CCGB MINUTES
February 6, 1998


Members Absent:  M. Duncan and J. Hopcroft

Ex-Officio:  D. Cox, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, and F. Shumway

Others:  S. Dennis-Conlon

Minutes:  J. Abel, Chair, CEE:  Minutes of January 30, 1998 were distributed and approved as read.

Announcements:  K. Hover, Assoc. Dean:
1. Update on ABET Accreditation for Fall 1998.  A recent letter from ABET (attached) indicated a July 1, 1998 due date for the self-study portion of the evaluation process.  ABET discussions will be occurring later in the semester, early March, with representatives from former ABET participants.  Suggestions of people who might help lead such a discussion were Sam Linke, Jery Stedinger, and Tob de Boer.
2. Information and applications on the NSF-sponsored Chautauqua short course “Enhancing Student Success through a Model Introduction to Engineering Course” was distributed (attached).  Members of the college have previously attended.  Please pass on the information to any interested faculty members.
3. Merrill Presidential Award nomination information was delivered to Directors, Chairs, and Assoc. Directors yesterday.  This award recognizes highly motivated, successful students.  The accompanying letter from Susan Murphy’s office indicates a February 13th deadline.  The deadline, due to the lateness of the letter arriving in the Undergraduate Programs Office, has been extended to Tuesday, February 17th.  The criteria for the award is listed in Susan Murphy’s letter, however, the University announcement indicates the award is given to students in the top 5% of their graduating class.  You may choose to nominate a student who is not listed as in the top 5% but has demonstrated criteria in other areas.  For your convenience each department memo regarding the award list students in the top 5%.  The GPA is the starting point, but the other award criteria include demonstrated leadership ability, community involvement, and potential for continued contributions to society.
4. Liability for faculty who advise student organizations has previously been discussed during the fall semester.  At that time it was decided that the CCGB committee was not the best or only forum for this topic.  Instead, this topic has been brought to the Directors & Chairs at their December 1997 meeting.  A representative of Risk Management will attend the Directors & Chairs February 17th meeting for further discussion.  What is discussed at that meeting will be reviewed later with the CCGB.  In early December, Civil & Environmental Engineering invited Allan Bova from Risk Management to meet with CEE representatives.  The collected advice offered by Bova at this meeting were written down by Ken Hover, edited by Allan Bova, and distributed at the Directors and Chairs December meeting.  At this time, this document is the only written documentation in the University concerning the liability issue.  Copies were sent to Peter Stein and Susan Murphy, but as of this time there has not been a response.  C. Van Loan, CS:
Wrote a letter to the University counsel’s office requesting guidelines on this issue. A letter should be forthcoming from the counsel’s office soon. This topic will be on the CCGB agenda again after the Directors & Chairs February 17th meeting.

5. Gold Stole Awards and special regalia will be discussed at today’s Associate Dean meeting. Due to misunderstandings and new marketing ploys, Engineering was one of the colleges at the University who purchased honor stoles for the first time last year. Thoughts are that graduation day is the only day in which students are treated as one, and honor distinctions should not be part of regalia at that time (honors designations do appear in the printed commencement program). Would like the recommendation of the CCGB for the college to NOT engage in the honor regalia in the future. CCGB members agreed unanimously with this recommendation.

**Electrical Engineering Proposal for Approved Electives:** John Abel, Chair, CEE: The January 30th discussion revolved around some of the administrative aspects of this issue. Discussion today should focus on the academic side, and whatever decision is made the administrative components will follow. Began with a round table discussion with each department stating their stand on the issue along with a quick summary of thoughts on the topic:

- MS&E - split, half who care about the issue/half who are neutral
- A&EP - would reduce flexibility
- M&AE - problem could be changed by field curriculum
- T&AM - no changes; problem could be changed by the field
- GS - agree with T&AM
- ORIE - also agree with T&AM
- ABEN - no changes; provide flexibility for students
- CS - have no problems with the way things are
- CEE - neutral, their field is barely making ABET requirements, if change occurs probably would treat electives as discretionary.
- EE - the motion would solve short-term problem in EE. Electrical Engineering feels students were more educated prior to curriculum changes. EE would like to pursue this larger issue as the curriculum review continues. Is the college doing their job in the education of the students?

