Agenda for March 9, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 2/23/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Engineering 150 . . . consideration of Prof. Van Loan’s Motions (attached)

CCGB Minutes
February 23, 2001

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

Absent:  K. Athreya, B. East, J. Hopcroft, S. Wicker, F. Wise, D. Worley, S. Youra

Ex-Officio:  T. Bennington, D. Cox, B. Grant, D. Maloney Hahn, T. Thompson

Other:  J. Belina, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of February 16th were approved with minor modifications.

Undergraduate Announcements:  D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that the field advisor evaluations are in process.

R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the Phoenix Society found space at the Apple Orchard to work on their Phoenix for this year’s Dragon Day

Engineering 116 Discussion:  L. Lion (CEE) spoke about the renaming of the ENGRI 116 course (see handout) from “Modern Structures” to “Modern Structural Systems and Materials.” Although the course content has expanded a bit, the course is basically the same. This course will be taught in the fall.

Student Evaluations/Electronic Evaluations:  R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) discussed the lack of clarity regarding the purpose of the course evaluations. He mentioned that A. Ruina (T&AM) piloted the electronic evaluations and encouraged student participation with some bonus grade points. Although the pilot was moderately successful, there was not much momentum for the College to adopt it. CIT has also been working in this area and would be glad to work with the college on implementing electronic evaluations. R. Cleary consulted with C. Hecht (CIT), who has a demo website that contained the basic data collection tools needed. Human Ecology used this pilot for some electronic evaluations and it worked reasonably well. He asked if the CCGB members are interested in moving toward electronic evaluations or whether they are happy with the current evaluation process. J. Belina (ECE) stated that the validity of the evaluation responses is most important, and if students are offered incentives to do them, the incentives are likely to affect the outcome. Peer evaluations are the most relevant because they are more likely to be of value to the teacher and the primary purpose of evaluations is to assist in course improvement. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) mentioned that the current evaluations do not give faculty good feedback; only the extremes are reflected. She added that ownership of the programming was an issue with the previous version of the electronic course evaluations, and steps should be taken to ensure that this is not a problem with future electronic evaluations. M. Hammer (Consult./Advisor in Stdt. Svcs.) could help with the conceptual details of the
electronic evaluation. L. Lion (CEE) said that he is in favor of using the electronic evaluations because the written comments were more extensive on them than on the paper version of the evaluations. C. Van Loan (CS) agreed that the written comments are the most important part of evaluations because they reflect the student’s true level of satisfaction with the course and give important feedback to faculty. He does not feel that electronic evaluations are as important as the content of the evaluations. His students submitted their course evaluations after the final exam, so their response rate was 100%. F. Gouldin (M&AE) agreed that the content of the evaluations is important, as is how they are administered. He suggested that a subcommittee work on the evaluations. R. Cleary asked for volunteers to help with developing a course of action regarding the course evaluations. F. Gouldin has pledged his assistance.

Minors in Biological Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Bioengineering Option:  D. Cox (Assist. Dean) discussed the matrix handout that outlined in detail the two minors and the option. The matrix has been reviewed by J. Jenkins (T&AM), J. Bartsch (ABEN) and M. Shuler (Bioeng. & ChemE). The matrix was created to help students understand the differences between the three programs. C. Van Loan (CS) suggested that the Bioengineering Option be changed to a Minor in Bioengineering. D. Cox responded that if the CCGB wanted to change it to a minor that would be fine, but departments own minors and options are administered by a cross-departmental committee. She indicated that there is a new Academic Standards section under the Bioengineering Option; this will be updated in future handbooks. E. Giannelis (MS&E) observed that there is a fair amount of overlapping between the three programs and wondered why they could not be merged into one minor. R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) stated that combining the three areas into one minor would be too confusing for students because it would give them too many options to choose from. J. Belina (ECE) mentioned that students can combine their interests in biology and engineering in 2 other ways: the College Program and by taking electives in biology. D. Cox stated that the College Program is not viewed as a biology specialty because it is intended to be much broader than that. R. Kay (EAS) added that some engineering departments such as CEE and EAS already have a big biology component.

Not on Agenda but Discussed: Approval of CS 321 As an ENGRD Course. C. Van Loan (CS) discussed the handout that detailed the catalog entry of CS 321. This is a Fall course taught by R. Elber (CS), and CS would like it added in the “scientific computing” category of distributions. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that any major rule or curriculum changes need to be approved by 2/3 of the engineering faculty. The current curriculum policy states that ENGRD courses must be taken in the first 4 semesters. R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) added that ENGRD courses serve 2 purposes: introductory engineering courses and fulfilling technical electives. R. Kay (EAS) questioned whether this proposal was driven by the necessity to meet a 300-level requirement for CALS. C. Van Loan replied that it was the major impetus for the proposal. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that CS should make it clear to the students that CS 321 does not satisfy the computing applications requirement. T. Healey (T&AM) mentioned that it appears that CS 321 is a higher level than CS 322. C. Van Loan responded that the focus of the course is totally different. R. Cleary suggested that the CCGB members give the proposal more thought and vote on it at the 3/2/01 CCGB Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m.