CCGB MINUTES
April 17, 1998


Members Absent: J. Hopcroft, J. Jenkins

Ex-Officio: K. Hover

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

Minutes: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Minutes of April 10, 1998 approved as distributed.

Announcements:
1. ABET: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Distributed a memo from ABET which asks the college to review the attached list of potential team chairs to determine if there are cases of conflict of interest for those listed. This memo, along with the attachment, was sent to the Directors & Chairs of each dept. Please respond back to K. Hover no later that Monday, April 27th. The definition of conflict of interest is outlined on page 3. The Undergraduate programs office will review the list of evaluation team members from previous years.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Should the packets of information be collected and sent to the Dean’s office for the ENGR courses such as distribution, intro., and communication courses? There should be a uniform set of numbers for these courses sent to all depts. listing the fractions of design credits and engineering science credits.

K. Gebremedhin, ABEN: ABEN is developing a one-page sheet for each course which also indicates, on the bottom, the percent of design or science in the course.

2. Pro-Rated Tuition: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: A draft of the conditions for pro-rated tuition was distributed(attached). This policy has been developed to gain a clearer understanding of the tentative policy handed down from university administration. The pro-rated tuition program does exist and was used on a trial basis last semester. This policy was developed to help students who have less than full-time status to finish their degree requirements without paying full tuition. Many students find this policy helpful as it enables them to complete their degree without withdrawing from the university and taking their few remaining course as extramural students. The university policy is vague, so D. Maloney Hahn and K. Hover tried to obtain clarification. The clarification document has been passed back and forth several times between Engineering and university administration. To date the clarification has not received approval from university administration. This document is the clearest version available in response to the pro-rated tuition policy. Right now, however, students who are on pro-rated tuition have worked that out directly with the Registrar’s Office.

B. Kay, GS: According to the draft the students would have to apply prior to the end of the pre-enrollment period. This would make it too late for students now as the pre-enrollment period has ended.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Previously students have been able to get approval for pro-rated tuition after the pre-enrollment period. Is this draft how we would like to have the policy administered?
M. Duncan, ChE: Item B reads, “Prior to the semester of pro-ration, the student must have accumulated the minimum number of credit hours required by the field to complete degree requirements.” Does this mean the students have already graduated?

J. Belina, EE: You can’t be eligible for graduation in the seventh semester in order to qualify for pro-rated tuition. Legally you cannot detain students, who receive financial aid, from graduating within eight semesters.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: The policy for university administration are not clear. I wanted to run this policy by the CCGB to get some feedback.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The question of item B makes it ambiguous. Only eight semesters?

J. Belina, EE: This used to be controlled with the residency requirement. Four semesters at the university, three within the dept.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Arts & Sciences have an eight-semester residency requirement with no exceptions. The present document is still an unofficial draft until it gets formal approval from Day Hall and the College; therefore, the specific provisions about things like timing of application are not yet in force. Please forward any additional comments to me within two weeks and I will send them on to university administration.

3. **Freshman Advisors:** K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Asked for feedback from the Directors & Chairs and the Assoc. Directors resulting in the updated freshman advisor spreadsheet (attached). Any feedback received seemed to cancel out and did not result in net changes. D. Ruppert clarified the interpretation of the motion from last year regarding which students are counted as “affiliates.” It would not be juniors and seniors but rather just juniors. The biggest change occurred in ORIE. Last year ORIE admitted 20+ more students than projected for 1998. Page two of the spreadsheet indicates the bottom line number of advisors needed per unit. The way we had agreed to deal with the sabbatical issue is that if a faculty member is on sabbatical in the fall, he or she is not put into the advising pool. If on sabbatical in the spring, the faculty member still does count toward faculty advisor pool numbers.

J. Belina, EE: EE has a correction in the number of seniors.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Today will be the last call to review the data and get back to me any changes or questions. The data will be re-run and a complete, revised spreadsheet will be distributed next week.

F. Wise, A&EP: Should the depts. plan for the number of faculty advisors as indicated on page 2?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Yes those numbers will only change by one either way so designating faculty advisors now would be helpful. If a dept. wishes to allocate more freshman advisors than indicated we would be happy to take them.

4. **Academic Calendar:** J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The proposed changes in the academic calendar, as discussed in the CCGB last week, were also discussed at the Education Policy Committee, at which J. Abel is an acting member representing the college. The committee discussed the proposal and was clearly against such a move. Peter Stein has since then decided to drop the whole idea. From various sources J. Abel has heard that J. Ford (Dean of Students) and D. Yeh (University Registrar) still think the proposal is a great idea. The faculty senate committee has not approved the proposal. The calendar changes may come up again in the future. At this time no formal action need be taken by any committee, but we should be alert to the possible revival of this proposal.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: M. Duncan’s argument, that less time between end of finals and graduation only will increase the intensity of the partying into what time is left available, has been reported to J. Ford.

