CCGB Meeting Agenda, May 19, 2006

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Chem 211 vs. Chem 207/208
4. Minor in Game Design
5. Review of Rules for Graduating with Distinction and Honors
6. Committee Assignments

CCGB Minutes, May 5, 2006

Ex-Officio: B. East, R. Robbins, L. Schneider, F. Shumway, M. Spencer
Other: D. Bell, D. Jenkins, C. Pakkala, M. Rajagopalan, D. Schwartz

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the April 21, 2006 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East stated that it is Slope Day today.

D. Gries said that Environmental Engineering is not going for ABET accreditation. They were allowed to get a double major. L. Lion said that there is a need for people to graduate from the major in order to get accredited. E. Fisher asked how the double major is done. L. Lion replied that it is easily done. D. Gries suggested that the CCGB raise the issue in September.

D. Gries stated that EAS is simplifying their major and changing the name to Science of Earth Systems. The full details are forthcoming. B. Isacks said that they are combining the Geological Sciences major and Science of Earth Systems major into a single major. F. Shumway asked if the change will be effective this fall. B. Isacks replied that the change will be effective this fall, and the Engineering Handbook is being revised to reflect this.

Review of Minors in Engineering: D. Gries said that the Engineering Management minor is given by CEE, and CEE majors can take that minor. CS majors shouldn’t be able to minor in CS. But some minors are different than majors, so the majors should be able to take them. A. Zehnder said that the 1998 Resolution on Engineering Minors doesn’t preclude majors from taking minors. L. Lion said that the CEE faculty approved the Engineering Management minor and allow major to take it. D. Bell said that this allows the double-counting of certain courses to take place. E. Fisher said that, according to the minors wording, departments should allow students to take any minor. D. Gries explained that the colored handout shows people who took 2 or 3 minors. In boldfaced type are those courses that were double counted, with those in red the courses that were required by the major. There was quite a lot of double counting going on. L. Pollack noted that the list doesn’t include field-approved electives. There are a number of electives in the major, and students should be able to use them in the minor. Advisor-approved and major-approved electives are different. D. Gries said that the idea of the handout was to see which courses could be used to finish the major and also be used for the minor. One example is a CEE major who minored in MAE and Biomedical Engineering. For some of these minors there is too much double counting occurring. L. Pollack stated that the CEE major student was using courses toward two minors, and she wondered if courses should only be applied to one minor.
E. Fisher said that the minors rules are hard to figure out for departments. J. Bartsch suggested that the CCGB members read the verbiage on the biomedical minor and maybe use it as a model for the rules. D. Gries said that the handout with arrows has restrictions for what courses can be taken. The minors guidelines reduce double counting between a major and minor. It doesn’t address double counting between two minors. J. Bartsch suggested that the number of minors be limited because some reasonable number might solve the problem. L. Lion said that he was unsure that there is a problem. A body of knowledge defined by some major constitutes a minor. A. Zehnder said that the number of minors is not a problem. There is only a small number of students taking minors. Some students come with almost a semester or year of AP credit, which is fine. Our students love to have credentials.

L. Trotter suggested that certain minors look at what’s going on in their programs and then refine their own criteria. Information Science is halfway between ORIE and CS, and there will be some double-counting. Maybe a refinement would limit double counting and additional courses could be required. D. Gries suggested that double counting between minors be restricted. He suggested that majors look at the requirements of the different minors. Various majors might see an overlap that the minors people don’t really understand. They might want to discuss this with the minors. S. Baker stated that he was not seeing the problem. A major offers a minor and the intention is that it is taken by students in other majors. If other majors already offer the courses a student needs to get a minor, he wondered why we need a major in that field if the courses can be taken elsewhere. He sees no problem with double counting if the courses represent breadth and depth. He suggested that there may be other structural problems within the minor. He asked if it is the intention that students can get a minor within the required # of credits. There is no problem with double counting except that it might show weaknesses in different curricula, and departments might want to look at their program structures.

