, as numbers of affiliates and available faculty typically change over the summer. The counter issue is that Advising needs to make contact with freshman advisors prior to the summer break. Furthermore, changes in advisor numbers affect all departments; a deficit in one department means that another department must make up the number. Since staffing issues are decided by mid-March, March 27 was designated as the deadline as a compromise.

J. Abel: This issue really has two questions: 1. Do we have suggestions to change the algorithm?; 2. What should the cut-off date be?
J. Jenkins: Suggestion—What if we were to keep the cut-off date as March 27, but do a recalculation of advisor numbers in late summer/early fall, taking into consideration changes in available faculty, new affiliates, etc. Any adjustments could be applied to the algorithm next year.
K. Hover: This is certainly a possibility.
J. Abel: Should the algorithm go before the Directors and Chairs for consideration?
K. Hover: Yes
J. Jenkins: What about Deans? How do they factor into the algorithm?
K. Hover: Last year we used eleven departments and one “administrative” department to figure the algorithm. Ken Hover and Ray Thorpe were the freshman advisors provided by the administrative department.
J. Jenkins: Motion—To approve earlier suggestion to recalculate freshman advisor numbers in mid-late summer. Adjustments to be applied to following cycle.
D. Bartel: If we adopt this motion, can we make the advisor submission date earlier, to the point of affiliation? By mid-March we have already assigned sophomore advisors and may need to reassign students, based on who we choose as freshman advisors. If we leave the date at March 27, could Ken estimate (at affiliation time) what the projected freshman advisor numbers might be?
K. Hover: An estimate is certainly possible.
D. Maloney Hahn: The usual ratio of advisees to advisors is approximately 18:1 across the board.
Vote—8 yes, 1 abstention; motion carried.
K. Hover: I will communicate this information with the Dean.

Engineering Minors: J. Abel: The discussion of minors has been taking place at various faculty meetings, but a few (MS&E, A&EP, CHEME) will meet later today or next week. There are basically two areas of discussion: Academic concerns and administrative concerns. How are the departments (who have met) feeling about this in general?
A. ACADEMIC ISSUES
K. Gebremedhin: ABEN is in favor of a minors program. Charlie Van Loan has no problem with the academic end of the program. His concerns are administrative in nature.
D. Ruppert: Bruce Turnbull suggested he would like to see a minor in statistics; a proposal will be forthcoming. OR&IE is favorable, overall.
J. Abel: We will need to decide what entities will be able to propose a minor (departments vs. units, for example).
J. Jenkins: We see this as primarily a breadth issue; T&AM is favorable.
R. Buhrman: What about minors outside of engineering? Is there a way to recognize these formally?
M. Duncan: Minors require state approval (usually about 3 years). This is why Bioengineering is an “option.”
K. Hover: We typically have lots of latitude with what we can put on transcripts, but little with what notations can go on the diploma.
M. Duncan: Most faculty in CHEME are concerned about the administrative end of things; most told me “maybe” or “no.”
D. Bartel: I will poll the faculty.
J. Abel: CEE and GEOL are in favor of minors; CEE will propose two—one civil, one environmental. We will put this item on the agenda again for next week to continue the discussion.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
K. Gebremedhin: Charlie Van Loan feels that all the requirements should be well-defined and in contract form; advising is a big concern with COM S, as they are apt to have many students interested in a minor.
J. Abel: Because a major concern is the certifications just before commencement, the student’s major field should also certify the minor requirements.
D. Maloney Hahn: A minors program would require considerable monitoring, but it should be a faculty decision as to whether or not the student has completed the requirements. The Registrar’s Office should not be responsible for that decision. The offering department should monitor and certify minor programs.
J. Abel: In programs such as the College Program, we require students to be responsible for completing requirements and being responsible for changes to their contract. Each minor would have a specific advisor(s) that these students would work with on their minor program. It might be centered in the departmental office. In any case, a contract would be made with the student, based on a specific menu of courses; a copy of the contract would go to the student’s major field.
K. Hover: Auditing would be with the minor field, then?
J. Abel: There might be a potential problem with grades getting to the minor field, so perhaps the major field would do the certification.
D. Maloney Hahn: If departments are eligible to propose minors, might the Bioengineering Option become a minor?
J. Abel: Cross-disciplinary areas are outside of the minors proposal, but perhaps we should have a sub-committee look at what might be done in the area of interdisciplinary minors.
D. Bartel: Would the GEOL/CEE minor proposed last year be considered inter-disciplinary?
R. Kay: Science of Earth Systems (SES) is a new track in Geology. Courses are cross-listed (in many cases) with CALS courses. Unless you knew the system, it was a bit difficult to decipher which courses counted where.
D. Bartel: It might be a mistake to allow interdisciplinary minors to occur.
J. Abel: If we allow them, we should define them differently.
D. Grubb: Last year we decided to keep minors limited and straightforward, due to administrative functions.

Future Meetings: J. Abel: Next week we will continue our discussion of minors. In two weeks, there will be a panel presentation on ABET accreditation concerns/procedures by Gerry Rehkugler, Sam Linke, Jery Stedinger, and Tob de Boer. Meeting adjourned 9:00 a.m.

Tentative agenda for February 27, 1998:
1. Approval of February 20, 1998 minutes
2. Announcements (Hover)
3. Continued discussion of Minors (Abel)
4. Report and recommendations from Student Experience Committee (Wise)