CCGB MINUTES
March 27, 1998


Members Absent: J. Hopcroft, R. Kay, D. Ruppert

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

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

Minutes: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Minutes of March 13, 1998 approved as distributed.

Announcement: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The theoretical date for the computation of faculty advisors is upon us. The Dean’s office will be forwarding the staffing projections for academic year ‘98-99 next week. Each department needs to submit to S. Dennis-Conlon, by Tuesday, March 31, the projected number of affiliates for the academic year ‘98-99. This message will be relayed to those fields who are not in attendance at today’s meeting. Once the information is received and the estimates are compiled the information will be copied to each field, CCGB members, and Dept. Directors and Chairs by late next week.

Faculty Presentations at Freshman Orientation: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: There are two issues involving faculty presentations at orientation (attached). The first issue is, do we want to continue this practice begun in 1997 in August, 1998? The second, if so, what format(s) shall we use, and how shall we coordinate this effort? These issues are being brought to the CCGB as this was the forum that began the faculty presentations at orientation in 1997 with a proposal from C. Van Loan. A survey to parents was conducted after 1997 orientation to get an idea of how orientation, on a whole, was perceived. On this survey we asked parents to rate the value of the faculty presentations for “gaining insight into what their son or daughter will experience here.” Ratings ranged from 3.5 to 4.5 on a scale of 0 (low) and 5 (high). Written comments from parents on the survey were varied. My recommendation is that parents want more contact with faculty. The question most frequently asked was what type of engineering should I study? A suggestion would be to modify the presentations to be more of a field information session. Also would be the shift of the coordination of presentations to the fields with the Dean’s office providing the publicity, help with room scheduling, etc. The proposed motion is:

Freshman Orientation on Saturday, August 22, 1998, will include a scheduled opportunity for individual departments to present a modified field information session to students and their parents. The degree to which this session highlights the research activities of the field or of individual faculty members is entirely at the discretion of the field. Fields choosing to participate will notify the undergraduate program office no later than May 15.

Freshman orientation must be scheduled through the university orientation. We need an idea today if fields want this option.

C. Van Loan, CS: Second the motion.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: Departments simultaneously make presentations so students will have to choose.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: A possibility would be to double team room assignments so two depts. could go back-to-back with half hour presentations each. If CCGB decided not to fill this hour slot during orientation, the Dean’s office could fill in.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: This group, CCGB, could do something such as a poster session. This would enable parents to get broad exposure to several departments.

K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: Is this too much information for students to absorb at this point?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Many questions that students ask during orientation are very detailed.

**Motion passed unanimously in favor of keeping the hour during orientation for some type of faculty presentation.**

F. Shumway, Advising: A generic description will go in the university orientation publication with presentation details conveyed at orientation.

---

**Revised Resolution on Minors:**

J. Abel, Chair, CEE, Speaking as Chair of the CCGB Subcommittee on Minors: The minors sub-committee revised the proposal (attached version March 12). The new proposal takes into consideration the administrative concerns that were raised at the CCGB. The major field will decide if a minor’s program is appropriate for their field. Requirements will be very clearly outlined to minimize student questions/concerns. After a student completes the course requirements, he or she submits the completed form to the minor dept. with a copy of the transcript. The minor dept. then certifies that the student actually completed the program. Only the minor dept. can certify completion of the program. This documentation can be done anytime once the student has completed the requirements. If the coursework were completed in the last semester before graduation, the minor dept. would not need to complete certification prior to graduation. An example of the minor petition form is attached.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: The major dept. would decide generally, not on a per-student basis, if the minor program can be done within their field. The minor dept. then is in charge of the certification process.

P. Kintner, EE: How will this affect the College Program students? Are major fields the only ones who can offer a minors program?

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The College Program students could have a minors program if it was beyond the current major/minor program in their contracted program.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Students in the College Program already have a major/minor program.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: A footnote could be added regarding the College Program. Cross-disciplinary minors program should have a separate mechanism to cover them as it has a whole set of different administrative issues. A separate piece of faculty legislation is needed to cover programs which might be modeled after the bioengineering option. Cross-disciplinary programs are not addressed in the current resolution. The minors program could be considered step one in the process with the cross-disciplinary issue step two. A department could choose not to offer a minors program or could offer two or more programs.

D. Bartel, M&AE: Can a field offer a minors program with courses in a different department?

J. Jenkins, T&AM: For example EE and CS departments could offer a joint minors program but one field would have to take responsibility for it.

D. Grubb, MS&E: If a field is offering a minors program they will not know if a student is in the minors program until after the students have completed it. This could cause conflicts when a dept. changes course content or offerings. How will the dept. know who to contact (students) when these changes occur?

