CCGB Meeting Agenda, May 5, 2006

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Proposal for Minor in Game Design
4. Review of Minors in Engineering

CCGB Minutes, April 21, 2006

Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, M. Spencer
Other: D. Jenkins, C. Pakkala, D. Schwartz, J. Wofford

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the March 17, 2006 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East stated that the time of transfer admissions is upon us. The Admissions Office is in the process of reviewing and screening admissions folders. They will arrive in departments soon. She requested that departments look through them soon and get them back to Admissions so the students don’t go to another college. E. Fisher asked how many students we are trying to admit. M. Spencer replied that we want to admit about 100 students because the actual acceptance rate is about 50 students. There are about 300 applicants. The quality of students varies from year to year. L. Lion wondered what percent of the students go through an initial screening. M. Spencer replied that departments will never see about ¼ of the applications. L. Pollack asked if it would help if departments rank the applications. B. East responded that it would be a good idea to rank them. She added that about 4 or 5 years ago the university was pushing for Engineering to admit more transfers. Everyone increased their numbers back then, but the numbers are slipping now. M. Spencer said that people should feel free to contact Admissions with questions and to ask for insight.

M. Spencer said that Cornell Days ended on Monday; there were 8 days of fun, involving roughly 1,000 students. This was the highest number in recent years. There were good evaluations, and they saw some really interesting students.

A. Zehnder stated that the pilot math placement exam had been given to students and seemed to go okay. He and B. East, F. Shumway and some graduate students will meet this afternoon to discuss how it went. The actual placement exam will be given in the next month or so.

CCGB Membership for 2006-2007: The following CCGB members are scheduled to serve next year: L. Pollack for AEP, Bryan Isacks for EAS, D. Ruppert for ORIE, J. Bartsch for BEE, A. Center for CBE, E. Fisher for MAE, A. Zehnder for TAM, S. Baker for MSE, and C. Seyler for ECE. K. Pingali will not return to the CCGB next year, so a replacement for CS is forthcoming.

Game Design Minor: D. Gries said that the Minors Committee looked at the Game Design Minor and they recommend its approval. J. Wofford stated that the Game Design Minor comes out of a handful of years of an initiative. D. Schwartz and D. Jenkins put events and courses together and gathered students into a movement in CS and across departments. They have an opportunity to broaden participation in the field of computing. Many majors are interested in game design. This minor has components of...
information science and computer science. There is collaboration across the Theory Center, Information Science, and Computer Science. They hope to include the Education Department also. They want to become part of the national scene.

L. Trotter asked if the minor would be open to all students in the college. D. Schwartz responded affirmatively. A. Zehnder stated that a CS student would not be able to minor in game design because the minors guidelines state that a student cannot take a minor that is offered by their major. D. Schwartz said that the CS courses don’t fulfill major core requirements. The courses in the minor are courses considered outside the core CS curriculum. There is a little bit of overlap in the courses, but they aren’t required for the major. D. Jenkins stated that the pedagogy of the minor is aligned more toward information science, but there is no representation at this level for the CCGB. This minor was paralleled with the IS minor. The courses are designed as interdisciplinary courses. They are not CS courses, because CS would not accept most of these courses.

J. Bartsch said that a lot of the minors offered are more like a concentration. He asked if this could be a concentration in CS. The interdisciplinary aspect is good, and it would be good if it could be broadened to include other fields and allow CALS Students to minor in it. D. Schwartz said that they could take the minor to the AAP and A&S Colleges, and it would become a specialization or concentration there.

D. Gries stated that A&S will change the term “concentrations” to “minors” when Peoplesoft is implemented. D. Jenkins said that the minor isn’t in the CS major, and they would be concerned if CS students couldn’t minor in this. Most software firms are excited about game design, and alums and companies rave about this. D. Gries stated that the rule in the Engineering Handbook is that students need to take 6 courses and they can’t take a minor offered by their major. There is a minor called Civil Infrastructure, but it is not the same as the corresponding major (CEE).

S. Baker stated that there is a need to decide what a minor is. The goal is to major in one field and to gain experience in another field. He is concerned that it doesn’t sound like a minor unless the goal is to offer it to non-CS students. L. Lion said that the intent of the minors seems to be that a student studies a body of information that is different from the major. If there is a set of courses like management that would be a different body of information, and it should be allowed. C. Seyler said that he would have no problem counting this as a minor for CS students if the CS courses could be excluded. L. Pollack said that some courses listed for the minor can’t serve as technical electives. It would need to be clear which category these courses could satisfy in the engineering curriculum. AEP always has students who want to use the courses incorrectly.

