CCGB MINUTES
April 3, 1998


Members Absent: K. Gebremedhin, J. Hopcroft, D. Ruppert, F. Wise, C. Van Loan

Ex-Officio: B. East, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon, J. Stedinger, J. Belina

Minutes: J. Abel, Chair, CEE: Minutes of March 27, 1998 approved as distributed.

Announcement: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Lists of students with missing grades were distributed to the appropriate departments. A memo to colleagues was distributed reminding them that grade submittal deadlines are to be taken seriously, and that missing those deadlines makes more work for all of us, and does a disservice to the students (attached).

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: Freshman advisors assignments are in the process of being calculated. FTE information from the Dean’s office was received with the number of faculty available for advising for next year. The net FTE’s for each department are minus leaves, retirements, and new professors. Individual department numbers were handed out listing all FTE’s. If these lists are incorrect please contact K. Hover with corrections by next Tuesday. The leaves and retirements, if occurring in the Fall semester, should already be indicated. In addition, faculty on phased retirement should also be indicated.

Biology Sub-Committee Report: J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Although members of the biology sub-committee are not present, are their any questions or comments regarding the sub-committee proposals that were outlined in last week meeting?

P. Kintner, EE: The faculty in EE are not in favor of another requirement, although they would be interested in looking at creating an option between Chemistry and Biology.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Proposal 1 seems to make it possible for a student to take a biology-related course that also fulfills another requirement; in this sense, it is not like adding a new requirement.

P. Kintner, EE: The computing requirement is a fossil as many courses are now offered which meet this requirement.

D. Grubb, MSE: Can the computing requirement be replaced by a biology requirement?

M. Duncan, ChE: Seconded D. Grubb’s suggestion.

J. Stedinger, CEE: Substantial number of students from many fields, including an occasional EE student, take ENGRD 241 to fulfill the computing requirement.

P. Kintner, EE: Is there a list of computing requirements that a course should offer to fulfill the computing requirement?

J. Stedinger, CEE: The CCGB minutes should have the details on the computing requirement dating back 4 or 5 years. Will try to dig out copies – I chaired that committee, so should have them.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: D. Grubb is the chair of the CCGB sub-committee on Computing and Computing Applications. Return to this suggestion after further discussion of the Biology proposals.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: The biology subcommittee proposals will be tabled until next week as members if the committee are not in attendance to answer questions on the proposals. Also, this will give the CCGB representatives more time to poll faculty in their depts. The CEE Environmental option
already meets the biology requirements of Proposal 1; however, the proposal may be more problematic for the CEE civil option. Need to get more feedback from the CEE faculty.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: The Biology Sub-Committee did a great service to the college by the collection and formatting of the biology courses. This has made advising students with an interest in biology, easier. Students with biology interest now have a resource they can go to and get information about courses offered in each department.

**More on Computing Requirements (not on agenda):** D. Grubb, MSE: The sub-committee on Computing and Computing Applications will conduct a total review of the computing requirements.

J. Jenkins, T&AM: CS 100 should also be discussed to see if it is an appropriate requirement.

M. Duncan, ChE: Can the computing requirement be taught in context such as the writing requirement and engineering distribution are being done now?

P. Kintner, EE: CS100 should not be a requirement but students should go straight to 211.

J. Abel, CEE, Chair: Are there volunteers to join the Computing sub-committee? We should ask P. Clancy, as chair of the computing policy committee, to join in the discussion. Other volunteers include J. Jenkins, K. Hover, someone from EE and possibly C. Van Loan (not present to defend himself).

K. Hover, Assoc. Dean: On a related issue, since the switch to JAVA has their been any feedback?

P. Kintner, EE: Any feedback received regarding CS100 has not been particularly positive.

J. Stedinger, CEE: A fundamental review of all courses which meet the computing requirement should be conducted.

D. Grubb, MSE: First feedback from the CS and other depts. on this topic will be solicited.

**ENGRG 150 Report for 1997-98:** J. Stedinger, CEE, Chair of ENGRG 150 Committee: A copy of the Fall 1997 ENGRG 150 Evaluations report by the ENGRG 150 committee was distributed (attached). The report summarizes the ENGRG 150 surveys collected at the end of the 1997 Fall semester, and presents an overview of the comments and observations made by students and faculty on those surveys about their ENGRG 150 Seminar experiences. The survey was the same one as last year with a few minor changes. The idea of a seminar with mini courses has been accepted by some of our leading competitors. Responses were received by half of the ENGRG 150 sections. The survey is looking for the best/worst topics. Co-op was rated the top activity in the ENGRG 150 Seminars.

P. Kintner, EE: Many of the highly rated topics relate more to being a student rather than engineering. Maybe presentations should be aimed at student lives rather than engineering topics.

M. Duncan, ChE: Students need to discover some of life learnings on their own.

P. Kintner, EE: Having conducted many presentations, students seem more alert in the early part of the semester compared to the later half. Students seem to be interested in how engineering has changed over my lifetime and how it will change over theirs.

J. Belina, EE: There was better attendance in the first half of the semester. Students seem particularly interested in what was said relating to career paths in EE.

J. Stedinger, CEE: The ENGRG 150 students are sorted by their interest with those undecided grouped together. A big push was done this year to involve the peer advisors in ENGRG 150 sections. Faculty and students would like to see more of the peer advisors. Peer advisors may have course conflicts with the ENGRG 150 times. Section times sometimes are in conflict or inconvenient for freshman schedules. We would like to continue to encourage faculty to schedule meeting times at the best possible time for students. The ENGRG 150 committee would like to identify, in each dept., someone as the ENGRG 150 coordinator. This person would work with the ENGRG 150 committee to help schedule and coordinate meeting times, order food, etc. The committee is trying to minimize efforts and economy of scale with the ENGRG 150 seminars.
D. Bartel, MAE: How has the scenery changed since ENGRG 150 has been a requirement?
J. Stedinger, CEE: ENGRG 150 has been a requirement for three years. Previously 60% of the students took the course. There are fewer students complaining there is not enough information to make decisions.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: Affiliation counseling with students has been helped through ENGRG 150. Only thirty-nine students are not affiliated at this time, mostly due to grade issues. ENGRG 150 has helped students get the information they need in order to decide which field to affiliate with.
D. Bartel, MAE: Many ENGRG 150 sessions may be redundant and be of topics that students are not interested in.
D. Maloney Hahn, Advising: We encourage faculty members to let the students help set the agenda for the ENGRG 150 sessions.
J. Stedinger, CEE: We suggest that students vote on what topics they would liked covered in their sessions, although some faculty set the agenda with very good results. In addition, these sessions give advisors a chance to do some group advising, especially prior to pre-registration.
J. Abel, CEE, Chair: ENGRG 150 changes for this past semester have been the one credit restored and the central coordination of the sessions.
J. Stedinger, CEE: Also we have implemented topics to include study skills and exam preparation and have enlisted the help of the peer advisors to the ENGRG 150 sessions. Based on the survey results, the approach used in Fall 1997 seemed to be well received by both faculty and students. Present plans call for continuation of a similar approach for Fall 1998.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

**Agenda for Friday, April 10, 1998:**

1. Approval of Minutes, April 3, 1998
2. Announcements (Hover)
3. Biology Sub-Committee Proposals (Gebremedhin)
4. Technical Writing Committee Activities (Wise, Youra)