Agenda, September 6, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Undergraduate Announcements
2. Dean Kent Fuchs: Welcome and comments
3. 2002-2003 topics for CCGB -- brainstorming session
4. Suggestions for acknowledging 9/11 anniversary in our classrooms -- discussion
5. “Out of Classroom” experiences in our curriculum (if there is time; T. Jordan)

CCGB Minutes, May 24, 2002

Members: J. Bartsch, J. Bisogni, D. Dalthorp, E. Giannelis, F. Gouldin, T. Healey, B. Kusse


Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, D. Maloney Hahn

Other: D. Bartel, C. Pakkala, M. van der Meulen

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of May 10, 2002 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: None.

BME Minor Discussion: D. Bartel (M&AE) and M. van der Meulen (M&AE) came to the CCGB meeting on behalf of M. Shuler (ChemE) to answer questions and address concerns. B. Kusse (A&EP) stated that one of the faculty members in his department thought that the curriculum was put together too quickly. Staffing for some of the courses was also raised as an issue, as was the coupling of M.Eng. with the minor. M. van der Meulen said that the current curriculum has been under discussion by the BME Curriculum Committee, although a previous committee formulated much of the curriculum 2 years ago. Although some of the courses are not staffed, they will be. B. Kusse added that he had a concern about the usage of the terms “suggested” vs. “alternative” and indicated that it is the only minor that separates courses into the 2 categories. M. van der Meulen responded that the 2 categories were used in order to clarify the options for both the students and their advisors. They would like to have 6 core courses eventually. T. Healey (T&AM) added that the course sequence listed is the recommended sequence rather than the mandatory sequence. C. Van Loan (CS) suggested that 2 tiers of courses be set up: A flat course structure and then another tier for designated courses that would provide the foundation for the M.Eng. J. Bartsch (BEE) stated that a minor is just that, a minor, and that it shouldn’t be a path to the M.Eng. He wondered if the objective was to create a minor or an entire program in BME. D. Bartel said that the subset of this minor leads to the M.Eng. in BME. He added that the courses accommodate the existing minor and provide a new set of courses that lead directly to the M.Eng. F. Gouldin (M&AE) suggested that the references to the M.Eng. be removed, along with the terms “suggested” and “alternative.” He said that it isn’t appropriate to reference the M.Eng. under the heading of undergraduate information, and it should instead be promoted via advertising and advisors. C. Van Loan stated that, because the College is procrastinating on presenting the information to prospective freshmen, it is losing students to other schools. He suggested that the College be up-front and organized with their offerings. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) said that putting in a lot of pre-requisites in the minor would discourage students who want to enter the minor late. He added that the minor shouldn’t be a 4-year program; that it should be shorter. F. Gouldin stated that he was uncomfortable with the references to the M.Eng. degree because the courses are not in place yet. He suggested that students be encouraged to take the courses for graduate study. D. Bartel responded that, although the M.Eng. Program is not yet in place, they need to recommend courses for students to take if they want to obtain the degree. He added that the current Cornell students would have an advantage over outside students because they will already be up to speed, and the program can be done in 1 year. M. van der Meulen suggested that asterisks be put next to BME 301, BME 302, BME 401 and BME 402 and designate at the bottom of the page that they’re recommended courses for the M.Eng. D.
Bartel stated that the minor was debated for 3-4 years, and the M.Eng. degree offers a number of opportunities for the students. He approved of the asterisks and footnote notation. B. Kusse said that he likes the idea that students don’t have to commit themselves to a major or concentration until their sophomore year. M. van der Meulen said that the curriculum is flexible for a minor. D. Maloney Hahn said that the minor wouldn’t be in the Engineering Undergraduate Handbook for Fall 2002. T. Healey stated that the e-mail votes on the BME minor would be due by May 31st.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.