J. Bartsch said that the Biomedical Minor wording is specific in specifying that double counting can’t be done. He suggested that perhaps they should allow one or two courses to be double-counted. A. Center wondered whether a concentration in game design as opposed to a minor listed on the students’ transcripts would significantly impact their ability to get a job or attract employers. The minor sounds like a good idea, but we need to achieve the objective with the least amount of negative fallout. Maybe a specialization would help rather than calling this a minor.

D. Jenkins said that most of the courses are not similar to what the students are taking in CS. D. Schwartz said that the minor would make a bold statement and would be extremely popular. B. East stated that the College needs to be equitable about how to apply the rules. The CS courses should be removed for the CS majors.
S. Baker asked who the target audience is for the minor. He wondered if a student can take all of the courses in the minor if the student is not in the CS major. D. Schwaritz responded that every engineering student could take this. Many students will take CS211. S. Baker asked if there any prerequisites for this minor. D. Schwartz replied that it depends on what a student would be working on. The student might possibly need C++ and data structures. If a student focused on design, communication, digital music and art, a student could make it through CS 200, 300 and 400 without a prerequisite. B. East asked if there are other minors that could be taken without prerequisites. D. Schwartz replied that the CS minor has CS 211 with a hidden prerequisite of CS 100. He hopes that the minor could be adopted by any other college.

L. Trotter asked if the target audience is CS. D. Jenkins replied that the impetus for creating the minor is that they had scores of students come to them and ask for courses in this area. By creating a minor they were accountable for something to bring to engineering. This minor brings students together from other majors. The market for software engineers with this type of experience is very high. He is willing to eliminate the CS courses for CS majors.

A. Zehnder suggested that the issue be tabled, have the Minors Committee discuss it, and come up with a variation of this plan to address the concerns raised by the CCGB, namely: Would this be open to CS students and under what conditions? Could non CS majors who have taken the core curriculum courses get through this? Would this be more appropriate as a concentration?

**CHEM 211:** B. East said that the issue is that we had too many students signing up for CHEM 207 when they only needed 1 semester of chemistry. This was because a rumor had it that CHEM 211 was harder than CHEM 207. CHEM 207 was too overloaded so lab sections needed to be added. The Chemistry Department agreed to change the CHEM 211 syllabus so it is a more reasonable 1 semester course. This change would ease the CHEM 207/208 overload. CHEM 208 can be taken after CHEM 211 if that is desired.

A. Zehnder said that the Chemistry Department has been responsive to the students’ needs. This change will allow the engineers to get a good basic chemistry course in 1 semester. L. Pollack said that there was a long waiting list last year (200 students) for CHEM 211 and students panicked and signed up for CHEM 207. The waiting list issue needs to be fixed. A. Zehnder said that he would ask the Chemistry Department what was changed on the syllabus. B. East said that she would relay the concerns about the waiting list and advising issues to the Chemistry Department, and she suggested that A. Zehnder do the same.

**ENGRI Courses:** A. Zehnder said that it was not clear if the consensus from the CCGB is that we should look into these courses. D. Gries said that the CCGB hasn’t had a chance to look at the syllabi of these courses and would prefer to wait until the next semester to look at them. J. Bartsch said that some of them have almost become gateway courses for majors. They are struggling with staffing to create an ENGRI course and use other ENGRI courses. A. Zehnder said that he would have the Engineering Courses Committee look at this issue at the beginning of the next academic year.

**Double and Triple Counting Courses in Minors:** D. Gries had nothing to report on this issue, but said that the Minors Committee would look at this issue along with the Minor in Game Design. B. East said that it is hard to look at minors data because we can’t tell in SIS who has taken a minor since it isn’t a field in the system. It is only listed in the notes section as a text field. E. Fisher said that it is best to say how each minor looks and what overlap exists.
S. Baker said that people in his department have trouble identifying who is trying to get a minor. Some students show up at the end and say they have a minor. B. East said that it would be best if the student came in and said they wanted to have a minor and received some information from the Advising Office about this. E. Fisher said that this would ensure that there were no surprises at the end.

D. Gries said that in 2005 there were two people with 3 minors; in 2004 there was one person with 3 minors.

A. Zehnder agreed to look at the minors issue at the next meeting, along with the Minor in Game Design.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.