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Responsibility is going to be on the students with some advising taking place with their faculty advisors, faculty members teaching the courses and faculty in the minor field. Same advising content will be in place. Any revisions to the course list for a minor would be included in Courses of Study. When the students apply for certification, they indicate which edition of Courses of Study they used for satisfying the minor.
D. Grubb, MS&E: Fields will not have the opportunity to approve minors before the student completes the program.
P. Kintner, EE: The dual major program is still an option.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: After hearing much objections to the administrative issues involving the minors program the Minors Sub-Committee revised the proposal to make the administrative issues as easy as possible and still meet the spirit of what the minors program objectives are.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Depts. are free to step up the monitoring of the minor program to include a pre-approval of the individual students. If the CCGB would like, the Minor Sub-Committee could revise the proposal to meet the objections of the committee.
J. Jenkins, T&AM: Some evolution will occur in the minors program within depts. as they gain experience and streamline their programs.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: This is partly an advising function and students don’t always follow the advice given to them.
P. Kintner, EE: The pre-check petition for students entering the minors program would be to look for double counting of courses.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Double counting of courses will be left up to the individual depts.
D. Cox, Asst. Dean: A list of minor programs will be in the handbook. Depts. could choose to have some of their minor programs listed generally and some listed as requiring pre-checks.
F. Wise, A&EP: Is this creating more work? Looks like there is a lot of flexibility in the minor program proposal. A&EP students have many technical electives required. These electives could be changed into minor programs. All students in A&EP could have a minor program.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Double counting is not a problem but a plus. A collection of courses to enable a student to have a minors program should be unrelated to the double counting issue.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: If a student attains the intellectual benefit from these courses then they should be entitled to a notation on their transcript.
P. Kintner, EE: Will this proposal go before the faculty for a vote?
K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: Call the motion.

Vote to send the minor proposal to the faculty for a vote:

7 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention

Note: Three CCGB members 'yes' votes would change if the proposal was submitted to the Engineering faculty without benefit of debate in a College faculty meeting.

C. Van Loan, CS: The CS dept. is neutral. All someone has to do is look at a student’s transcript to see what type of courses they have taken. Fields should already be encouraging students to do interdisciplinary work. Many of the CS faculty are nervous about the amount of administrative work involved. The only thing the minors program will do is to make the students happy but will be of no consequence to employers.

M. Duncan, ChE: The faculty in ChE voted against the minors program. The changes made in the proposal by the minor sub-committee were not significant enough that ChE faculty would change opinions.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The insertion of the dept. option to decide whether to allow its students to undertake each minor program is a mechanism for fields to approve the minor program proposal. The proposal will go to a faculty vote with a full faculty debate.
P. Kintner, EE: Believes this is a benefit to other depts. and depts. can choose not to participate in the minor program.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Although GS dept. and R. Kay are not in attendance, the dept. is in favor of a minor program. The CEE dept. will have one or two minors programs.
K. Gebremdhin, ABEN: ABEN is in favor of the minors program but wonders if this issue can be split administratively and academically.
C. Van Loan, CS: The cross-disciplinary education would be great.
M. Duncan, ChE: The minors program will actually discourage breadth as students will be trying to fill major requirements in one field and minor requirements in another, limiting them to two fields of study.
D. Bartel, M&AE: The faculty in M&AE are somewhat mixed but generally positive about the minors program. M&AE are not sure they would offer a minors program.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: This proposal will go to a full faculty meeting with a debate not just a mailed ballot. This will have to be taken up with the Dean.

**Biology Sub-Committee:** C. Van Loan, CS, Chair of Sub-Committee: The Biology Sub-Committee submitted a report to the CCGB (attached). The first section is information as why biology is important to engineering. There is a web site for biology with information to look at from some of our competitors along with a list of courses at Cornell. Chemistry and physics will become even more important in the next century therefore the Biology Sub-Committee suggests that the minimums be kept as they are for these requirements. Employers look for classical engineering education with a biology component. The sub-committee came up with two proposals:

**Proposal 1:** Create a biology requirement in the spirit of the writing requirement and the computer applications requirement. It should read as follows: *A student must take at least one course selected from the Bioengineering Option course lists.*

**Proposal 2:** Liberalize the Biology and Chemistry Distribution so any entry in the Bioengineering Option course lists can be used to satisfy the requirement. Currently allowed are BioG 101 & 103, BioG 105, BioG 107, and Chem389.

The Biology Sub-Committee does not want to add credit hours but rather just nudge students to take a biology course. Cornell University has more courses in biology than most of our competitors. We just need to package them better. Eventually this should lead to a minors program in Biology, making it more involved than the Bio-Engineering Option. Fields need to be flexible and identify opportunities for students. The Biology Sub-Committee created a packet of sample schedules in each department which includes biology courses (attached). Some depts. did not respond with the information so the sub-committee created what they thought would be possible schedules. The courses were not checked for coordination of scheduling. Please review and send any changes to C. Van Loan. The Biology courses and information along with sample schedules should be on the web site. The College has not invested much resources in what we look like on the web.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The sub-committee suggests that either proposal be implemented. Whichever proposal is adopted would have to go to the full faculty for approval.

**Agenda for Friday, April 3, 1998:**

1. Approval of Minutes, March 27, 1998
2. Announcements (Hover)
3. Discussion of Biology Sub-Committee report (Gebremedhin)
4. Report on ENGRG 150 (Stedinger)