CCGB Meeting Agenda, February 22, 2008

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. New committee assignments and review of committee charges (Fisher)
4. CS100/101 update and syllabi (Gries/Fan/van Loan)
5. Update on Math 191/2 workshops (Gries)

CCGB Minutes, February 8, 2008

Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 11/30/07 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East said that during the middle of March SIS will be transitioning to the new PeopleSoft system. The main impact on faculty is that the Faculty Advisor will be replaced with a web-based Faculty Center tool. It is easy to use, but online tutorials are also available. There will be a time when we won’t be able to get up-to-date data—primarily during the spring break. If anyone needs information from SIS, they will need to get it before March 11. Undergraduate Coordinators will have view access, but they won’t be able to print during the period that the system is down. No transactions will happen while the system is down. A note about the transition will be sent to faculty next week. A note will also be sent to graduate and undergraduate coordinators. The Faculty Advisory Committee has seen this new system. It will provide us with at least what we’ve had in the past. It is easy to use, with web links. Students will get a letter about Just the Facts being down.

J. Bartsch asked if those who had access to SIS will have access to the new system. B. East replied that those in engineering who have had access to SIS should have access to the new system.

E. Fisher asked why both systems don’t overlap. D. Gries said that technically it would be extremely difficult. If you made a transaction on one, it would need to appear on the other. The information needs to be transferred to the new system, which then needs to be brought up while the other system is brought down. This will be during a 10-11 day period. B. East said that it will take about 50 hours just to transfer all of the information to the new system.

T. Fine asked how reliable the new system will be. D. Gries replied that the developers have been working on it for many years now. B. East added that all the registrars at Cornell have verified data after transfers from the old system to the new one, and glitches have been fixed along the way. There is no completely painless way to do this transition, but they are making it as painless as possible. W. Philpot asked why the transition could not wait until summer. B. East replied that the admissions records need to be put in the new system, and thus timing is a sequencing issue.

Course Numbering: B. East stated that the course numbers have been changed to 4 digit numbers. There are no 3-digit numbers in the new course roster or Courses of Study or the Engineering Handbook. D. Gries used his expertise to develop a look-up table, and it will be available online.

Notification of Parents: B. East stated that there is a minor change in the parental notification letters. In cases where a student is put on a leave of absence or withdrawn, it is “directory” information, and the Associate Directors can tell parents about that with no prior approval. But when students are given conditions to meet in order to remain in Engineering the following semester, the information is part of the academic record and can be shared with parents only by the Dean’s designees.
The letters have been changed for leaves of absence to indicate that students are not at Cornell during the semester (to allay fears that they can never come back). If we think a student is in serious trouble, the Dean’s designees can tell parents what we think is important. The students given a warning are not in serious trouble, so we prefer that people stick with letters. The university will defend someone if they have a student in distress, they share information with the parents, and then a lawsuit arises later. E. Fisher asked if there is a specific form with the student’s permission information on it. B. East replied that the University Registrar’s Office doesn’t have a template, but our Engineering Registrar, Duncan Bell, has one. A student can request that their academic information not be shared with anyone. If they have done that, we can’t share the information about meeting conditions with parents. Undergraduate coordinators will be receiving a list of the students who have requested that information not be shared. People should check that list or check with D. Bell before sending the letter with conditions to parents. We’re trying to notify parents prior to a crisis situation. Often the students are depressed and spiral downward and then we have a bigger crisis than a student not registering.

**New committee assignments and review of committee charges:** E. Fisher said that there are several tasks to do regarding the motions passed on 6 February 2007 concerning the curriculum changes. The CCGB Physics Liaison Subcommittee will review the physics syllabi to try and determine how math can be integrated into the engineering courses.

The CCGB Chemistry/Biology Subcommittee will decide if and how to integrate math into CHEM 209 and 208.

An assessment regarding the effectiveness of the math 191/192 workshops needs to be done.

The syllabi of the CS100 and CS101 courses need to be generated and reviewed by the CCGB.

