## Agenda, May 10, 2002

**CCGB Meeting**

1. Approval of Minutes of 5/03/02 Meeting
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Discussion of BME Minor Motion
4. Reports from subcommittee chairs

## CCGB Minutes

**May 3, 2002**


Ex-Officio: D. Cox, D. Maloney Hahn, J. Saylor, T. Shapiro, T. Thompson

Other: C. Pakkala, M. Shuler, M. Walter

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of April 26, 2002 were approved with a minor revision.

**Undergraduate Announcements:** T. Healey (T&AM) announced that the CCGB would need to meet for at least one more week. M. Shuler (ChemE) stated that he would provide an outline of the new Biomedical Engineering minor next week. T. Healey added that the minor would be voted on 2 weeks after it is first discussed, likely via e-mail.

**BME Minor Discussion** (Proposed Motions distributed): M. Shuler (ChemE) spoke about two proposed motions for the CCGB:

1. The BMEP will be responsible for administering the BME minor.
2. BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 to be used as an Introduction to Engineering class. While BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 will be the recommended entry to the BME minor, other introduction to biology classes can be substituted. Since the flexibility of the minor is a critical issue to CCGB, the purpose of the motion is to improve flexibility. The combination of BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 has many similarities in content to ENGRI 120, Introduction to Biomedical Engineering.

The Biomedical Engineering Curriculum Committee met and discussed the proposed curriculum, and they decided that an attempt should be made to meld the existing minor with the new curriculum. Previously, the Deans of the colleges involved with the proposed minor and the chairs/directors of the College of Engineering met and discussed the minor, and they decided that the BMEP should administer the BME minor. M. Shuler seeks CCGB’s endorsement of the BMEP as the administrative home for the minor. F. Gouldin (M&AE) asked where students would go to obtain advice about the BME minor. M. Shuler replied that there would be an identifiable office and office assistant, basically the same setup as a department, with the core faculty under a program director. B. Kusse (A&EP) asked what problem the new minor is solving. T. Healey (T&AM) replied that it is taking the minor out of T&AM and putting it where it belongs intellectually. He added that the Directors, Chairs and Dean consider this step very important and have already approved it. M. Walter (BEE) stated that it Biomedical Engineering is a program that is experiencing many changes, and he supports this administrative plan. A lot of time has been spent discussing this minor, and the important thing is to continue to serve students. B. Kusse asked if any engineering student could take the minor. M. Shuler replied that students from every major could take it. J. Bartsch (BEE) asked who would make the day-to-day decisions regarding the minor. M. Shuler replied that the core faculty will be responsible for the curriculum and an advisory board would approve changes. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) asked if the new courses would be labeled with prefixes relating to their home departments. M. Shuler replied that the core courses would be co-listed with their appropriate departments. F. Gouldin
expressed his concern that other minors are more flexible in their description. M. Shuler said that the intent is to develop a basic structure of the minor that will remain constant, although specific courses may be added or removed. He added that the list of the available courses is quite extensive, and the structure has become more flexible in the past 2 weeks. The sequence of courses is recommended for continuing (M.Eng.) students.

F. Gouldin stated that the Introduction to Engineering classes are offered by departments in order to expose freshmen to faculty, and flexibility is important with them. If the students wanted to major in biomedical engineering, they would have to start as freshmen and, if another Introduction to Engineering class were taken, there would not be a slot available for the BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 class. He suggested that this intro course not set a precedent for other intro courses. M. Shuler responded that this course would affect the minor but not the student’s choice of major. J. Bartsch asked if a student would need to be in BIOG 110 in order to do ENGRG 110. M. Shuler replied that the two courses have been linked, but it is conceivable that AP bio would be acceptable for taking ENGRG 110. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) suggested that, as other bio courses are listed as distribution courses, perhaps BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 be listed as a distribution course also. M. Shuler responded that, if it made things easier for the students, it could be done. D. Maloney Hahn also stated that students with an AP Biology score of 4 receive 6 credits, and he wondered if that would substitute for the entry course. M. Shuler said that the students would need 8 credits, and it would be possible for them to use the AP credits plus ENGRG 110. He stressed the need for ENGRG 110 to provide background in engineering, in order to provide the basis for a track that might lead to an M.Eng. E. Giannelis (MS&E) asked what advantage there would be to having the course as an intro rather than distribution course. M. Shuler replied that some majors require a specific engineering distribution course and strongly suggest a second engineering distribution, and for students in those majors an Engineering Distribution designation for BIOG 110+ENGRG 110 doesn’t work as well. D. Maloney Hahn asked how pre-med students would utilize ENGRG 110. M. Shuler replied that he would examine that issue, and added that ENGRG 110 will have a lab component that will provide important lab experience for the pre-med students. J. Bartsch stated that, if an actual layout of the minor curriculum could be provided to the CCGB, it would help facilitate the voting. M. Shuler agreed to bring in a layout to the 5/10/02 CCGB Meeting.

Letter to Provost Martin with Regard to Impact of Residential Internet Fees and the need for faculty input to decisions concerning campus networking facilities and fees: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) distributed copies of a letter she and S. Wicker have drafted to the Provost. She requested comments and approval from the CCGB members. F. Gouldin (M&AE) suggested that the letter elaborate on how the web is used for classes (i.e. problem sets and solutions, senior questionnaires, etc.). D. Cox (Assist. Dean) added that there should be some mention of how the web improves work efficiency as related to administrative processes (i.e. evaluations). J. Bisogni (CEE) suggested that the CCGB request a reversal of the decision that was made. T. Shapiro (LIFE) asked if other colleges had prepared (or were preparing) letters for the Provost. T. Jordan said that she would check with the other Associate Deans.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 a.m.