## Agenda, March 19, 2004
### CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Course Renumbering (B. East and D. Bell)
4. Online Course Evaluation for Spring Semester (D. Gries and M. Hammer)
5. Nomenclatures: Major, Minor, Concentration, etc. (B. East and D. Bell)
6. Where ECP Courses Fit In As Liberal Studies Courses (R. Evans)
7. What Is A Distribution Course? (D. Grubb)

## CCGB Minutes, March 12, 2004


Ex-Officio: D. Cox, B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, L. Schneider, K. Smith

Other:  C. Pakkala

### Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of 2/20/04 were approved after replacing “TAM” with “Admissions” in the final paragraph.

### Undergraduate Announcements:
B. East: She and D. Gries have been meeting with The Associate and Assistant Deans regarding PeopleSoft. They will bring items that require input to the next CCGB meeting. D. Gries mentioned that Arts & Sciences is changing their terminology, and their minor will correspond to what we think it should be. He also thanked everyone for submitting changes to him for the Courses of Study.

### PINs And Whether Engineering Will Use Them:
D. Gries stated that the College of Arts & Sciences would no longer utilize PINs. The question is whether engineering wants to give them up. PINs will only be in effect until PeopleSoft is utilized for the student system. Each college will be able to set a default to determine if the advisor’s consent is needed. Each advisor can decide that on an individual basis for their students. B. East said that A&S advisors have had trouble with getting PINs to the correct students and it has been a nightmare for them. B. Kusse stated that he has in the past given students the authority to register on their own, but problems developed and they didn’t come to see him. Advising is very important, and advisors should be required to see their advisees. D. Gries distributed K. PINgali’s statement, which indicated his desire to abolish PINs. D. Maloney Hahn said that the Student Experience Committee wants to keep PINs. The PIN number just freezes course requests, and there is no disadvantage to using it. D. Grubb stated that Engineering should follow the decision of the Student Experience Committee and continue to use PINs. J. Bartsch agreed that PINs should continue to be used. The CCGB agreed to continue to utilize PINs.

### The charge to committees concerning ABET:
D. Grubb stated that the CCGB committees were told they needed to do various things back in November.

### CCGB Review of Post Course Assessments
D. Cox distributed a draft checklist for the post-course assessment review. The two-page draft form was meant as a catalyst for discussion. The CCGB will ultimately need to determine how to review the post-course assessments. She and D. Gries are currently collecting syllabets and after that cycle is completed, they will collect post-course assessments. There are unique challenges this year; everyone is learning how to put together post-course assessments and how to review them. The checklist might be helpful for faculty who are writing post-course assessments as well as for those reviewing them. The intent of having a form like this is to save time. For a well-done post-course assessment, the committee could just check the boxes on the form. The form includes areas to evaluate the assessment plan, the samples of...
student work, and improvement plans if applicable. More importantly, it gives the CCGB committees a section to make recommendations for changes to the Common Curriculum.

It is critical that every course outcome have one direct assessment method and that samples of student work be collected representing satisfactory to excellent performance. Surveys and other indirect measures can be used to supplement the direct measures. The Post Course Assessment should include a description of the analysis of the results showing student attainment of the course outcomes. If outcomes were not satisfactorily attained, or an instructor listed other areas as deficient, an improvement plan should be included in the Post Course Assessment. The plan would describe how the deficiencies would be remedied. The checklist is optional; not required.

B. Kusse asked if the assessments reflected the instructor’s or student’s point of view. D. Gries responded that they reflect the instructor’s point of view. The assessment would focus on specific questions on an exam, determine if certain outcomes were met, etc. B. Kusse stated that they write exam questions to assess if the students have adequately grasped the material they want to teach the students. D. Cox said that it is possible for a student to do well on an exam but they could have missed a question that measures mastery of a specific outcome. B. Kusse asked for an example of how an outcome would be assessed. D. Cox gave the following example” A course outcome stated, “students would understand and be able to apply multiple regression”. A student got a B on the exam by correctly answering all of the questions about probability but missed the question that demonstrated his ability to apply multiple regressions. While the overall exam performance was good, it did not demonstrate that the student met the stated multiple-regression course outcome. Only a measure of performance related to the specific multiple-regression question would measure attainment of the multiple regression course outcomes.

D. Gries stated that the outcomes for CS100 were on the ABET website and could be viewed as another example of how to determine outcomes. He added that the outcomes should be made general enough so that this is an easy process. B. Kusse said that the ABET process is very confusing for people in his department. D. Cox stated that the course outcomes should be specific to the course content. The post-course assessment doesn’t assess ABET criteria a-k but focuses on outcomes specific to a particular course. Those specific course outcomes should map to the ABET criteria a-c but should not restate them. M. Louge said that his committee came up with a virtual course, essentially basket weaving, which they posted on their website and which might be useful for other departments to view. They prepared the syllabet, the course assessment procedure, and then made up the assessment report. D. Gries stated that each committee would have to look at post-course assessments and make decisions about whether changes are needed. D. Cox said that a small sample set of documentation should be collected for each course and these materials will be available for review by the ABET evaluator. D. Grubb stated that he is confused about what the post-course assessment group needs. D. Gries replied that the idea is that if the Distributions Committee takes a look at the ENGRD post-course assessments and gets an idea of what was submitted, that’s fine. They may not need to have any changes made. D. Cox agreed to send the checklist electronically to the CCGB members. A consistent process for CCGB committee review of the Post Course Assessments should be developed. A post-course assessment need not be long —if there are no problems, one page or less. M. Louge said that the number of pages submitted would depend on the number of course outcomes.

Mapping Common Curriculum Courses to ABET Criteria a-k

D. Cox said that she has looked at the common curriculum courses and mapped them to ABET criteria a-k. She and David Gries will review this matrix and if the common curriculum doesn’t meet criteria that it should, they will bring the issue to the CCGB. D. Grubb said that the common curriculum probably won’t cover design components, lifelong learning, or working in multidisciplinary groups. D. Cox said that she would share mapping information with departments.
Syllabets
D. Gries said that about 20 more syllabets need to be submitted. R. Kay asked how a change in instructor should be handled with regard to the syllabets. The current instructor doesn’t use the same syllabus as the former instructor. D. Gries stated that there should be common material that everyone should teach in the basic courses. The higher the course number, the more flexibility there is. R. Kay asked what should be done if one instructor want to emphasize one thing and the other emphasizes another thing. D. Gries replied that the outcomes should be written in a general fashion to cover both versions of the course. D. Cox added that as long as the program is happy with the program-level courses and CCGB is happy with the curriculum content, ABET will be happy with it.

Documentation of CCGB Curriculum Changes Since 1998
D. Cox distributed the draft of the Guidelines for Documenting CCGB Changes and Feedback Loops since 1998. Copies of the minutes that relate to curriculum changes made since 1998 will be provided to each CCGB committee. For each change made since 1998, each committee should write a brief summary description using the Guidelines. D. Cox agreed to send the guidelines electronically to the CCGB members and mentioned that the guidelines would be shared in the ABET planning meeting as well. D. Gries said that each of the committees is responsible for documenting the feedback loops. The committees are: Technical Writing, Liberal Studies, Math and Science and Distributions. The documentation submitted by each committee must show that the feedback loops are in place.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 a.m.