**CCGB Meeting Agenda, April 8, 2005**

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Double Major in Civil Engineering and in Environmental Engineering
4. ROTC Courses as Advisor-Approved Courses
5. Writing Assessment Issue

**CCGB Minutes, March 18, 2005**

Ex-Officio: R. Robbins, L. Schneider
Other: S. Coldren, C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the March 4, 2005 CCGB Meeting were approved with modifications.

**Undergraduate Announcements:** None.

**Double Major in Civil Engineering and in Environmental Engineering:** W. Philpot announced that approval had been obtained at the state level for the Environmental Engineering major and that the next step is accreditation. An ABET requirement is to have students who have already completed the program. The program was originally structured so that students could get an accredited degree from BEE or CEE while focusing on environmental engineering. Currently they end up with a degree in CEE and we need to document that they have finished the environmental engineering component. The way to do that would be to have them double major. For a double major they need to have a GPA greater than 3. This situation would presumably be only for 2 years. The CEE department has students who have already taken the courses decreed for the Environmental Engineering major. D. Gries asked if the students could have double majors even after accreditation. W. Philpot replied that environmental engineering would have to become significantly different in order for someone to double major. D. Grubb stated that it is important for the students to have an accredited degree. C. Pollock asked why accreditation is important for the students. W. Philpot replied that it is because the students need 12 years of apprenticeship to become professional engineers and 4 years at Cornell counts as 8 years toward that. J. Bartsch added that the students want to have the option of accreditation. It is an important stamp of certification for the students. C. Pollock said that it seems odd that we’ll pass out a second degree. He wondered if the students could do some token of extra work for that accredited degree. W. Philpot replied that the current students have already done extra work toward the degree. One of the students is taking a dual degree with ARTS and has done extra work toward the environmental engineering degree on top of that. D. Gries said that CEE can’t apply for accreditation until some students graduate with a degree from the Environmental Engineering major. W. Philpot stated that the students now take the chance that the program will be accredited. They are being clear with the current graduating students. There are 5 students this year and there will likely be a similar number for the 2006 class. C. Pollock asked what would be done in 2007 or 2008 if someone wants to double major in Environmental Engineering and major in Civil Engineering. W. Philpot replied that someone in CEE would have to take extra courses, such as a course in dynamics (which isn’t required in Environmental Engineering). D. Grubb said that the proposal isn’t clear. W. Philpot agreed to re-word the proposal to include “allow students who qualify for a double major to take this.” D. Grubb suggested that “until Environmental Engineering becomes accredited” be added to the proposal. D. Gries questioned what would happen if
accreditation isn’t done. W. Philpot responded that the students would then have a double major. J. Bartsch added that the accredited degree will be in BEE or CEE. D. Gries suggested that the CCGB approve this until 2006. W. Philpot stated that the CEE is assuming that the major will be accredited. The vote on the proposal will be done via email after the proposal is rewritten. A straw vote resulted in 10 members in favor, 0 against.