R. Kay, GS: Can the CCGB take a vote to formalize our opposition to the proposal? I therefore, make a motion to vote against any proposed calendar changes.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Can the motion by R. Kay be amended to state the university proposal as it now reads?
R. Kay, GS: *I move that the CCGB vote against the proposed university calendar changes which start the spring semester two days later, Wednesday rather than Monday, and end finals week two days later, Wednesday rather than Friday.*
D. Bartel, M&AE: I second the motion.
J. Abel, Chair, CEE: *Motion passed unanimously.*

**ROTC Proposal:**

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: There are multiple ways to approach the proposal sent to us by ROTC, which is why this is being presented to the CCGB. J. Muckstadt delivered the proposal from ROTC to K. Hover to present to the CCGB. The summary of the proposal is attached. The ROTC are asking that the three courses listed, Mil Sci 321/231, Nav Sci 102, and AS 331/332 be granted academic credit within engineering. These courses are coming from ROTC and are not cross-listed in the college. The courses are not listed as liberal art electives. If counted as academic credit where and how would the credit meet college requirements? If used as an approved elective it would make it a case-by-case situation. The instructors for these courses teach for three-year terms. Having served two 3-year terms in the ROTC relations committee, K. Hover has been involved in a number of search committee for the ROTC instructors. The potential instructors are subjected to a rigorous interview process in order to teach these courses at Cornell. Should this issue be discussed quickly or sent to the sub-committee for review? A full syllabus and course content is available for review.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Two military courses are currently cross-listed within the college; ABEN 305 and MAE 101. These courses are engineering faculty controlled and reviewed, and we currently give credit for them toward the engineering B.S. degree, usually in the approved elective category.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: These proposed courses do not have cross-list status nor would they logically fit in with an engineering dept.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: The ROTC students are actual members of the armed services and receive pay along with scholarships while they study at Cornell.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: There is a university policy which states that students cannot earn credit and get paid to attend courses. These courses are not electives but rather required.

C. Van Loan, CS: Cross-listing these courses is not the way to go. The CCGB would not want to be responsible for the review courses such as these.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Some of the other colleges in the university are looking to approve non-faculty taught courses, such as EMT training. The College of Arts & Sciences policy states that students may not get credit toward graduation for ROTC courses unless they are cross-listed by a university department.

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: If the CCGB believes that further study is needed or deserved K. Hover would help facilitate it.

D. Grubb, MS&E: This is not the first time that this has suggested, nor will it be the last.

F. Wise, A&EP: What is the motivation factor to do this?

D. Bartel, M&AE: The motivation is to reduce the workload for students in the ROTC program.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Other students in engineering have to work, etc. and do not receive credit for it.

J. Belina, EE: Engineering students not in ROTC are closed out of at least one of the proposed courses.

C. Van Loan, CS: Motion that *“Engineering will only consider/accept credit for those courses that are cross-listed with a Cornell academic dept.”* This re-affirms existing CCGB policy.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: *Motion approved unanimously.*

F. Wise, A&EP: Who is driving this proposal?

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Students and the ROTC faculty.
Course Evaluation Revisions: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Previously the CCGB suggested a sub-committee to address the whole course evaluation process. Prior to creating a sub-committee the CCGB wanted assurances from the Dean that he was committed to change and thought this program was important. K. Hover and J. Abel spoke with J. Hopcroft regarding this project and he is very interested in re-evaluating the evaluation process. The Dean would like the CCGB to recommend a charge to such a committee with key issues that should be addressed.

D. Ruppert, ORIE: Is the evaluation actually a measurement of an instructor?

J. Belina, EE: The A and B objectives of the evaluation might be in conflict. The A part, how to improve a course, and the B part, assessment of teaching ability and effectiveness, may need to be separated. The evaluation should never be used as the sole criteria of a person’s teaching ability. Additional criteria, such as peer evaluation or mid-term evaluations, should also be used. Many schools have adopted a two-step approach to evaluation. The mid-term evaluation originally came from Stanford. Many students just rapidly check through opt-scan forms with no thought given to the questions.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Any other comments to convey to the Dean? This is an important educational issue with a long-range timeline. The CCGB was looking for confirmation that if we put in a recommendation to the Dean it will be listened to. We believe that to be true.

D. Bartel, M&AE: At a recent M&AE town meeting, students indicated that they are very interested in the quality of instruction. Evaluations may not be a valid measurement of that.

J. Abel, Chair, CEE: This is a rather open-ended charge to a evaluation process sub-committee. J. Abel and K. Hover will draft a charge and bring it back to the CCGB for approval.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 am.

Agenda for Friday, April 24, 1998:
1. Approval of Minutes, April 17, 1998
2. Announcements (Abel)
3. Department of Statistical Science; possible statistics curricula in Engineering (McCulloch)

Tentative Agenda for Friday, May 1, 1998:
1. Approval of Minutes, April 24, 1998
2. Announcements (Hover, Abel) [Pro-rated Tuition, Architecture Concentration, CCGB Subcommittees, Business Courses for Engineering Undergraduates]
3. ABET Planning (Hover)