Agenda for March 16, 2001
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes of 3/9/01 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Transfer Student Process (B. East)
4. Continuation of discussion of CS321 as ENGRD (C. VanLoan, R. Cleary)
5. Proposal for new ENGRD course in AEP (F. Wise)
6. Proposal for new ENGRD course in MSE (C. Ober)

CCGB Minutes
March 9, 2001

Members: J. Bartsch, R. Cleary, M. Duncan, E. Giannelis, F. Gouldin, T. Healey, J. Hopcroft, R. Kay, L. Lion, C. Van Loan, S. Wicker

Absent: B. Grant, F. Wise, D. Worley, S. Youra

Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, T. Bennington, D. Cox, B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, T. Thompson

Other: C. Pakkala, J. Stedinger

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 23rd were approved with a minor modification.

Undergraduate Announcements: R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the CSE Award nominations are due soon and asked faculty to write a paragraph or two when endorsing the nominations or suggesting their own nominations. He noted that TAs are not eligible for this award.

D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that the Advising office is working on the early intervention students and asked for suggestions from the faculty regarding improving the early warning system.

B. East (Admissions) mentioned that Admissions is gearing up for hosting week, which will be held in mid-April. She invited faculty participation on the hosting week panels.

T. Thompson (Registrar) stated that the electronic add/drop implementation has been postponed until Spring 2002.

Motions from CS Regarding Engineering 150: C. Van Loan (CS) spoke about Motion 1, restating his department’s view that the month of September gives the faculty and students ample time to build a good relationship. Anything beyond that is unnecessary and too time consuming for the faculty. He suggested that October be utilized for a series of dazzling field presentations that would create a higher profile for both the course and CS. L. Lion (CEE) proposed a MOTION: That Motion 1 be sent to the Student Experience Committee and that they include their recommendation for approving the motion to the CCGB in 1 month, as well as provide the CCGB with other suggestions for improvement. F. Gouldin (M&AE) seconded Motion 1, stating that the faculty in his department did not support the motion because they felt that the students and faculty needed more contact. J. Stedinger (Eng. 150 Advisor) stated that reports and summaries of the 150 evaluations indicate that the contact between the faculty and students is important. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) added that the intent of the 150 course is to build a relationship between faculty and students, and the results of a COFHE survey of seniors indicates that they wanted more contact with the faculty in small group meetings. This type of contact is critical for the success of students. J. Hopcroft (Dean) emphasized the need to think carefully about the
change. He indicated a longer time period for the Student Experience Committee to review the motion and suggested that, if the change were approved, it would become effective in 2002. R. Cleary suggested that the Student Experience Committee be given until the end of the semester to review Motion 1. L. Lion’s motion was amended to read: Motion: Send Motion 1 to the Student Experience Committee and have them report their findings to the CCGB by the end of the semester. Opposed: 1 In Favor: 10. S. Wicker (ECE) mentioned that a number of faculty in his department were in favor of Motion 1 and requested that the ECE be allowed to meet with the Student Experience Committee to discuss Eng. 150 options.

Motion 2: C. Van Loan (CS) revised the advisor formula to read $n=\text{Net FTEs} – 1.25*F – 1.00*E$. The new formula is intended to more accurately reflect the fact that the faculty advise 8th semester seniors. The faculty in CS feel that advisors should get credit for higher-level advisees because they are dealt with longer. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that advising doesn’t end at graduation, due to the request for recommendation letters, and that faculty have other things to do than advise 8th semester students. L. Lion (CEE) asked for an explanation of how the 8th semester seniors aren’t accounted for. C. Van Loan responded that the advising load in the fall is spread over the juniors and seniors, while in the spring the load is spread over the sophomores, juniors and seniors. J. Stedinger (Eng. 150 Advisor) stated that, when the Eng. 150 advising guidelines were developed, all concerns were considered and all the issues were balanced, and the formula was fair for all semesters. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) added that the ratio of advisors to advisees is the same number no matter what formula is used. J. Hopcroft (Dean) stated that the ratio is based on the number of faculty available and that every department has an equal load. If someone in the department is available but not advising, the ratio for that department will change. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) said that the target class size of 710 this year will reduce the advisor load. F. Gouldin (M&AE) requested that the old advisor spreadsheets be reviewed to determine the affect of the present and proposed. R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) agreed to find the spreadsheets and perform the necessary calculations with the 2 formulas.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.