Making Affiliation Requirements Consistent: D. Gries stated that Dean Fuchs noticed that we have different bars and different tape measures for the bar regarding affiliation requirements. R. Robbins wondered if a student doesn’t do well in a math class and repeats it, which grade is used for affiliation. All engineering departments except ECE and Geo Sciences use the higher or most recent grade. There is a discrepancy in how majors look at repeated required courses. D. Gries added that it would be nice to have consistency across the majors. The proposal is to make a higher grade replace the lower one in a course. M. Louge said that there are no guidelines spelled out in the affiliation requirements in the handbook; the rule is implicit and a common practice. If guidelines are specified, they should be the same for every major. Anything that simplifies life for advisors is good. J. Bartsch said that he is amazed when students come in and begin the pre-affiliation process. They worry about a single grade. If we can agree to common verbiage, it would help students a lot. C. Pollock stated that if a student doesn’t meet the requirement for a class, they get a D, then if they retake the class and get a C, that does not demonstrate mastery of the subject matter; it is merely scraping by. B. Kusse said that students are looked at on an individual basis, regardless of what the current verbiage is. The AEP department looks to see if one course is a problem, or a series of courses, or some type of trend for affiliation. They require a certain threshold in each course. A student could keep taking a course until they get a certain grade. D. Gries wondered if a student could affiliate with AEP if they received a D and then a B-. B. Kusse replied that they could, if that were their only weakness. M. Louge stated that putting the rule in the handbook would make it more legalistic. B. Kusse added that nothing is currently written down in any of the catalogs. M. Louge said that the Cornell rule is to calculate all the grades for the GPA. For engineering less than a C- is for failing, but less than a D elsewhere on campus is failing. There should be a recommended practice to the departments. D. Grubb stated that the CCGB can’t tell majors what to do. This rule would just be useful to be written out. J. Bartsch said that if a student fails a course and retakes it, the new grade is averaged with a 0 for an F. If a student gets a D in math and retakes it, he felt there should be a rule about not taking a course to inflate a grade. He wondered if the grade would always be there. R. Robbins said that if a course is repeated, the grades are averaged in. He agreed to check with the University Registrar to see how it is done across the university. D. Gries stated that Peoplesoft will make grading the same across the university. He suggested that the CCGB members check with their departments on this issue.

ROTC Courses as Advisor-Approved Courses: D. Gries mentioned that the Advising Office had a student petition to use two ROTC courses to be used as advisor approved courses. That petition was turned down, as that type of request regularly is. In the student handbook the ROTC courses can be approved only if they are cross listed in other departments. This means that the ROTC students take a lot more credits than other engineering students. The ROTC courses are generally 2-3 credit courses. M. Louge stated that in MAE they had some difficulties with this. He formerly chaired the ROTC committee, and the ROTC staff and students indicated that they want some flexibility by engineering departments. MAE 101 is taught by ROTC. He has occasionally made strict decisions and overruled advisors regarding some course rules. Each ROTC advisor needs to make the rules clear to their students. The rules penalize ROTC students. The ROTC program is shrinking, so we should give them a break. The students take a high number of courses, take early classes, and we should approve the courses if they are extracurricular, not academic. We accept courses from other universities as liberal
studies courses. ROTC has difficulty fitting their courses in with those of academic departments. L. Trotter stated that if there were some judgment of the quality of their courses, that would be okay. B. Kusse wondered what the Arts College does regarding ROTC courses. D. Gries replied that no ROTC courses are allowed unless they are cross listed in other departments. M. Louge said that surveys in MAE indicate that their students are dissatisfied with advisor-approved electives. There are some hard advisors, which creates some tension. The advisor-approved electives should be looked at for clarity, and maybe the college should bring back free electives. A. Zehnder asked if there were a mechanism for ROTC departments to approve cross listing. D. Gries replied that other departments are not interested in doing this. D. Grubb suggested that the CCGB should find out what the ROTC courses consist of prior to making a decision. M. Louge suggested that the three heads of ROTC be invited to each give a 10 minute presentation to the CCGB of what they do. D. Gries stated that the liberal studies courses don’t have to be technical. The CCGB could say no now or find out more about ROTC and how many of our students are in it, then report back to departments. **Vote:** 7 in favor of obtaining more information, 3 in favor of saying no now.

**ENGRI 118:** D. Gries stated that although ENGRI 118 has evolved throughout the past 8 years, there has not been a drastic change. He suggested that the CCGB should approve it, even though the syllabus and description have not been sent to the CCGB. A. Zehnder said that the course is essentially the same, but the title has changed to reflect new technology, so the CCGB should just approve it. This course was co-listed with MSE but is now just TAM 118. D. Gries said that he will ask for updated syllabets next fall, but the CCGB should approve this now. He added that when faculty change courses they should check with the CCGB first. He will put this in Courses of Study now, and assumes it will be approved. A. Zehnder agreed to have W. Sachse produce a syllabet, which he will bring to the next CCGB meeting. **Vote on approving the changes made to ENGRI 118:** 8 in favor, 2 against, 0 abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 a.m.