Agenda, April 7, 2000
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Report from Communications Committee (F. Wise)
4. MS&E Affiliation Criteria (S. Sass)
5. Affiliation Criteria, Engineering Distribution Courses & Beyond (J. Jenkins & F. Gouldin)

CCGB Minutes
March 31, 2000

Members:  J. Bartsch, R. Cleary, M. Duncan, F. Gouldin, J. Jenkins, R. Kay, P. Kintner, L. Lion, S. Sass, C. Van Loan, F. Wise

Absent:  B. East, T. Healey, J. Herrera, J. Hopcroft, J. Jenkins, M. Miller

Ex-Officio:  K. Athreya, D. Cox, M. Fish, D. Maloney-Hahn, F. Shumway, S. Youra

Others:  J. Burns, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of March 17th were approved with a slight modification.

Undergraduate Announcements:  Handouts (ASEE and the Thornfield experience) from T. Healey (Assoc. Dean) were distributed.  J. Bartsch (ABEN) recommended the Thornfield experience and suggested that if faculty had any questions they should contact previous participants.  D. Maloney-Hahn (Advising) distributed the Advisor Distribution Algorithm – Spring 2000 handout.  F. Shumway (Advising) pulled current affiliation data from the data warehouse and worked with field coordinators to ensure that the information was accurate.  Students with double or triple majors, as well as those in the Dual Degree and College Programs were included in the advisee count for all effected departments.  M. Fish (Advising) stated that their data covered the Spring ’99 – Fall ’99 time period.  The Dean’s Office provided the number of available faculty.  All faculty on lines were included, with leaves addressed.  Faculty on phased retirement, people on sabbaticals during the fall semester, and first-year faculty were not included.  J. Bartsch asked why ABEN was not included in the algorithm.  D. Maloney-Hahn explained that ABEN faculty are not expected to participate; it is currently done solely on a voluntary basis.  P. Kintner (ECE) explained that the College of Engineering is specifically focusing on the 150 obligation for faculty.  D. Maloney-Hahn requested that faculty review the information with their colleagues as soon as possible and submit the advisors’ names to the Advising Office by April 14th.  He also asked that faculty obtain a tentative number of faculty who are permanently leaving Cornell.  F. Shumway emphasized the importance of matching the interests of the faculty with those of the students.  D. Cox (Assist. Dean) emphasized that the 150 time slot is critical for matching the interests of the faculty and the students.  P. Kintner asked if additional faculty members could be offered as freshman advisors.  This would mean that if a student and faculty member were well matched, they could retain that match for all 4 years of the student’s tenure at Cornell.  D. Maloney-Hahn replied that if a department wanted to provide more faculty this year, then fewer would be required from that department next year.  The Advising Office will have further data available for the 4/7/00 CCGB meeting.
Motion on Engineering Mathematics Syllabi: J. Burns (T&AM) discussed the math syllabi handouts. The new syllabi reflect that Math 293 and 294 may be taken in either order. The course material has been shifted around so that at least one lecture covers each topic on the list of syllabi. Math 192 will be implemented this fall so that incoming students can be placed into it. D. Maloney-Hahn questioned what type of placement credit students would receive. Given the current guidelines, even if students receive a 5 on the Math BC (a higher-level advanced placement math exam), they will not be placed out of Math 192. With the new changes, the math placement exam has become more important and will be used for ALL incoming students, including transfers. F. Gouldin expressed concern that Math 191 would be review for students and would bore them. D. Maloney-Hahn stated that approximately 200 students placed out of 192 last year and that the GCE (General Certificate of Exam) may allow the students to move into Math 293. This would seem to indicate that very few students would need to take Math 191. J. Burns stated that the current Math 192 is covered in the BC. With the new 192, only 40% of the material should be familiar to the students. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) inquired about which math courses would be offered this summer for new students who arrive early. The placement exam and courses offered should be consistent. J. Burns responded that the new courses would be offered this summer.

D. Maloney-Hahn added that Advising has agreed to work with Math to give the placement exams and will report in the future how well the process works. F. Gouldin (M&AE) suggested that the third sentence in the first paragraph of the motion be eliminated because the content is already outlined on the syllabi chart. L. Lion (CEE) asked that under Spring 2000 in Implementation the following be added under 191/3 Transitional: 192 Old. Under Fall 2000 190/1 New should be added: 192 New. Under Spring 2001 should be added: 192 New. R. Cleary (ORIE) requested that the numbers be changed under “Elaboration Regarding 190 and 191” to 1-2-3 rather than 1-3-4. The Motion was voted on with the proposed amendments. Ten faculty members voted in favor, with zero opposed and zero abstentions.

Discussion of College Mission Statement: P. Kintner (ECE) spoke about the need for the Cornell Engineering Undergraduate Program to compose a mission statement. He distributed handouts that contained the mission statements of various colleges and universities across the United States. Although the mission statement for MIT was not written for ABET, they like it. It defines engineering and the influence of engineers on society. They emphasize the importance of educating students to prepare them for integration within a society. Leadership is stressed, as is the blending of research and technology. Leadership, service and innovation are also emphasized in the mission statements for Berkeley, Stanford, and Carnegie Mellon. Ohio State focuses on “being the best” rather than producing students with leadership qualities. Michigan’s mission statement is rather generic and clearly written with ABET in mind. P. Kintner requested that faculty keep the handouts in a secure location, think about what types of things should be included in a mission statement for Cornell’s Engineering Undergraduate Program.

F. Wise (A&EP) stated that any mission statement he composed would be similar to that of MIT. F. Gouldin (M&AE) said that departments are always evolving and that faculty members are always agreeing to disagree, so obtaining input from faculty in the departments may be difficult. P. Kintner agreed that, while Engineering is constantly changing, it does so at a different rate (more accelerated) than other colleges. Because of that students need more skills outside the traditional engineering field. S. Youra (Comm. Prog.) questioned the need for the Dean to be involved in the mission statement process. P. Kintner responded that Dean Hopcroft has been involved and has urged the CCGB to come up with a mission statement for the Undergraduate Program. It is possible that a larger statement that encompasses the entire College will be composed in the future.
The meeting adjourned at 9:03 a.m.