CCGB Meeting Agenda, April 21, 2006

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. CCGB Membership for 2006-2007
4. CHEM 211 Syllabus Change
5. Double and Triple Counting Courses in Minors
6. Game Design Minor
7. ENGRI Courses – Do we want to review these?

CCGB Minutes, March 17, 2006

Members: A. Center, E. Fisher, D. Gries, B. Isacks, L. Lion, L. Pollack,
C. Seyler, L. Trotter, A. Zehnder
Ex-Officio: B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, R. Robbins, L. Schneider, F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the February 17, 2006 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East mentioned that Dragon Day is today and that the Phoenix is outside Duffield Hall. She requested that everyone come out during the parade and support the students.

Math 190/191 Discussion: A. Zehnder said that the CCGB had discussed the Math 190 issue last time. The Math and Science Committee met with A. Schatz, F. Shumway, and R. Robbins to identify students who took the placement exam. The exam was done online, and given to students based on their AP scores. The threshold used meant that 400 students took the exam, which is a lot of students. F. Shumway said that the problem is that they don’t know what kind of calculus the students took in high school. A. Zehnder said that they still need to look at the scores for those who don’t pass the exam. E. Fisher stated that A. Schatz said that maybe 10 students are not ready for Math 191. B. East said that many more students than 10 have difficulty with Math 191 when the ASPAC review is done. A. Zehnder said that it is not clear whether they are not prepared when they come, or they don’t perform well in class, etc. F. Shumway stated that there is another piece to this. For those who don’t do well on the exam, they will take a course in the summer to prepare them for Math 191. L. Pollack said that 400 students are more than half of the incoming class. F. Shumway said that we are not sure what type of calculus course they had in their schools and they didn’t take an AP exam, so they would need to take the test. R. Robbins said that people with a low AP score would have been placed in Math 190. A. Zehnder said that students who come into the pre-freshman summer program would take the equivalent to Math 111 if they aren’t ready for Math 191. E. Fisher urged that the early date be kept for the Math 191 prelim. A. Zehnder agreed to talk to the Math Department about the prelim timing.

Academic Integrity: F. Shumway said that a couple of academic integrity situations had recently arisen. A student had been contacted by an Administrative Assistant for his local home address. When the student asked why it was needed, he was referred to a professor, who said it had to do with an academic integrity issue. The student came to see Fran and was in a bad way (stressed out). The department had a preliminary hearing, and the student was told by the professor that a decision would be made in 2 weeks, thus adding to the student’s stress. F. Shumway asked what the protocol is for violating A.I. and wondered how it is discussed in class. She wondered what a reasonable amount of time would be for a student to be formally charged after a primary hearing. D. Gries replied that a...
student should know almost immediately what they are being charged with. L. Pollack said that it is best to call the students in right away, tell them the problem, and then assess them a penalty. L. Trotter stated that one reason it takes time to notify students about an outcome is because more than one student might be involved, and it is better to see them individually, not collectively. Until 1 or 2 years ago he rarely saw anything like this. F. Shumway said that they are seeing more students in the Advising Office about this type of issue. A. Zehnder said that faculty members need to follow protocols and be consistent. They need to tell students what is going on. F. Shumway said that it is not clear about how to notify a student and what the time frame is. A. Zehnder said that it is up to the faculty member to contact the student. They need to contact the student and let them know what the issue is. D. Gries stated that the Advising Office will draft up some academic integrity guidelines.

**What Constitutes an ENGRI Course:** D. Gries stated that Information Systems came up with a course and didn’t ask for it to be an ENGRI course in the beginning. Then D. Williamson wondered why it wasn’t an ENGRI and how it could be. The course doesn’t seem to contain much engineering, but rather more science. He wondered what needs to be in an ENGRI course. No set of guidelines exist for what constitutes an ENGRI course. He suggested that the CCGB look at the ENGRI courses every 4 or 5 years for content. D. Maloney Hahn said that in 1994 the intro courses were created as a requirement and needed to contain both introduction to engineering processes and open-ended problem solving skills. A. Center said that if there are no significant linkages to engineering, then it is not engineering course. B. East wondered whether departments that aren’t ABET accredited should have intro courses. L. Trotter said that Information Systems should have to prepare a syllabus. They need to say they will do design and open-ended problems. A. Zehnder said that it should be a 3 credit, 100-level course. It doesn’t look like an engineering course, but engineering as a discipline changes over the years. B. Isacks stated that the implicit requirement is that the ENGRI courses are proposed by an engineering department. The presumption is that it is probably relevant for engineering. B. East said that the CCGB should still look at the intro courses and make sure they are doing what we intended them to do. D. Gries said that the Curriculum Committee will look at them.

The meeting adjourned at 8:34 a.m.