## Agenda, April 9, 2004
### CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Motion from Math & Science Committee: “The CCGB upholds BEE’s policy of substituting Organic Chemistry 257 plus one credit of Introductory Biology for Physics 214.”
4. Report on Updating the Liberal Studies Courses and Requirement

---

### CCGB Minutes, March 19, 2004


**Ex-Officio:** D. Bell, B. East, R. Evans, D. Maloney Hahn, M. Spencer

**Other:** N. Peterson, C. Pakkala

### Approval of Minutes: The minutes of 3/12/04 were approved as written.

### Undergraduate Announcements: None

### Nomenclatures: Major, Minor, Concentration, Etc.: B. East distributed handouts which defined a major, minor, concentration and specialization. Also distributed was a list obtained from the Courses of Study that indicated contexts in which the terms options and concentrations appeared. She stated that the registrars in each college have been meeting for months to go over issues related to converting information in SIS (Student Information System) to PeopleSoft. Currently SIS can only track majors over time. Minors are put in the notes section of transcripts, but they can’t be tracked. A common set of definitions was never developed at the university. The implementation of the PeopleSoft Student System gives the university a chance to standardize definitions. The impact on the college of the proposed nomenclature changes would be minimal. It provides an opportunity for the college to add things to transcripts, but it will also force people to examine what kinds of options, tracks, etc. are in departments and whether they want to put official notations on student transcripts. B. Kusse asked if we want to change the term “specialization.” B. East replied that the specialization category is an issue, but not many people have them, and the registrars have almost decided not to use that term. D. Gries stated that the term “concentration” is used in both a formal and an informal sense. B. East said that the Bioengineering Option doesn’t fit into either a minor or concentration. She had preliminary discussions with M. Shuler, and he’s comfortable with it being a concentration. D. Gries said that the word “minor” is being used for a group of courses outside a major in all colleges. A minor in the Engineering College is 18 credits and a few other stipulations. The Arts College is changing its concentrations to minors. B. East said that each college can define the specifics of what constitutes a concentration and a minor but it should fit within the general definition proposed. If the PeopleSoft definitions don’t meet our needs, we should mention that now. She suggested that the CCGB representatives take the information back to their departments and ask for feedback. Each department has the authority to define the specific details of concentrations.” D. Bell said that currently the Registrar’s Office posts the environmental option as an official note, and that is like a concentration. If departments want something to be on the official transcript and be able to track it, they need to let him know. These changes will be in effect when PeopleSoft is implemented in fall 2005. D. Gries said that the college has two ideas of a concentration here, 1 substantial and on the transcript and 1 loose term for classes a student can take. B. East said that the terms in lots of publications are used in different ways, which confuses both the students and us. R. Evans said that if the Communications Program had a specialization, it would be possible for a student to have a specialization in Technical Communication. B. East suggested that he work
with the Technical Writing Committee on that. If the term “specialization” is still in the system and he wants it used, he should let them know. People should think of things that will and won’t work and let her know of them at the next CCGB Meeting. They should also check with colleagues within their departments.

**Online Course Evaluation for Spring Semester:** D. Gries said that on April 9th people would be emailed with details about the online course evaluation. On April 16th the site will be ready to accept the 4 extra questions that faculty can add to their evaluation form. The faculty should give the questions to their undergraduate coordinator. There will be a demo site for people to look at. Submissions will be accepted from April 28th-May 8th. On April 9th program coordinators will receive the list of courses for which students should complete evaluations. People can suggest that courses be taken off the participant list. C. Seyler expressed his concern about the return rate for the online evaluations. D. Gries said that he had little anecdotal evidence about the evaluations, and he had a 96% return for his class. Other reports on the web say that the response rate is typically lower than usual. There might have been a big jump downward in the answers to the questions because the evaluations went online, but the response rate should be more normal this time. The mean hasn’t changed. The only thing that has changed is the procedure in submitting evaluations.

