Agenda, May 7, 2004
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Committee Progress Reports
4. Discussion of Minor Certificates (led by TAM representative)
5. Committee Assignments for 2004-2005 (Required by the By-laws. We need to know who your CCGB representative will be and what committee that person will serve on. The committees are: ASPAC, Engineering Courses, Science and Math, Humanities and Social Sciences, Technical Writing, Evaluation of Student Experience.)

CCGB Minutes, April 23, 2004

Members:  J. Bartsch, A. Center, D. Gries, T. Healey, R. Kay, M. Louge, W. Philpot
Ex-Officio: R. Evans, L. Schneider, K. Smith
Other:  C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of 4/9/04 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: J. Bartsch asked what the overall assessment was of Cornell Days. He said that he met some really great students, who appeared to possess a sharp intellect.

What CCGB Committees Have To Do For ABET: D. Gries stated that there are two things to be done by the CCGB committees: (1) Look at the post-course assessments for various courses and write a short report, and (2) Look at past minutes of CCGB meetings from 1998 and document feedback loops.

(1) Gries distributed a list of courses for which each of the committees will review the documentation. He distributed the courses so that one committee wouldn’t have so much work. The post-course assessment guideline and review sheet should give the people on the committees an idea of what they should be doing. If a course assessment seems inadequate, people should let the instructor know so it can be improved next time. The process should become easier each time. While examining the post-course assessments, people should look for individual or broader problems that span several courses. This all needs to be done for ABET. It shouldn’t take too long; maybe an hour or 1.5 hours. The committee should ask:

1. Is the documentation okay for abet?
2. Does CCGB need to do anything to improve the course?

The reports are due to D. Gries by May 5. T. Healey asked what should be done about documentation that is missing. D. Gries replied that it should just be noted that it is missing and he will contact departments for that information. R. Kay said that since critiquing the documentation is a bit tricky, he wondered if, when finding some problems with the documentation, whether we should let the instructor know. D. Gries replied that addressing problems with the course documentation would be between the CCGB and the instructor; you could contact the instructors if you felt comfortable doing so. M. Louge said that they analyzed their courses, and it took 5-10 minutes for each course, using the assessment form. It was easy. The problem is that most instructors don’t know what the course outcome should be, and there are other misunderstood things. There are not really problems with the courses, but with the assessments. D. Gries instructed the committee members not to lose the documentation because it is the only documentation that we have and we’ll need it for the ABET evaluators. Some of the documentation is duplicated in departmental offices. Louge: A typical issue of the documentation is that it becomes too large.
(2) D. Gries stated that each committee needs to go through the CCGB minutes since 1998 and write a short report about issues that they discussed and when, and why the issues were addressed. The result that was decided should be discussed, as well as whether the CCGB had a motion based on that, what the motion was and the outcome that was attained. It doesn’t have to be a long report; the shorter, the better, if it explains the “feedback loops” that we have been using. He requested the report by May 5.

On course evaluations: M. Louge stated that S. Leibovich had told the instructors to have their students do the online evaluations. He suggested that it would be good to have different versions of the survey, i.e. one for class and one for the labs. D. Gries replied that this is something that the CCGB should work on. In 1984 the faculty met; there were about 25 people present. Of those present, 18 voted yes to put the evaluations online and the others abstained or voted no. They voted that the summary evaluations are public and, by rights, anyone can see them. J. Bartsch asked about assessing outcomes by adding relevant questions to the survey. D. Gries replied that it would be good if instructors could add questions to the online evaluations, but the process is currently funneled through the course administrators. He added that Monday morning M. Hammer should fix the problem in the system and that the course administrators would be able to add questions to the course evaluations.

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 a.m.