Agenda, March 8, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 3/01/02 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Resume discussion of second recommendation to College Program Committee
4. Request Across University for Uniformity of Language of Honors Designations
5. Note: next week Sally Klingen (ILR) will present results of study of engineering students’ considerations at time of affiliation

CCGB Minutes
March 1, 2002


Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, T. Shapiro, K. M. Smith

Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 22, 2002 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: None.

Act on Motion Concerning Engineering Minors: C. Van Loan (CS) presented his amended motion concerning eligibility and procedures for Engineering Minors. He stated that it is consistent with the interdisciplinary minors that are being created throughout the university. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) added that it takes into account case law and sum up the previous CCGB discussions. F. Gouldin (M&AE) asked if a faculty vote would be required if the motion was passed. T. Jordan replied that a faculty vote did not seem necessary, but that she would ask the Dean his opinion. T. Healey (T&AM) moved to modify item “b” in the first paragraph of the motion to read as follows: “Complete satisfactorily six courses (18 credits minimum) stipulated in a College-approved Engineering Minor offered by an engineering school or department.” J. Bisogni (CEE) seconded the change. A vote to approve the amendment was passed with 6 in favor, 2 opposed and 1 abstained. Bartsch (BEE) stated that the Biomedical Minor exists already and asked if the BEE students would be able to minor in that. T. Jordan replied that they could do that if the BEE faculty approved the motion, but noted that today’s vote does not address the issue of the Biomedical Engineering Program’s “integrated minor”. C. Van Loan added that it would be stipulated in the course catalog what fields could take each minor. F. Gouldin asked if the intent of the motion is for the faculty in the fields to look at the intellectual content of the minors and determine if their students can take them. T. Jordan replied in the affirmative. F. Gouldin stated that because the original legislation was set up by the College, the CCGB has no authority to amend it, and he thinks that the motion should require College faculty review and a vote, if only via e-mail. He also stressed the importance of assessing the long-term viability of the unit which offers the minor, to ensure that the courses in the minor are offered regularly. C. Van Loan responded that the motion is academically sound, has permanence and will be controlled by the sponsors. The **Amended Motion on Engineering Minors was approved with 6 in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstentions.**

Statements by Individual Fields as to Whether Their Major Students will be Allowed to Participate in the Information Sciences Minor: T. Jordan asked the CCGB faculty if their departments approved of the Information Sciences Minor for students majoring in their department. C. Seyler said that the majority of the ECE faculty were opposed; M. Duncan said the ChemE faculty approved; J. Bisogni said 2 of the CEE faculty
were opposed, but most approved, and that he would return later with an official response; B. Kusse said the A&EP faculty would likely approve; J. Bartsch said the BEE faculty would approve; F. Gouldin asked for more consultation time with the M&AE faculty; C. Van Loan said the CS faculty approve; D. Ruppert said the ORIE faculty response is unknown; R. Kay said that the EAS faculty would approve.

Present and Debate Motions of Recommendations to College Program: C. Van Loan (CS) proposed Motion 1: The CCGB recommends to the College Program Committee that the College Program henceforth be referred to as the “Independent Major.” He said that the name change allows for more creativity and takes any stigma off the program. T. Healey (T&AM) added that the proposed title change is more realistic. The motion was approved with 10 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

Motion 2: The CCGB recommends to the College Program Committee that students should apply to the program before the end of the fourth semester and can only be admitted if they are in good standing. B. Kusse (A&EP) asked if the only change to the College Program admittance guidelines was the required GPA from 3.0 to 2.0 and wondered who advises the students. T. Jordan replied that changing the GPA requirement is the basic change and that the Assoc. Dean and the College Program committee oversee the program and sometimes advise the students, but the students also have faculty advisors associated with their chosen major and minor. B. Kusse expressed his view that students graduating from the College Program are in a poorer employment position (are less marketable) with interviewers than are those students who are graduating from accredited departments. T. Healey (T&AM) replied that the College Program students are in a different job pool and that the employment stigma of the College Program is not of great importance because 2/3 of engineering students don’t go into engineering fields anyway. Some go into non-engineering fields in graduate school and some go into business positions. T. Shapiro indicated her approval of the College Program by stating that the program helps by giving a large range of students a larger range of possibilities. B. Kusse stated that the College Program was initially set up for good students and the students were therefore attractive to employers who want better students. C. Van Loan (CS) responded that if a student is in their 5th semester at Cornell and has a C-average, there is nothing wrong with that because that student is officially in good standing in the College. He added that employers generally look at factors in addition to a student’s GPA. B. Kusse stated the need for discipline and structure for poorer students and observed that the current College Program doesn’t have much structure. C. Van Loan replied that a group of faculty could set up a general studies template for both advisors and students, which would provide program structure. K. Athreya (Minority & Women’s Progs.) said that many schools have 15-20 different templates for their majors. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that changing the GPA requirements causes the honors characteristic to be lost and that a curriculum that is not offered in departments should only be offered to better students. T. Jordan responded that not all non-3.0 students are unmotivated and questioned the assertion that a high GPA is evidence that a student is well suited to a flexible program. It is possible that the students with low GPAs don’t fit well in an engineering department and would do better in a more flexible and creative program. She added that not all avenues should be closed to a 2.0 student if they can’t affiliate with a department. D. Ruppert (ORIE) moved to table Motion 2 and J. Bartsch (BEE) seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.