The liaison committees typically have one engineer plus representatives from the other related departments. E. Fisher will draft a new committee membership list and bring it to the next CCGB Meeting or circulate it before the next meeting. If anyone has an interest in any of the tasks, they should email her with their interest. S. Baker said that he interprets his involvement as coming through the Student Experience Committee. Perhaps the Student Experience Committee should be involved in this revamping process. B. East said that the Student Experience Committee is not active at the moment, so maybe its members could be on other committees. E. Fisher said that she welcomes thoughts on how to organize this.

A. Zehnder said that the Math Department thinks that the Math Liaison Subcommittee is their committee, although we review Math 191 and 192. We have an ad-hoc group for that. D. Gries stated that there is an upcoming meeting to discuss math and who should be revising the Math 191 questions and who should develop the Math 192 questions. We will also have questions about how the assessments are done. B. East said that the Math 191 workshops have been great, but a bunch of things have slipped through the cracks. We are trying to decide who should handle things administratively to make sure that things don’t slip any more. L. Schneider said that we need a group to make decisions. B. East stated that we want to get organized at the math meeting.

D. Gries stated that CS generated syllabi for the CS 100 and 101 courses but didn’t present it to the CCGB. They can present it for the CS 100 courses and 101 courses at a future CCGB Meeting.

**AP Statistics Exam:** D. Gries said that questions arose about whether credit should be given for AP Statistics. Math 270 requires calculus and Math 294 is a co-requisite. None of the departments who responded to his email survey would allow credit for AP STATS but would approve it as an advisor-approved elective (except for ORIE). The only way we would allow statistics for credit would be as an advisor-approved elective. D. Gries feels that we shouldn’t let it be used as advisor-approved elective. We should keep things as they are: not credit for the AP STATS. Allowing credit will cause confusion.
F. Shumway agreed that allowing students to receive credit would create confusion. Quite a few students ask about AP STATS at orientation each year.

**Review of Math 191 Workshops:** A. Zehnder stated that Marie Terrell from the Math Department called regarding a grant proposal. She wanted to know about what math problems our students were having in 200-level courses that prompted us to want the math workshops. She asked for copies of exams from key 200-level courses. She wants to know what courses are available and who is teaching them. Workshops were offered in the fall semester using questions pulled from 200-level courses. Students worked on the problems with a workshop facilitator for many weeks. An assessment was done in the fall. The assessment indicated that the workshops were okay but too long. We needed to revise the Math 191 workshops. We will implement workshops for Math 192 starting with Fall 2008. The Math Liaison Subcommittee met in December to discuss a revision of Math 191 and the creation of Math 192. D. Gries stated that our dean is willing to pay for the development of the Math 192 questions and the revision of the Math 191 questions. We need to decide who should do what. We feel that the Math Department should be involved with decision. There has been some confusion about who should be working on the changes. Irena Peeva and Mike Kelley seem to think they know who should be working on this. Hopefully it will be cleared up at the math meeting next week. A. Zehnder said that it will likely be up to Engineering who develops the questions and revises the Math 191 questions. B. East stated that it is important to make a collaborative decision with math. We need to use their energy and get their help. A. Zehnder responded that Math will defer to any reasonable decisions we make.

L. Schneider said that in the fall some surveys of students and the TAs and course assistants of Math 191 were done to see how the workshops went. We want to do a more powerful assessment with pre-testing in the relevant 200-level courses for a clearer test of whether this helps students to apply information to real-world types of problems. D. Gries said that the questions in the workshops took too long to answer this past semester. M. Kelley’s solution is to lengthen recitations. This isn’t a good solution since there are 30 of them. We should shorten the questions. S. Baker said that from the Curriculum Task Force’s point of view, the workshops are not what they expected. We need to scale down our expectations to what really works. It is not difficult to turn this around and do it well. We need to tie in quantitative measurements with what we’re doing with the students for the feedback loop. E. Fisher said that we need a CCGB-designated group to decide what to do with the workshop information.

S. Baker stated that CHEM. 209 will also require substantial oversight and interaction from the Chemistry Department to make sure it accomplishes what we want it to.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.