Agenda for April 6, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 3/30/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Whitaker Proposal/Biology
4. ENGRG 150 Advisor Allocation

CCGB Minutes
March 30, 2001


Absent: K. Athreya, T. Bennington, R. Cleary, D. Cox, B. East, E. Giannelis, S. Youra

Ex-Officio: B. Grant, D. Maloney Hahn, T. Thompson, D. Worley

Other: C. Pakkala, J. Belina

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of March 16th were approved with minor changes.

Undergraduate Announcements: T. Healey (T&AM) stated that if any CCGB members know of distance learning initiatives within the College, they should notify R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean).

D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) announced that Urbain (Ben) DeWinter and Sol Eisenberg of Boston University will visit the College of Engineering on 4/30/01. They would like to meet with members of the various engineering fields to discuss the Boston U. Study Abroad Program at the Technical University of Dresden and explore ways in which their program might serve Cornell students. Their program is targeted to sophomores and is essentially an ECE curriculum, although they are willing to discuss options for other fields. J. Belina (ECE) noted that their courses closely parallel what the students in ECE do in their sophomore year.

Discussion of CS Motion 2: The CCGB members looked at the table that R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) had prepared. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) and C. Van Loan (CS) noted that the numbers were a bit inaccurate. F. Gouldin requested that the numbers for 2000 be added to the table. C. Van Loan stated that his purpose in proposing the motion was to put major advising on equal terms with freshman advising and that the current methodology does not seem to reflect that. M. Duncan (ChemE) noted that their advisee assignments are cyclic, so they have advisees for 5 semesters, with 1 semester double-loaded. Those advisors who currently have seniors received sophomores this semester or will be assigned freshmen in the fall. L. Lion (CEE) stated that their senior advisors cycle back to freshmen in the fall and that neither he nor the other CEE faculty see any problems with the current plan. T. Healey pointed out that a freshman-sophomore advisor is not necessarily “off-duty” in the fourth semester, due to advisees with affiliation difficulties, letters of recommendation for internships, etc. F. Wise (A&EP) stated that it is time-consuming to advise freshmen and sophomores because they frequently have new questions and issues that require some research before they can be addressed. The seniors are a bit easier to advise because they have their game plan in place and know what they are doing. Due to the inconsistencies with the data, the CCGB members decided to delay the vote on Motion 2 until 4/6/01.
Discussion of CS Motion 3: C. Van Loan (CS) briefly discussed the rationale behind delaying the assignment of junior/senior majors for the upcoming year. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that there are timing issues which would make the delay difficult. Room assignments are done at the beginning of May, it takes time to arrange the 150s, and faculty need to be lined up for the classes prior to the end of the spring semester. C. Van Loan agreed that it is difficult to line up 150 instructors, but he suggested that the Dean just assign faculty to the courses or line up peer advisors to department clusters of advisees. The faculty in CS have important things to do and too many advisees color their entire term. L. Lion (CEE) viewed the motion as a recipe for chaos and stated that most departments need to know early how many advisors they are expected to provide. C. Van Loan countered that the number of advisors can be estimated and that 90% of the class arrangements can be done in March or April. J. Hopcroft (Dean) suggested that one option is to change the current formula to give the College 1 or 2 additional advisors that could remain on hold until needed. This option would prevent dramatic changes to the current schedule and would also allow other departments that don’t have enough advisors the ability to occasionally “borrow” an advisor from a different department. **Motion: To determine the number of junior/senior majors for the upcoming year on June 1st.** The motion was rejected with 4 opposed, 2 abstaining and 2 in favor.

Discussion of New Affiliation Requirements in ECE S. Wicker (ECE) discussed the future ECE affiliation requirements that increase the minimum grade in all math, physics, and engineering courses from a C to a C+ and an average of 2.5. It also requires ENGRD 210 or ENGRD 231. All grades in repeated technical courses are included in the average. The reason for the affiliation changes stems from the desire of ECE to broaden the base of the courses. The ECE examined their students’ records to determine what courses indicated their future success or failure and determined that ENGRD 231 was a good indicator. L. Lion (CEE) mentioned that 2.0 is the required GPA for a student in good standing. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that his department examined expulsions of students that occurred in the 7th and 8th semester and determined that the number of them could possibly have been reduced if problems had been identified in the sophomore year. J. Hopcroft (Dean) expressed his concern that with ECE’s new affiliation requirement of a 2.5 GPA, many students could be in good standing but be unable to affiliate. He suggested that ECE identify those courses that are particularly difficult and offer students in those courses extra assistance. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that with the College standard for affiliation at 2.0, there were approximately 80 students who didn’t affiliate this spring. The Advising Office sent warning letters to those students with fewer than 14 credits. He asked for clarification for the rationale that ECE students obtain a minimum grade of C+ and an average of 2.5 in ALL math, physics and engineering courses (even those based in other departments). S. Wicker responded that all the courses predicted success in ECE. D. Maloney Hahn expressed his concern that the new affiliation requirements will discourage those students who don’t come into the College with a strong high school background but who can turn things around. S. Wicker replied that ECE doesn’t want to discourage students with potential, but they want to discourage students from taking a course several times. The ECE faculty want to be up-front with the students regarding the affiliation requirements and required leaves of absence, but they are also willing to allow students to petition. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that he feels that requiring a certain GPA is easiest because it gives students a chance to recover when they receive a bad course grade. Minors help students get through a tough program, and requiring students to see their advisors on a regular basis helps them to focus on their studies. S. Wicker thanked the CCGB members for their comments and assured them that their comments would be passed along to the ECE faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.