Agenda for 4/27/01  
CCGB Meeting  

1. Approval of minutes from 4/6/01  
2. Undergraduate Announcements  
3. Proposal for an ENGRI course in Computer Science (Information to follow from CS)  
4. Continued Discussion of Biomedical Minor (Please bring or forward questions/comments on how the minor fits for particular courses of study.)  
5. Associate Dean's Updates (Possibly including, but not limited to: Spring ECC meeting, student projects, ABET, academic integrity, role of the Associate Dean.)  

CCGB Minutes  
April 6, 2001  

Members: J. Bartsch, R. Cleary, M. Duncan, E. Giannelis, F. Gouldin, T. Healey, R. Kay, L. Lion, C. Van Loan  

Absent: D. Cox, B. East, J. Hopcroft, S. Wicker, F. Wise, S. Youra  

Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, T. Bennington, B. Grant, D. Maloney Hahn, T. Thompson, D. Worley  

Other: C. Pakkala  

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of March 30th were approved with a minor change.  

Undergraduate Announcements: D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) announced that the folks in his office will set up appointments with the fields to discuss the undergraduate handbook and how Advising can meet the needs of the fields.  

R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the CSE Conference is this weekend and that faculty should greet the visiting alumni. Fred Gouldin has agreed to chair the Student Experience Committee, which will meet soon to discuss ENGRG 150. R. Cleary attended the Big 10+ Associate Deans Meeting in Chicago and appreciated hearing about what is going on in other colleges/universities.  

J. Bartsch (ABEN) asked for clarification of the rumor that ENGRD 202 is being overhauled. T. Healey (T&AM) responded that T&AM, CEE and M&AE have been examining the course and have thought about splitting the course into a 3 credit lab and 1 credit lecture course.  

Whitaker Proposal/Biology (handout): R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean) discussed the proposal to the Whitaker Foundation which requests monetary support for developing and sustaining undergraduate and graduate programs in Biomedical Engineering. The Whitaker Foundation normally uses a more hands-on approach (tighter regulations) than do other organizations that donate money to Cornell. R. Kay (EAS) stated that it would be inappropriate for the foundation to be hands-on when they don’t know how the university functions. C. Van Loan (CS) was enthusiastic about the proposal and suggested that fields look at how students could fit the 5 courses in. R. Cleary suggested that the courses could likely be fit in with what they are currently taking with very little effort. E. Giannelis (MS&E) asked what job opportunities would be available for students who have taken the minor. R. Cleary replied that there are a lot of job opportunities in the pharmaceuticals industry and biotech companies. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that there are currently a lot of minors and precedents set in the college. Some of the fields find it easy to work the minors into their programs, but other fields find it difficult. He wondered if the CCGB would be pressured to change the rules of the minors if the proposal were accepted. R. Cleary
responded that he doesn’t perceive the proposal as changing the minors’ rules. L. Lion (CEE) asked if the BIOG 110 were going to replace the current BIOG 110. J. Bartsch (ABEN) replied that the bio courses are always evolving, and the new BIOG 110 is the evolved version of the current BIOG 110. The new BIOG 110 is designed to be a stand-alone course. R. Cleary stated that the new BIOG 110 appears to have more computer modeling than the current course. C. Van Loan recommended that the college be proactive rather than passive and actively discuss ways for students to complete the minor. He suggested that a member of the CCGB work with W. Mark Saltzman (ChemE) and his curriculum committee to transmit the faculty’s ideas to the Whitaker Foundation. R. Cleary mentioned that he is on the curriculum committee and will relay to that committee any ideas/concerns that the CCGB members have about the Whitaker Proposal. The committee views the outline of the minor as outstanding, and is working on ways to make the minor available to as many students as possible. L. Lion asked what field would administer the minor. R. Cleary replied that he would check on the administrative details. F. Gouldin stressed the importance of clarifying the prerequisites, particularly those for BIOG 110 and BME 1. R. Kay agreed that the prerequisites, and the timing of them, are important. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that this is not a traditional minor because it is open to all students at the university; not just to those students in Engineering.

**Discussion of CS Motion 2** (handouts): The CCGB members looked at the Fall 2000 Freshman Advisor Distribution per Van Loan Proposal and the revised tables prepared by R. Cleary (Assoc. Dean). R. Cleary mentioned that the chart reflects no difference in the figures for last year with either formula. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that there were more students between 1998 and 1999, which changed the advisor ratio, so the middle column (Motion 2 Proposed) would not have worked. Both R. Cleary and C. Van Loan (CS) agreed that the proposed change is philosophical and is viewed differently by how each person feels upper-level advisees count. **Motion:** To change the advisor allocation formulation so that the number of available advisors (n) would be calculated using: \[ n=\text{NetFTE’s}-1.25F-1.0E \] instead of the current \[ n=\text{NetFTE’s}-1.0F-1.0E \], where \( F \) = number of advisors required to handle continuing majors AND \( E \) = number of ENGRG 150 advisors for the previous year. The motion was rejected, with 3 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 abstention.

The meeting adjourned at 8:51 a.m.