B. East stated that as departments offer different majors, we’re going to have more double counting. It has become harder to legislate a body of knowledge. E. Fisher suggested that faculty think about this issue from an employer’s point of view. They want this to mean something. She doesn’t think that each department can evaluate their minors on their own because they need to know what the other majors are doing. D. Gries stated that a review of minors is done when they are approved by the CCGB. D. Bell offered to send people data on which students are minoring in what areas. E. Fisher agreed that it would be helpful. A. Zehnder suggested that the CCGB ask the departments to review their minors for content and potential overlap with other majors and minors. The CCGB will request that information from departments next year. In the meantime, people can look at the Engineering Handbook to determine where overlap occurs. D. Gries and A. Zehnder will put together a request for the next academic year.

Proposal for Minor in Game Design: M. Rajagopalan stated that the important thing for people to realize is that game design isn’t the same as game development or software engineering. Game design is taking game development and software engineering and creating something that will provide entertainment and artistic experience. Game design involves different disciplines, and it is put together to create a meaningful experience (fun, broadening minds, etc.). Design touches on development aspects, as well as social and cognitive aspects. The objective is not supposed to be how to make a video game from a technical standpoint. With this minor there are some psychological courses and others that aren’t about the mechanics of making games, but it allows for the analysis of how effective a game is.

D. Schwartz said that many games involve virtual worlds, and students are immersed in them. Engineering is included in this minor. Prism magazine listed the field of Entertainment Engineering. ASEE is excited about that. In 2005 the gaming industry generated 7 billion dollars. The average age of the gamer is 30, with that of the buyer at 37. The size of the industry is bigger than the N. American box
office receipts. It is a gigantic industry, and there are hundreds of game programs. RIT is working on a masters program in game design. There is an Entertainment Technology Center at Carnegie Mellon University. They offer a masters degree in that and it is popular. They are franchising this and creating an Asian branch. USC has a minor in game design. Many schools have masters, including Georgia Tech, and they are working on something at the undergraduate level. Cornell’s CS Department wants to give students exposure to multiple disciplines. This minor fits well with their goals. Next week there will be an international announcement about a Games for Girls contest. Teams had to make games for girls. One person on the team is an Independent Major with a CS concentration, one is a filmmaker, there are some BEE students, and others. We will use this event for marketing purposes.

S. Baker stated that he was uncomfortable about this minor at the previous CCGB Meeting. This is a new category in minors. The goal should not be to offer a minor that is a major somewhere else. If we are offering a minor that is really in a separate area, we will have problems treating it as a minor. The problem is a structural one: how to call it a minor if it is intended to be a separate concentration that many people can take. If the intent is to create a concentration separate from the core of a major, we might not want to have this restrictive requirement. There is a conflict between the intent of a minor and this, which contains the components of a major. B. East said that we already have something like this. We can’t say no to something like this because we have other similar things, but maybe we should examine the structure of our minors. A. Zehnder stated that he is concerned about the emphasis or reliance on non-tenured faculty to teach the program, along with the durability of the program. He asked what CS reaction is to this minor. D. Jenkins replied that CS is supportive, and they have been working on another structure. A list of faculty have endorsed this minor, with most of them in CS. C. Van Loan helped develop the minor and crafted the language. D. Gries added that it wouldn’t have come before the CCGB unless the CS faculty supported it.

L. Trotter said that the minor is not really a concentration because a CS student would need to take things not available in CS at all. It is not a subset of CS; it forces a CS student to take something peripherally related but distinct. D. Gries said that the minors encourage students to broaden their engineering education and develop skills in disciplines other than their major. This does that. L. Trotter said that this minor is a great idea, especially if CS courses are precluded for the majors. This forces them to go outside their major. D. Bell wondered when CS will start certifying students if the minor is approved. D. Schwartz said that they could start certifying students almost immediately. M. Rajagopalan said that current juniors could do this minor.

A. Zehnder called for a vote on the minor, and the vote was 10 members in favor and 1 opposed. The motion passed.

A. Zehnder thanked all of the CCGB members for their service during the year. B. East thanked C. Pakkala for her efforts.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.