CCGB Meeting Agenda, October 22, 2010

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. Discussion of CEE using 1 Advisor Approved Elective to meet an ABET science requirement
4. Discussion of Physics 1112 (K. Dimiduk)
5. Discussion of ENGR Course Proposal (S. Baker)
6. Definition of an ENGRD Course (S. Baker)
7. Discussion of Academic Integrity

CCGB Minutes, May 21, 2010

Ex-Officio: K. Dimiduk, B. East, F. Shumway
Other: M. Bazley, B. Howland, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the 5/21/10 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: F. Shumway thanked everyone for their help during orientation. B. East said that this year’s freshman class is large. Advising did a great job giving enrollment information to the students during the summer.

Committee assignments for 2010-11: D. Gries said that there will probably be a few more changes to the committee list.

Charge to Technical Writing Committee: W. Philpot said that the charge to the Technical Writing Committee to review the Engineering Communications Program comes directly from Lance Collins. It has been several years since the ECP has been reviewed, and it is time to make another review. S. Hemami said that E. Fisher agreed to be on this committee.

Charges to Other Committees: W. Philpot said that the Student Experience Committee has been active for several years, but several things have changed. Stressors are up again; maybe there are some issues with that. The committee needs to take another look at student issues. B. East said that it is time to do another survey of the student experience. D. Gries said that the committee should first decide on the focus of the survey. W. Philpot said that he thought that the survey was supposed to be done every 5 years. B. East said that there is no time frame for the survey, but every 5 years is good.

D. Gries said that there is an issue about the connection between Engineering and the Math Department. The TAM faculty continue to teach some math courses. The CCGB, in a resolution last spring, asked the dean to work on ensuring that teaching between the Math Dept. and Engineering continues. The dean is talking with Peter Le-page about making sure that our association continues at least for the next 5 years.

D. Gries said that the Chemistry Dept. was supposed to let students drop chemistry courses, but F. Shumway received about 30 calls from students who couldn’t drop the course. He talked with Vice Provost Laura Brown about the situation with Chemistry, and they feel that Chemistry needs to change the way their course enrollments are handled. F. Shumway explained that we were trying to make sure that anyone who needs CHEM 2080 in the spring would be in CHEM 2090 in the fall. Advising pre-enrolled students during the summer (primarily ChemE and Pre-med students) so they could get into CHEM 2090 this fall. Once those identified as needing the course this fall were pre-enrolled the course became available for other students. Students are now being put on a waitlist. Today Chemistry will give her the waitlist, and she will figure out who needs it now and put them in the course. Chemistry will assign students labs during the weekend and will email students about which lab they’re assigned to. Chemistry thinks they will get all the students that need it into the course. B. East said that part of the problem is that Chemistry doesn’t have enough TAs to offer enough labs due to the budget cuts. The deans of both colleges have met (in the past) about this issue.
F. Shumway said that a bigger issue is students who don’t have math for placement in Physics 1112. If they can’t get into a chemistry class, they won’t have a science class in the fall. This means that some of them will have 2 sciences with labs in the spring (which is not ideal) or will need to take a science class somewhere else or during the summer. E. Fisher said that it seems that a fair number of students who don’t have to take chemistry are in the course. B. Howland said that many students don’t have their AP scores in June, so advising errs on the side of caution when pre-enrolling during the summer.

Announcement about the Revised Energy ENGRI proposal: W. Philpot said that the Energy ENGRI proposal didn’t get quite dealt with last semester. The required revisions were reviewed by the Engineering Courses Committee and then recommended approval. The CCGB accepted it during the summer with 1 abstention. There was a rush to get it out so it could get listed and students could enroll in it. S. Baker said that the Engineering Courses Committee will look at it later and make sure that it meets the criteria as laid out. D. Gries said that we don’t have a good definition of an ENGRI. S. Baker said that he provided a suggested definition. M. Duncan said that we should see what our needs are now and address that when defining the ENGRI.

Course Evaluations from Students Charged with AI Violations: D. Gries said that he spoke with a professor who does not want to include course evaluations from a course in which students have been charged with an academic integrity violation in a primary hearing. He spoke with Dean of Faculty Bill Fry about this, who said that there are no guidelines about this and it is up to us to decide.

S. Hemami said that if we are putting our course evaluations online for everyone to see, we are making public statements about our teaching quality. Whether the numbers are accurate or not, this issue is important. In a course last year a large fraction of students cheated, so the student evaluations should not be counted in that case. We need to be careful about this. D. Gries said that in that case the instructor told the students that he felt cheating had gone on and, without identifying any individual students, told them that they could retract the assignment and accept a zero grade if they had cheated. Those who didn’t retract and were believed to have cheated were charged. He feels that the evaluations shouldn’t be counted in those instances. K. Dimiduk said that the entire class didn’t seem happy about the situation, which is justification for not publishing the evaluation.

It was decided that D. Gries will talk to Mike Hammer about the technical issues behind removing some names from evaluations. He will report back.

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 a.m.