CCGB MINUTES
March 13, 1998


Members Absent: K. Gebremedhin, J. Hopcroft, J. Jenkins, and R. Kay

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

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon, J. Belina, and R. Thomas

Minutes: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Minutes of March 6, 1998 approved as distributed with the following change: D. Maloney Hahn and F. Shumway were not in attendance at the meeting.

Announcement: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The order of material taught in Math 294 has been partial differential equations first and then linear algebra second. The order is being reversed so that linear algebra will be taught first followed by partial differential equations. This switch is taking place because Math 294 directly relates to ENGRD 241 and 222 and impacts the order of material taught in these courses. Math 294 is a co-requisite not a pre-requisite to these courses. Any questions or concerns should be referred back to the Math/Science committee; J. Jenkins, Chair.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: ORIE has related some concerns regarding the sequence of Math 294. Is this still a concern?

D. Ruppert, ORIE: ORIE 270 is now being taught without the matrix portion in this course. Although not ideal it seems to be working teaching regression without matrices.

Student Experience Sub-Committee Report: F. Wise, A&EP, Chair of sub-committee, continued discussion of the Faculty Advising Evaluations. A draft of a letter, from the Dean, has been generated to distribute to the faculty (attached). The evaluations are not as closely tied to pre-registration as much as previously.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The evaluation forms are optically scanned. The fields will be responsible for the distribution and collection of the forms for upperclasspersons. Are No. 2 pencils required?

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Instructions will be sent with the forms.

P. Kintner, EE: With Project 2000 implementation these types of surveys should be able to be done relatively easily.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Project 2000, as of this point, does not have any surveying capability. It also does not even have advisor protection key or pin number in it. This problem was raised in the Assoc. Dean’s meeting.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Is the memo from the Dean suitable to distribute to the faculty?

D. Bartel, MAE: Can we change the word “upperclassmen” to upperclasspersons?

P. Kintner, EE: Electrical Engineering will be distributing and collecting the evaluation forms in the larger senior level courses. This will impact only a few faculty members but optimizes the return.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: CEE will be placing an evaluation form in each student’s mail folder.

F. Wise, A&EP: Will this method work to get a good return? It has been overwhelmingly reported that if there is no method for getting the evals returned it will not be done.

M. Duncan, ChE: Chemical Engineering is withholding the pin numbers until the student completes and returns their evaluation form.
C. Van Loan, CS: Will there be statistical data for the number of responses for each advisor?  
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Also, are the results of these evaluations distributed?  
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Typically, in other surveys, the Dean shares the information with the Director and Chairs. The distribution from that point varies from department to department.  
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Each field, using whatever methods they choose, should try to get the most complete collection of evaluation forms from juniors and seniors as possible.

**ENGRD 210:** P. Kintner, EE: The Electrical Engineering department has been involved in reviewing the curriculum. The first step is looking at ENGRD 210. ENGRD 210 is made up of differential equations and linear algebra, fundamental and in some cases redundant. The math sequence has been a problem. EE has streamlined this course to make it more attractive to students. The course starts with analog and moves to digital and is a device-oriented course, ignoring ordinary differential equations. This course is a work in progress with at least 75% of the revised course syllabus going to be taught next semester.  
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Is this course a distribution requirement for affiliation?  
P. Kintner, EE: 231 is the distribution course needed for affiliation, although 210 is a pre-requisite for upper junior level courses. The pre-requisite structure will stay the same. The course number will not change.  
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Will the title, “Introduction to Electrical Engineering I” be confused with the Introduction to Engineering courses?  
P. Kintner, EE: The catalog copy goes in today so the title could still be changed. There was no intent to confuse this course with the introduction courses.  
C. Van Loan, CS: How does this course fit together with others?  
P. Kintner, EE: EE does not feel that metrics will be needed, just freshman calculus.  
R. Thomas, EE: The EE faculty approved the content but there may be too much material to be covered in one semester. Until the course is actually taught we won’t be sure. In the case that there is too much material some will have to be omitted.  
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Do we want to approve the content?  
D. Grubb, MSE: New distribution courses are typically reviewed by the CCGB Engineering Distribution Sub-Committee where the committee may ask for additional and all material relating to this course.  
P. Kintner, EE: As I am the chair of the Engineering Distribution Sub-Committee and half the members are EE faculty this issue has essentially been reviewed by the sub-committee. I would like to make the following motion:  
“i move the following syllabus be approved for the modernization of EE 210.”  
Motion was seconded.  
C. Van Loan, CS: Will the same groups of students be targeted for this course?  
J. Belina, EE: The course covers more interesting topics and it may be that students outside of EE are attracted to it.  
P. Kintner, EE: EE would like to move forward, with the CCGB approval, on the development of this course following the track indicated.  
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: When the syllabus EE 210 is set a re-examination of this course in CCGB should be done.  
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: How many credit hours is this course? P. Kintner, EE: The credit hours remain the same at three.  
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: I am uncomfortable with the title remaining as listed because of the possible confusion that may take place.  
P. Kintner, EE: The title will be listed as Electrical Engineering I.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: All in favor of approving the syllabus for EE 210? Motion carried unanimously.

