The minutes of May 3, 2002 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East (Admissions) mentioned that they had accepted 20 students thus far from the wait list, and they anticipate ending up with 740 incoming engineering students. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that I. Kramnick (Vice Provost) and his staff are still looking for faculty and staff members to join in the Freshmen Book Project and read Frankenstein.

BME Minor Discussion: 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.
He also distributed the outline of the proposed BME Minor.

The Biomedical Engineering Curriculum Committee met and discussed the proposed curriculum, and they decided what courses should be contained in the minor. In order to make the BME Minor more accessible to ALL students in engineering, the Bioengineering Curriculum Committee and the field decided to eliminate all 600-level courses from the list. They also decided to add a few new courses to increase flexibility within the minor, and the graduate field is happier with the revised list of courses. D. Dalthorp (ORIE) asked if there are 6 new tenure-track faculty lines in engineering that have been created by the minor. M. Shuler replied that there are 12 available faculty slots, with 6 from engineering. Three of those are new lines, and 3 are involved with a new allocation process. The Director of the Biomedical Program will be in charge of the teaching assignments in engineering. S. Wicker (ECE) proposed a vote on Motion #1, which states, “The BMEP will be responsible for administering the BME Minor.” Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

M. Duncan (ChemE) asked if a syllabus was available for the introductory courses. M. Shuler replied that they were not available yet. F. Gouldin (M&AE) asked if M. Shuler felt the students should start this minor when they are freshmen. M. Shuler replied that it would likely be easier for them to start it as freshmen and then add biology in the sophomore year, but it isn’t essential that they proceed that way. The students could start the minor in their sophomore year. F. Gouldin asked how the sequence would affect students who want to proceed with the M.Eng. Program. M. Shuler replied that, in order to proceed with the M.Eng., the students would need to have some knowledge of biomolecular engineering by the time they graduate as undergraduates. R. Kay (EAS) asked if AP credit could be substituted for BIOG 101-104 and satisfy the ENGRG requirement. M. Shuler replied that ENGRG 110 would add the necessary engineering component that would be missing from the introductory biology courses. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) asked if ENGRI 120 would be offered if ENGRG 110 were changed to a distribution course. M. Shuler responded that ENGRI 120 would not be offered next year because he doesn’t have the faculty to teach it, and he has higher priority items to contend with, namely obtaining faculty for the core courses and establishing the minor and M.Eng. Program. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that it is important to allow the
fields some flexibility with the courses in the minor and that he (and the CS field) would like to see the syllabus for the courses before they approved the minor for their students. He thought a sentence should be added to the second motion that states that BIOG 110 could replace the third physics course (Physics 214), because the students don’t really need to take it. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that the Math and Sciences Subcommittee had been meeting and could take a look at the course syllabus and treat the issue in depth if the CCGB wanted them to. F. Gouldin (M&AE) stated that he would vote against the amendment, because obviously there are many pros and cons to replacing the course, and the issue requires more discussion. He also stated it would be unfortunate to anchor the motion where it is because there is a sense of urgency that the minor be put in place. M. Shuler said that the minor will be put in place regardless, but the timing of its implementation may influence how some freshmen arrange their classes to accommodate the minor. T. Healey (T&AM) stated that he is behind the minor when it comes to ORIE & CS, but he thinks that 101-104 might be more appropriate. M. Shuler said that Bio 110/Eng. 110 is meant to be a useful-level biology course with an engineering flavor while the other biology courses are really more hardcore. M. Shuler said that biochemistry 330 could possibly replace Physics 214. He said that the spirit of the motions is to make the minor more accessible to engineering students from all fields. J. Bartsch asked if a student who came in with a 5 in AP bio could not take BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110. M. Shuler said there is no reason the students couldn’t take the 1-credit ENGRG 110 class, but the 1-credit class wouldn’t satisfy the Introduction to Engineering requirement. He also suggested that someone with a 4 in AP bio should take BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110. S. Wicker said that students would need to take the entire 4 credit hours to get the Introduction to Engineering credit, and if they placed out, they’d take another introductory course. Motion: BIOG 110 and ENGRG 110 to be used as an Introduction to Engineering class. Vote: 11 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed.

Reports from Subcommittee Chairs: J. Bisogni (CEE) stated that the Math and Science Committee met to discuss requirements and where fields could fit them in. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) mentioned that bio in the core curriculum had previously been discussed and possibly going to a physics sequence, such as 207 & 208. He wondered if the 2 courses would allow for bio in the curriculum. J. Bisogni replied that it wasn’t discussed, but it would be something to factor in.

F. Gouldin (MS&E) stated that the Liberal Studies Committee met with Michael Davis (the Bovay Ethics Chair candidate), and he turned the group’s thinking around. M. Davis was adamant that ethics become part of the curriculum, with it being included in multiple courses. He also mentioned that it would be good to talk about the code of ethics, the history of it, and why they were instituted. He will bring a recommendation from his committee regarding ethics to the CCGB in the fall.

J. Bartsch (BEE) stated that the Student Experience Committee met and looked at previous surveys on the student experience and spent time reviewing Eng. 150’s, AEW’s, Peer Education Program and other programs. The current year’s Eng. 150 report has issues that need to be emphasized. He wondered if another Student Experience Survey should be done, because the last one was done in 1998. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) said that the Eng. 150 students suggested that, to motivate the students to participate more in future Eng. 150 classes, the students take a design project and compete with the other classes for a winning design. J. Bartsch added that the students also suggested that “Meet the Professors” sessions be set up so they could become more familiar with their faculty in an informal setting.

B. East (Admissions) requested that transfer folders be returned as soon as possible. P. Beebe (Communications) asked that the Technical Writing questionnaire be returned to J. Belina.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.