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The approved electives are described as enhancing a student’s career and professional objectives.

P. Kintner, EE: In the curriculum review, which was done to help the lower level students succeed, flexibility was designed to be beyond the field program in order for student to enhance their educational experience.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: Freshmen may not know what they want in approved electives.

R. Kay, GS: Has never been asked to approve an approved electives as a freshman advisor.

K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: Pre-medical students often fill in approved electives in their first few semesters.

P. Kintner: Seniors are taking too few courses, internal discussions with EE faculty have taken place concerning this.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: As a freshman advisor, I encourage students to start working on their liberal arts requirements if they have an open slot.

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Normally freshman schedules are booked with 3-4 math courses and the freshman writing seminar.
J. Jenkins, T&AM: More and more students are coming to Cornell with a whole year of AP credits.
D. Cox, Asst. Dean: Isn’t the issue that field advisors cannot tell what courses were approved as an approved elective or which were approved as a liberal arts elective (by the frosh/sophomore advisor)?
F. Shumway, Advising: Devised a draft checklist (attached) that could be put in the freshman folder which, if completed by the freshman advisor, could inform the field advisor what was previously decided.
D. Grubb, MS&E: The Minors issue is also involved within this whole discussion.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Students are still taking the economic way and staying less time at Cornell.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: EE was reminding us that the flexibility is beyond the core program.
J. Jenkins, T&AM: Students with one year of AP credit are still going to try to get a MEng degree within a four year time frame.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Can we do anything to modify the definition of approved electives and let the fields decide if they are field approved electives or advisor approved electives?
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: It is fair to say that, based on the poll of departments at the start of this discussion, the proposal from EE will not be approved by the CCGB. Rather EE has the option and flexibility to increase the field requirements beyond the minimum of 48 credits. This could be done by requiring less junior-level courses and more senior-level courses or add additional senior-level courses to the field requirements.
C. Van Loan, CS: Like the use of the word “free” which implies that students have a choice of what they wish to take. “Free” electives maybe an incentive for students wavering on which college or university they wish to attend.
K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: Would the freshman advisor sign the checklist as well?
F. Shumway, Advising: Freshman advisor would only need to sign for approved electives. After the approved electives listing we could add “generally taken after affiliation”. This checklist would become part of the freshman folder which is passed on to the field advisor.
P. Kintner, EE: It would be nice if the checklist also had a line or two where students could list their career objectives. Might explain why a student is choosing certain electives.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Are there complaints that the folders are not being sent to the field advisors?
F. Shumway, Advising: The Advising Office has not had any complaints that field advisors have not received freshman folders. The affiliation form does not require the signature of the freshman advisor. The field receives the student transcript once they are affiliated.
J. Jenkins, T&AM: Can fields decide whether to ask for approved electives?
C. Van Loan, CS: Fields could also request additional information, such as approved electives, as part of the affiliation process.
R. Kay, GS: The timing of the completion of the checklist could be a problem as students add/drop courses.
P. Kintner, EE: Emphasize to freshman advisors the criteria for approved electives during advisor training.

Freshman Advisors: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Last year a formula was created and used to determine the number of freshman advisors needed from each field (attached). This algorithm was fairly successful and advising would like to use this formula again. The proposed cut-off date would be March 27, 1998, one week after spring break, in order to allow time for more accurate data but still allow planning and notification of advisors.
C. Van Loan, CS: If this algorithm is designed to simplify the process wouldn’t it be better to calculate the numbers when the data is correct? Would a May 1st deadline achieve that?
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The deadline of March 27th was to allow for fields to assign their freshman advisors, notify those people, and get the data to the Advising Office. With a May 1st date it is less likely that faculty will be notified before the semester ends. If the notification process could be sped up a later date could be used.
D. Bartel, M&AE: The data is “after the fact” no matter when you set it as things change on a daily basis.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The algorithm seems fair. No matter what date you set adjustments will still have to be made. We can discuss this further at a future meeting.

Next Meeting: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: As John will be out of town next week, D. Bartel, has agreed to chair the CCGB meeting. Major topic will be the Biology Sub-Committee report.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 am.

Tentative agenda for February 13, 1998:
1. Approval of February 6, 1998 minutes
2. Announcements (Hover)
3. Biology Sub-Committee Report (Van Loan) and discussion