CCGB Minutes, May 6, 2005

Ex-Officio: B. East, R. Robbins
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the April 8, 2005 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East thanked everyone who participated in Cornell Days and mentioned that Admissions will use their wait list. Although the student yield is a bit down from last year, the Co-op numbers are up slightly from last year, with employers seeking more students.

ROTC Courses as Advisor-Approved Courses: L. Trotter distributed a handout and stated that he reviewed the ROTC course materials. There are certain elements of politics and ethics in the courses that students could study for credit, which is a positive thing. Some history courses are beautifully laid out, and would constitute a legitimate history course. He believes that students that take these courses have some exposure to ethics, which is good. A historical view of philosophy is given, but the context in which this is viewed is confined. This is generally limited to war topics and the concept of “just wars.” The extent to which it can be said that this material is academic is limited, so it is difficult to sanction academic credit for this. Engineering could say that for all of this material put together, and advisors could give 3 credits. Someone has to decide with a critical eye whether and how many credits should be assigned. There is some educational value from a fraction of the courses. He’s more comfortable with cross-listing courses or having a body in engineering decide whether credit is assigned. He has serious doubts about whitewashing this issue and saying that the courses are okay for academic credit.

M. Louge stated that he thinks that we should bring the ROTC students back into the fold. The ROTC Relations Committee has a say in who comes to campus to teach. There is educational value in an ROTC experience. If we want to have ROTC courses count toward an approved elective, we need to have specific criteria. MAE 101/201 is a fine technical course, and one he has taught. Sadly, many of the ROTC courses are inclined more toward indoctrination than education. L. Trotter said that oral communication is important for our engineering students. It is in some of these ROTC courses, but the focus is military briefings, with no breadth of the topic of communications. M. Louge said that the courses should be open to students other than ROTC students for equity purposes, if they are cross-listed. Because 6 of the engineering departments are accredited, we should use the ABET guidelines for the courses. We should obtain their objectives and ask how the effectiveness of their courses is assessed. Perhaps the CCGB could determine if the courses could satisfy the communications requirement. Engineering need not award the same # of credits the ROTC awards for their courses. We should not give credit to a whole program but instead to specific courses. If the proper criteria are in place, we could open the door to the ROTC students and not subject ourselves to criticism of having
sold out our curriculum to people in extramural courses. A. Center wondered if engineering could give some credit for the overall program. He wondered if the ROTC program were like an independent research project. L. Trotter replied that students can use independent research for part of their field program. M. Louge stated that some people have abused this privilege in order to graduate early, so MAE major coordinators have tightened the requirements a bit to prevent that.

C. Pollock said that his son did naval ROTC at Cornell and it was an excellent and rigorous program. Collectively the students learn a lot of stuff such as leadership, command, ethics, etc. Maybe a fraction of credit would be good to give to the ROTC students for their courses. L. Trotter said that if an individual course merits credit in its own right, he would agree with that, but it is hard to assign a value to each course. He suggested that maybe the entire programs should be assigned credits. D. Grubb said that the Liberal Studies Committee decides what non-arts courses are okay in Engineering. D. Gries stated that there are Air Force courses for 0 or 1 credits or 3 credit courses, with about 5 leadership courses, so assigning credit per course might prove difficult. Navy weaponry courses have about the same number of credits, while the Army has only 2 credit courses maximum. A. Center said that it is fine if the ROTC instructors want to cross-list a course, as long as they can find a sympathetic department. D. Grubb added that the lack of a host department has been a problem in the past. M. Louge said that the subjects that the military covers aren’t really what engineering covers.

A. Zehnder stated that he has a freshman in ROTC who likes the courses because they don’t require independent thought. A course here in Engineering would make the student criticize or analyze the subject matter. L. Trotter said that the scope, breadth and context in which these subjects are viewed are not the same as the academic context, although a student can’t go through some of the ROTC history courses without learning some history. J. Bartsch said that some ROTC courses should be considered as liberal studies courses. BEE has been allowing these courses as advisor-approved electives for a long time. This practice has served the students well and is not harmful. He was on the ROTC committee before, and he was convinced that many of the courses had merit as liberal studies. The History Department will not allow cross listing of these courses. C. Pollock stated that he thinks advisor-approved electives are fine and there used to be free electives which would solve this problem. He feels that up to 2 courses should be counted for credit. D. Grubb mentioned that two of the Navy courses are already cross-listed.

D. Gries suggested that Engineering could grant the ROTC students 6 credits of advisor-approved electives, while L. Trotter suggested that Engineering grant the students 3 credits. A. Center stated that the ROTC program does provide an educational experience and wondered if Engineering could recognize that. He wondered whether the students could get 6 credits if they take cross-listed courses in addition to the courses in their programs. He stated that he thinks that they should receive 3 credits just for being in the program. D. Grubb said that credit can’t be awarded just for being in the program because a course number needs to be given in order to assign credits. D. Gries agreed that the students could be awarded up to 3 credits, but engineering should not allow an accumulation of 3, 1-credit courses. D. Gries asked if the decision should be placed on hold. M. Louge suggested a straw vote to determine if the CCGB could accept a minimum of 3 credits awarded to ROTC students who complete their program. D. Gries said that the CCGB should just look at specific courses in order to award credit. L. Trotter suggested that the students be given credit during their junior or senior year. The question is where credits fit into the curriculum toward graduation. **D. Grubb presented the straw vote allowing 3 distributed credits for ROTC Students.** Straw Vote: 7 in favor, 1 against. The CCGB will talk about this more generally in the future.
Fourth Math Course for CS and ORE Majors: D. Gries distributed a handout with the official motion of the math and science sequence for CS and ORE majors. A. Zehnder said that he asked K. Pingali about Math 293, and he didn’t want to use it. D. Gries stated that the ISST major was not included in the initial discussion of the motion, so they aren’t included in it and they haven’t asked A. Zehnder to be included. L. Trotter stated that he thinks that the people in the ISST want to be included on this. D. Grubb requested a vote on the following motion: The CCGB approves the following math sequences for CS majors and ORE majors: - For CS majors: Math 191, 192, 294 and (Math 293 or CS 280). –For ORE majors: Math 191, 192, 294 and (Math 203 or Math 304 or CS 280). Vote: 8 in favor, 1 abstention, 0 against.

Committee Assignments: The CCGB members for the 2005-2006 academic year will be: AEP: Lois Pollack; BEE: Jim Bartsch; CBE: Al Center; CEE: Len Lion; CS: Keshav Pingali; ECE: Adam Bojanczyk; EAS: Bryan Isacks; MSE: David Grubb; MAE: Elizabeth Fisher; ORIE: Les Trotter; TAM: Alan Zehnder. D. Gries said that he would be checking up on committee members in the next few weeks.

Extra Meeting After Final Exams: D. Gries stated that an extra CCGB meeting will be held to discuss how students performed in Math 191/192. We want to see how well students who took the math placement test in January did in Math 192 this semester. We will then make a decision about the Math 191 students. Their exam is on May 17, so we are suggesting a meeting on Friday, 5/20/05 at 8:00 a.m. in 240 Carpenter. R. Robbins said that he will receive the grades from Bing Cady by then. This evaluation will only involve 7 students. A. Zehnder agreed to bring the motion that was drafted about this issue so it can be voted on.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.