Agenda, February 20, 2004
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Proposal For a New ENGRG Course, ENGRG 357 (R. Kline)
4. CCGB Committees
5. ABET

CCGB Minutes, February 6, 2004

Members: J. Bartsch, A. Center, D. Gries, D. Grubb, T. Healey, R. Kay, B. Kusse,
K. Pingali, W. Philpot, L. Trotter

Ex-Officio: D. Bell, B. East, R. Evans, L. Schneider

Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East announced that a new Director of Advising had been hired. His name is Richard Robbins, he is from West Virginia University, and he will begin in Engineering Advising on 5/10/04.
A. Center stated that he received 5 out of 19 course evaluations in one of his courses and wondered if that return rate was consistent with what is seen overall.
D. Gries said that he received a return of about 95% because he gave students the equivalent of a quiz grade for completing the course evaluation. If they didn’t do the evaluation, they didn’t get the credit. The average return on all course evaluations was 56%. B. East asked how the return rate compared with that of previous years and said that it would be important to look at the feedback. A. Center wondered if the return rate differed by year, i.e. seniors, freshmen, etc.
B. Kusse said that he had a 40% return, and those completing the evaluations appeared to be the unhappy students rather than a more balanced cross section. He did an informal sampling and discovered that a lot of students that liked the class material didn’t bother filling out the course evaluations online, but they would have done a paper evaluation in class. He doesn’t think that students should receive a grade for submitting an online course evaluation. D. Gries said that if you require the online evaluation for a grade, receiving 100% return doesn’t affect the grade in the course.

Discussion of Nomenclature in Engineering: Programs, Majors, Minors, Fields, Specializations, Options, Concentrations and Tracks: D. Gries stated that currently everyone is confused about what a field, major, option, program, minor, track, concentration and specialty are. Field Coordinators in departments coordinate a major, not a field. D. Gries, B. East, and D. Cox propose revising the student handbook. Majors would be structured by the major itself and not by the department. A proposed revision was distributed to all present. D. Gries indicated a number of pages where program objectives had been added in for ABET, course listings were more detailed so that students could get to know more quickly what they’re majoring in, and department names were listed accurately for ABET. Wherever “field” appeared in the handbook, they replaced it with the word “major”. On the first page of the handbook, under “Major” are listed major-required courses, major-approved electives, and major-complementary courses (courses outside the major). The proposed revision changes just about everything in the handbook, and departments should look in the handbook to see what has been done. They didn’t fix CEE because they’re not sure when the Environmental Engineering Major will be in place. The flowcharts have not been corrected yet. The major impetus for the change is the creation of majors that span departments and colleges. It has been very confusing for years. The fall 2004 ABET accreditation review is another reason for making the change now. ABET has
complained in the past about the confusing nomenclature. We want to face this issue once and for all, and in a year have the changes complete.

B. Kusse asked when the corrections are needed and where they should be sent. D. Gries said that they could be given to him. This isn’t really a CCGB matter, but this seemed a good place to broach this subject. Dean Fuchs gave his permission to make the changes, and hopefully they will simplify things.

The Proposal on Nomenclature states that:

1) The Engineering College, including central administration and all its offices, the schools, and the departments, will use “Majors” when referring to Bachelor of Science degree programs.

The term “field” is reserved only for referring to Graduate Fields of the Graduate School (and also for things like field trips in a course). For example, from now on, undergraduate field coordinators will be called Undergraduate Major Coordinators, or simply Major Coordinators.

2) Web-based material for departments, schools, and the Engineering College administration will be changed to reflect the new nomenclature in the next three months (or sooner), wherever it is feasible.

3) All paper material should be changed to reflect the new nomenclature the next time the material is to be revised.

4) Where appropriate for marketing purposes, the names of departments and schools will be used in addition to, but not in place of, the names of Majors. For example, in undergraduate admission publications, both departments and Majors will be highlighted.

The result of all this is that we will have:

1. Schools and Departments, which give courses and administer undergraduate Majors, where a Major is a program of courses leading to a bachelor of science degree.

2. Graduate Fields, which administer graduate degrees.

D. Gries asked what people thought of the proposed changes, despite the work that will be required. J. Bartsch said that he thinks consistency across the college is good, and it will be good for the students in particular. D. Gries mentioned that the word “concentration” (defined as a focused study) is used by CEE and other departments. In CS and ECE they’re called “specializations”. He wants them to change the term “specializations” to “concentrations”. PeopleSoft defines “specialization” as a period of short-time specialized study. K. Pingali said that there is a difference in terminology between the Arts and Engineering Colleges. D. Gries said that they would check with the Arts College. The goal is to make all colleges consistent with the terminology. R. Kay said that the Arts College uses the term “concentrations” for minors. K. Pingali suggested that the notion of “concentration” be eliminated and added that the more terms we use, the more likely it is that confusion will arise. A. Center asked if the proposed changes had been broached with the Directors and Chairs. D. Gries replied that they had not yet been discussed with the Directors and Chairs; they wanted to discuss the changes with the CCGB members first.

R. Evans asked if the idea behind some of the proposed changes were an attempt to acknowledge interdisciplinary possibilities for undergraduate students. If the answer were yes, he wondered if there was a way to become interdisciplinary enough to establish a concentration. D. Gries replied that what they’re trying to do is acknowledge the disciplinary stuff and not make it confusing. B. East added that the Arts College would change “concentrations” to “minors”. D. Gries said that the proposed changes would ensure that the Engineering College is consistent with the rest of the university. He requested that departments begin looking through the revised handbook and if changes are required, to let him know. B. East said that they would get information about the flow charts to every department. A. Center said that as we get into Master of Engineering degrees, they have Systems Engineering, which is a field. He wondered if PeopleSoft would handle that.
D. Bell said that the Graduate School would handle all graduate-related changes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 a.m.