**Course Renumbering:** D. Bell distributed a handout describing how courses will need to be renumbered to fit into the PeopleSoft system. The University is currently running out of course numbers and PeopleSoft allows more than 3 digits for course numbers. B. East said that PeopleSoft gives us the option of keeping the historical data for changes, so we can go back and identify courses. To make the changes in course numbers, departments can just add a zero to their current number, or they can take the opportunity to reorganize the numbering system in their department. D. Bell said that the college registrars need the changes by May 2004. The university provided him with a list of all of the courses from both semesters and the summer courses in Excel templates. He indicated he would send them to Associate Directors electronically. D. Gries stated that coordination on the ENGRD and ENGRI courses would be required. D. Grubb said that a course number would have to be retired if a course changed significantly.

**Where ECP Courses Fit In As Liberal Studies Courses:** R. Evans stated that his understanding was that ENGRC 350 and ENGRC 335 students could satisfy the expressive arts area in liberal studies. The courses were changed to fit under the social and behavioral analysis heading of the liberal studies requirement. The ECP folks thought the two courses would more appropriately meet the cultural analysis category instead. D. Gries said that the Arts College changed their categories, and this caused us to change our categories. D. Maloney Hahn stated that the Liberal Studies Committee needs to look at the engineering courses and revise the liberal studies listing. L. Trotter said that his committee (Liberal Studies) would examine this issue. He suggested that R. Evans send him a note to ask the committee to specifically look at whatever he wants changed. They will look at it during the spring break. D. Maloney Hahn suggested that Ray Thorpe be added to the committee. The courses outside the Arts College should be looked at carefully, and the initial list should be reviewed. R. Kay said that the Arts College has a subsidiary list of courses outside their college, and we should look at that. K. Pingali asked if engineering could reduce the number of categories, and he said that we need to understand what their categories mean. D. Gries said that we might merge some categories, but we will not produce new ones. D. Maloney Hahn stated that we accepted the categorizations, but we need to review the first 3 categories. We should eliminate the rule of taking 2 courses out of the first 3 categories. M. Louge said that the rule is a major structural impediment of having people study abroad and taking something other than English. At some point the committee might want to look at the rules. D. Gries said that of 6 required courses a student could take 4 courses in a foreign language and 2 courses in other areas. J. Bartsch said that he was told that students couldn’t get credit for taking a language exam. D. Maloney Hahn said that the Arts rules exist for Arts students. If engineering students take the CASE exam and get a Q+ or a Q++, we still post the credit for that.
What Is A Distribution Course?  D. Grubb stated that he thinks we should defer consideration about whether a course should be 3 or 4 credits in the ENGRD group, particularly ENGRD 211. He believes that we need a larger-scale view about whether a course’s content should make it 3 or 4 credits. We need to decide the educational purpose of these courses. They were set up to be technical courses in a discipline, taken by students who are not majoring in the discipline and at the same time they serve as a technical introduction to the major. There has been no decision to change their purpose. Currently the “introduction to the major” aspect dominates, there is no breadth or ‘distribution’ in many ENGRD courses. Currently there are 8 categories that the students need to choose from, and it might be best to have fewer categories, perhaps 3, so that students see real breadth and not a course very similar to those in their major.

There are two possibilities of dealing with the ENGRD courses. The first possibility is to forget that these were historically distribution courses and re-label and re-categorize them. The other possibility is to keep them as distribution courses and require ENGRD courses to be useful for this purpose. If courses are closely driven in content by requirements for following courses in the major, they should be removed from the distribution list because this would make them no use to students outside the major. This issue is a big-scale deal, and we need to look at a bigger set of curricular issues, but we don’t need to act on this now. M. Louge said that it is a statement of fact that we’ve become more specialized, and the solution lies within the individual majors, not just the CCGB. We need to relax the pile of subjects the students deal with, and this starts with individual departments removing things. D. Grubb added that more introductory stuff would have to be moved into a field course. The CCGB members should think about the issue, and it will be discussed at a later CCGB meeting. If people have ideas on how to handle this, they can send him an email.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.