Agenda, March 1, 2002  
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/22/02 Meeting  
2. Undergraduate Announcements  
3. Act on motion (appended, see attachment) concerning Engineering Minors  
4. Statements by individual fields as to whether their major students will be allowed to participate in the  
   Information Sciences Minor  
5. Present and debate motions (see attachment) of recommendations to College Program  
6. Request across university for uniformity of language of Honors designations

CCGB Minutes  
February 22, 2002


Other: J. Bird, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 15, 2002 were approved with a single word change.

Undergraduate Announcements: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that CIS (Office of Computing and Information Science, of which the “FCI” is the faculty body) has requested that the University Registrar present its courses in a separate part of the Courses of Study catalog, and cross-list those courses with the home department/college of whatever faculty member was teaching the course. She wondered if the CCGB members could envision any advising or academic program ramifications. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) said that the existing cross-listed courses are cross-listed between 2 different departmental units, whereas the new listing would be between a virtual department and a faculty member’s department. S. Wicker (ECE) mentioned that a separate section in the course catalog would be confusing since students can’t major in CIS. C. Van Loan (CS) said that CIS should be thought of as a shadow department, and he volunteered to bring to the CCGB a rough draft of the course offerings in order to clarify the issue.

Minors Legislation (handout distributed): T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) spoke about the historical background of the engineering minors. She indicated that the original legislation explicitly stated that an engineering student could “complete satisfactorily six courses (18 credits minimum) as stipulated in a College-approved Engineering Minor offered by an engineering school or department other than that which offers the student’s major.” This legislation was approved by the CCGB on 3/27/98 and subsequently voted on and approved by faculty at a College faculty meeting (with 42 members present) on 5/20/98. T. Jordan stated that the CCGB generated in Fall, 1998, a body of Minors Case Law. S. Wicker (ECE) suggested that the CCGB members poll the faculty in their departments about the Information Science Minor. He also asked for feedback on whether majors could take a minor sponsored by their field. He said that the existing Case Law requires that the minors should be first voted on by the CCGB, the members would solicit approvals from members in their departments, and then the minors should be voted on again with the CCGB members representing their departments’ interests. C. Van Loan (CS) disagreed, stating that there should be one vote which explicitly states what a minor consists of and who can take it. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) said that the original intent of the minors legislation was to approve the content of the minor and then allow fields time to react, and that the original resolution of 1998 was intended to require that a minor be outside a major. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) suggested that, under requirement “b” of the original Resolution on Engineering Minors, the sentence be changed to: “b. Complete satisfactorily six courses (18 credits minimum) as stipulated in a CCGB Engineering Minor.” J. Bisogni (CEE) stated that item “b” is too
vague and that the original legislation on majors taking minors needs to be amended. S. Wicker suggested that case law be discussed next week, and T. Jordan moved that the subject be tabled until the 3/1/02 CCGB Meeting.

**College Program (handouts distributed):** T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that the College Program was created in the 1960’s. Students enrolled in this program have a major that consists of approximately 32 credits and an educationally related minor of approximately 16 credits. Although this is not an ABET accredited program, it benefits the students by providing some flexibility for non-traditional majors. Some students have used the College Program as an honors program, and some have used it as their only way to graduate, so there is a broad range of students in the program. Students graduating from the College Program generally follow the same paths as the traditional majors, i.e. some go to graduate school, some begin work, and some remain unemployed 6 months after graduation. T. Jordan mentioned that some adjustments to the College Program requirements are possible including: 1) replacing the 3.0 GPA requirement with a required “in good academic standing,” 2) replace major and minor titles with something less confusing, and 3) change the College Program name to something more descriptive. C. Van Loan (CS) suggested that the College Program be re-named “Independent Major,” that the “in good academic standing” wording be used, and that “major area of study” and “minor area of study” be used. B. Kusse (A&EP) stated that he doesn’t think an open-ended program such as this is good for poorer students who need structure. E. Giannelis (MS&E) added that this program is essentially another major in the college, but this one isn’t accredited. C. Van Loan responded that the Chief Scientist at Intel was in the College Program, so obviously the College Program students can be successful. The College Program is also an excellent way for the students to be academically creative. He suggested that templates/designated paths be created for the weaker students who need structure. S. Wicker (ECE) stated that the College Program discussion would resume at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m.