Agenda, May 5, 2000
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Engineering Writing/Communication Committee

CCGB Minutes
April 28, 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: K. Athreya, M. Fish, J. Herrera, J. Hopcroft, M. Miller, F. Wise, S. Youra

Ex-Officio: D. Cox, B. East, T. Healey, D. Maloney-Hahn, F. Shumway

Others: C. Pakkala, R. Springall

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of April 14th were approved with the following change (in bold) in the final paragraph on page two: L. Lion (CEE) spoke about the CEE 590 course which is currently overloaded with undergraduates who want the Civil minor in Engineering Management.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East (Admissions) announced that nearly 600 people attended the Cornell Days 2000 events. The Admissions Office has received a larger number of deposits so far this year, but those may level off. The students who are certain they are coming to Cornell are the ones who apply for early decision. B. East presented an “Honorary Ambassador” t-shirt to C. Van Loan (CS) for his hosting efforts during Cornell Days 2000.

3-2 Program: (Handouts distributed.) B. East (Admissions) spoke about the transfer agreements that Cornell currently has with Ithaca College and Wells College and inquired about the College’s interest in expanding the program to include other local 4-year schools. Students in this program spend 3 years in their home institution and finish with 2 years of study at Cornell in engineering—obtaining a B.A. and a B.S. in the process. This arrangement benefits Cornell by increasing the number of transfer students. The other colleges benefit because they are able to attract better students. R. Cleary (ORIE) stated that he has a lot of experience with 3-2 programs at other colleges. He questioned the benefit to the students of transferring to Cornell and spending 2 difficult years trying to finish their bachelors degrees. He does view this program as a good recruiting tool for liberal arts colleges to get undergraduate students into a technical field. It is his perception that most advisors at Cornell do not know the 3-2 program even exists. R. Springall (Admissions) said that although all 13 students from IC who have participated in this program have done EE or M&AE, this type of program should feed into all engineering programs. The goal of Admissions is to expand this program to include other, neighboring colleges and to make it more visible within the College of Engineering as a whole. L. Lion (CEE) praised the program, stating that CEE sees it as a way to increase their student numbers. P. Kintner (EE) asked if this process was a more effective way of producing transfer students. B. East responded that it is, although it won’t reduce the number of freshmen admitted. It will generate a bit more work for the staff who will review the transfer folders and perhaps create a few more discussions with faculty members, but these students will be treated like any other transfer students. C. Van Loan (CS) appreciates the good-will angle created by
this program and is looking forward to working with additional non-standard students. P. Kintner suggested that Admissions attempt to expand the program by selecting 1 or 2 neighboring schools and setting up agreements with them.

**AEW’s:** C. Van Loan (CS) stated that the pilot AEW’s for 100M were viewed as successful for the spring semester. Also, 99 was not cancelled for the fall. J. Jenkins questioned how to make the course seem enriching rather than remedial. C. Van Loan replied that they have worked hard to remove the stigma associated with the AEW’s and hopes that the remedial tone is not present in the current AEW’s. P. Kintner (EE) asked how the AEW’s operate. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) responded that upper-level undergraduate students who are trained to be facilitators teach the AEW’s. The AEW’s serve over 1,100 students and are currently funded by a private donor. Unfortunately that funding is only good through the next year, so plans are underway to generate funds to extend the AEW’s beyond that time.

**ABET:** (Handout distributed) P. Kintner (EE) stated that he went to a Best Assessment Practices III conference at the Rose-Hulman Institute. The conference addressed the issue of assessment and feedback loops in the context of EC 2000 and the ABET accreditation process. Essentially faculty as a group will be responsible for their courses and outcomes and demonstrate that they have feedback loops in place to assist in monitoring their courses. It has been estimated that 20-30% of faculty will not accept the new assessment process and that each department should have a “champion” of the process in order to “sell” it to the faculty. F. Gouldin (M&AE) asked if the faculty member would have to devote all of his/her time to this endeavor. P. Kintner responded that, as this is a continuous process, a person would need to devote 1-2 years to it. He suggested that the Engineering faculty start the parts of EC2000 which are to their advantage and experiment with feedback loops by doing assessments at the end of the students’ senior year. This is a complicated process, and a few institutions have made the decision to excel in assessment. Further adding to the complications is the fact that there is no agreement on definitions, vocabulary, etc. ABET and engineering programs have major learning and development to do before EC2000 reaches equilibrium. T. Healey (Assoc. Dean) stated that at the recent Big 10+ Associate Deans Meeting, ABET was viewed positively by those institutions that have already gone through it, e.g., Northwestern, Ohio State and Michigan. He said that the associate deans from those institutions highly recommended that each department have 1 or 2 faculty members attend an ABET training workshop to “get religion,” and (even better) to get faculty to become ABET evaluators. They also recommend that we use the flexibility of EC 2000 to make curriculum changes that truly benefit the College. F. Gouldin expressed his concern that departments would not have the resources to commit to the process. P. Kintner suggested that some faculty be sent to ABET training to give them exposure to the process in order to provide procedural consistency across the College.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 a.m.