Course Evaluation Procedures and Instruments: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Interested in making a motion, in the future, along the lines of: “Establish a sub-committee of the CCGB, to make recommendations to the Dean, through the CCGB, on policy and procedures for course evaluations.” Questions are consistently asked regarding course evaluations and interpretation of statistics. The Dean uses these evaluations as broad instruments, not specific content. Course evaluations are distributed at the end of the semester. They can be handed out anywhere from the last third of the semester to finals. The forms are optically scanned and processed. Some of this processing is done in the Advising Office, some in the Undergraduate Programs Office and then finally in the Dean’s office. No one office is specifically in charge of the course evaluations. The idea would be to give the course evaluations a home. Having the course evals go through the CCGB would be a way to give the Dean specific recommendations. There is also no uniformity in how chairs use the evaluations; for example, some do not even share them with the faculty who has taught the course.

P. Kintner, EE: What is the motivation to making recommendations to the Dean as the Directors and Chairs have latitude to do what they want anyway? The course evaluations are tied directly to salary.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: CCGB could make recommendations to the Dean who would, in turn, relay them to the Director’s and Chairs. The comments are coming from faculty who are concerned with course evaluations.

C. Van Loan, CS: The statistics are poor. Grade inflation is a concern. I believe the college should publish the percent of A, B, C’s in every course, 400 level or below. There is a tremendous correlation between grades and course evaluations. This is not a good trend and should be looked at along with the analysis of the statistics. There should be a 100% return of evaluations. The evaluations should be hand written, not bubble sheets. Much of the evaluation process is driven by the person in charge of the opt. scanner. The College of Engineering is the most quantitatively astute; yet its use of course evaluation statistics do not reflect this.

P. Kintner, EE: Agrees with much of what C. Van Loan has said. The evaluations have a broad range of topics with a wide spectrum and a whole bag of issues. Would we be able to solve this issue if we pursued it?

C. Van Loan, CS: If the statistics and data are being held secretive that it becomes a political issue. The reality may be that we would be unable to change the way the evaluation procedures and analysis is done. The Directors and Chairs may not have confidence in the numbers so choose not to distribute this information. I have heard of cases where the procedures are not followed properly. Some of the questions on the evaluations are ambiguous.

P. Kintner, EE: The whole evaluation is reduced down to questions 5, 8 and 13. How would we start dividing the issue up?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: There are concerns in the college and sometimes some of these concerns are buried. Do we want to establish a body of people to oversee the course evaluation process? Nothing is specifically wrong with the way course evaluations are conducted. Would a sub-committee be a good way to make recommendations to the Dean, since this issue has a steady stream of comments?

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: There are no set policies and procedures on the way course evaluations are processed and there should be some.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The Dean agrees that a CCGB sub-committee would be good. This issue has not, however, been raised to the Directors and Chairs.

D. Ruppert, ORIE: Would the findings of this sub-committee be looked at and then ignored by the Directors and Chairs?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The Dean sees that some sort of course evaluation is critical to help improve the instruction at the college.
D. Ruppert, ORIE: The CCGB sub-committee should be able to make policy not just recommendations.
P. Kintner, EE: There are two parts to this issue; the evaluation part and the improvement of undergraduate teaching. We may not be able to address the second part but perhaps the first by addressing uniformity of mechanical procedures. This topic is too big to address now.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: This sub-committee would not be designed to produce results by the end of the semester, rather a long-term project. If we are concerned about the student experience then curriculum is an important part of this. One of the reasons that course evaluation procedures should be done uniformly is to foster usefulness of the results for faculty to improve teaching.
P. Kintner, EE: C. Van Loan believes that large samples of data is important to get back good statistics but I believe that the number of returns vs. the number of students attending is also important for statistically purposes.
F. Wise, A&EP: Who and how did the course evaluations originate?
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The course evaluations were partly done over time and with the task force a few years ago.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: The task force recommended written evaluations to the college, I believe. The task force did a thorough study but its recommendations were not implemented at the time. It would be worthwhile to look at the task force report again.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: There is no written policy regarding course evaluations. A sub-committee could do a procedural manual.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: There is lots of oral tradition and habit with course evaluations. Course evaluations play a very real and important role and there is a need for a forum to conduct these types of discussions.
F. Wise, A&EP: A some level some interpretation will be done by someone and comparisons made. The evaluations ultimately rely upon some level-headed person to assess them.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Could we have a straw indication of the CCGB to see if there is interest in a task force to investigate this issue with assurances from the Dean and the Directors and Chairs the ability to set new procedures?
C. Van Loan, CS: With no faculty time the percent of grade distribution could be published for each course to help understand the correlation of evaluations with grades and learn about grade inflation.
P. Kintner, EE: Isn’t course grade information available on the web now that the University publishes at least a mean grade for each course?
D. Bartel, MAE: This topic should be discussed more if we could set new policy on course evaluations and get support from the Dean.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: K. Hover will go back to the Dean with our concerns and ask for a specific charge. Then the pieces of the evaluation process could be divided within the sub-committee.
CCGB members generally assented to this approach.

No meeting on Friday, March 20.

Agenda for March 27, 1998:
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Main item will be either a report from the biology sub-committee or the minors proposals.