Agenda, September 10, 2004  
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes  
2. Undergraduate Announcements  
3. CCGB Bylaws: Begin a Discussion of Possible Changes to Bring Them Up to Date  
4. Engineering Distribution Courses

CCGB Minutes, September 3, 2004


Ex-Officio: D. Bell, D. Cox, B. East, R. Evans, D. Maloney Hahn, L. Schneider, M. Spencer

Other: N. Peterson, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the May 21, 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East said that Kerwin-Michael Smith had taken a job as Registrar at JGSM and that his former position in Engineering was available. She also thanked everyone for participating in the orientation events.

Discussion of CCGB Bylaws: D. Gries said that the bylaws need to be revised. Some of the wording is outdated, and a few things need changing. He requested that the CCGB members send him email about what needs to be changed. D. Grubb said that he is in favor of revising the Bylaws if that clears up discrepancies. Now is the time to change things. Things that are a matter of policy changes should be approved by the CCGB. Changing higher-level areas requires full faculty approval. The Student Experience Committee is supposed to review evaluations of the common curriculum courses. The committee doesn’t review each ENGRD or ENGRI course. D. Gries said that we’ve reviewed this with the intent of satisfying ABET. D. Grubb stated that the more detailed the Bylaws are, the more difficult things become and the more often they need to be changed. Keeping them general is good.

CCGB Committees for 2004-2005: D. Gries distributed the 2004-2005 CCGB Committee list. B. East asked if ASPAC representatives rotate in some specific way. D. Maloney Hahn said that the rotation has been haphazard. There have been terms, but they try to hang onto experienced people. B. East said that there needs to be 5 faculty members on it, and if they can’t be there, they should send representatives from their department. D. Grubb stated that the Bylaws say the terms are generally for three years.

Representation on the CCGB: D. Gries said that the new BME has only 3 people and therefore will not have a representative on the CCGB this year. Carol Casler has agreed to inform BME of what happens at CCGB meetings.

Post-course assessments: D. Gries handed out a list of Spring 2004 spring courses with information on their post-course assessments. He wants to have all of the spring post-course assessments within a week.
**ABET Visit.** D. Cox stated that the ABET evaluation is scheduled for November 21-23. The program evaluators have the self-study reports, and we are sending them transcripts. If an evaluator contacts people in the departments, they should consider that part of the formal evaluation. The evaluators will write their evaluation report prior to coming to campus for the on-site visit. When they get here and look at the facilities, look at materials and visit with people, they will revise their report as required. D. Cox said that the program evaluators might ask for information from departments prior to the review.

**Report on Registration & Problems:** D. Maloney Hahn said that some of the enrollments were tight, mostly in the chemistry courses. Pre-sectioning is done for the freshmen. They don’t pre-section freshmen into Physics 112 unless they come in with calculus, which puts a strain on chemistry.

D. Gries asked if the pre-enrollment numbers are higher now than they were last year. D. Maloney Hahn replied that they are higher. Chemistry 207 has a strain this year, with 1,100 students trying to get into it. The enrollment for physics next spring will likely rise considerably.

B. East asked if it is conceivable that we allow students to register for both Math 191 and Physics 112. D. Maloney Hahn replied that since every student has calculus, they could take Physics 112. They don’t need to have Math 191 prior to registering for that. No credit is given for Physics B unless they come in with calculus credit. Maybe the College should revisit the granting of credit for physics B: if the students get a 5 on that. B. East asked if Physics 112 and Math 191 could be taken together? D. Maloney Hahn replied that they could.

D. Grubb stated that the math change was discussed last year, and the enrollments should have been predicted. D. Maloney Hahn said that there have always been problems with chemistry enrollments. D. Grubb asked who is to decide if AP credit acceptable, i.e. physics B. D. Bell replied that the Physics Department says that a 4 or 5 on the AP is required to accept Physics B for Physics 112. B. East asked if the students would be let out of Physics 112 with Physics B? D. Bell replied that currently that is the issue. D. Maloney Hahn stated that Physics B is not calculus-based, so a 5 for Physics B would be required. D. Gries said that the Math and Science Committee would examine this issue.

Maloney-Hahn discussed the issue of the timing of the writing seminar ballots. Sign-ups for the writing seminar used to be via paper ballots. This process went electronic, but the students didn’t know what seminar they were placed into until the Friday after classes began, which was confusing. D. Gries said that he would talk to the writing seminar people about this, and it will be discussed at the Associate Deans meeting. Ideally the students should add/drop the Wednesday prior to classes. D. Bell said that the students don’t have their schedules set by Wednesday, so that wouldn’t work. D. Maloney Hahn said that students are pre-sectioned into stuff, except for those with AP or those who need placement. The online things are making life easier. J. Bartch stated that he has some 150 students who needed to change their FWS sections and the 5 possibilities don’t fit. He wondered why there couldn’t be a list with courses that have room in them. Currently the students have to look up each individual course to see if there is room in them. B. East said that the current Associate Dean in Arts is willing to address this situation.

**Possible Items for Discussion This Year:** D. Grubb asked about what other topics people want to address. He requested that the CCGB members email him with possible topics.

M. Louge brought up the concept of international exchanges with foreign schools. There will likely be some things being developed with China and India, as well as with France. B. Kusse asked if the
international thing was being set up with only 1 program. He feels that all of the schools/depts should be able to allow their students to participate, and he wondered which programs would fit into it. M. Louge replied that he looked at CEE, ORIE, ECE and MAE, and they all have different ways of dealing with it. He would be happy to sit down with people to discuss it. The Independent Major would be an easy way of fitting the exchange program in. D. Gries said that this is done during the student’s junior year and it is difficult to fit the requirements in. Taking the Co-op Program during the summer would help.

The 2-2-1 program is where students spend 2 years here and 2 years there, then 1 year back here. The MEng degree is given here. The faculty will discuss this. M. Louge stated that the 2-2-1 program would be with the Independent Major, not with a department. J. Bartsch stated that CALS has a program with China, and Norm Scott is the contact person. The plan is to have 15 undergrads to come and study here. There is a program with Dublin also.

**Committee Reporting:** D. Grubb stated that we have committees and they should do reports as done in the past. We will be more specific in a week or two about what is required.

**Liberal Studies Revision:** D. Grubb asked if the Liberal Studies revisions had been done. D. Maloney Hahn replied that there is a list online, but we may have to look at revisions as we go along. J. Bartsch added that the list is extraordinarily helpful.

**Status of Biology Courses for Engineers:** D. Grubb suggested that the status of biology courses for engineers be addressed. He wondered what a suitable bio course for engineers would be and how many of them should take the course. An engineering distribution course is labeled biology, which contains elementary biology.

**Engineering distributions: What Are They For and Should the Rules be Enforced?** D. Grubb stated that one of the rules is that they are 3 credits each; a Major is to require 1, and there is a choice on the other one. A student is to receive more than 1 overview of engineering, which would be a more serious introduction to an area of engineering. Most students in a Major are required to take 1, and the Major merely suggests that another one be taken, which means that the students don’t see more than 1 side of engineering. A. Center stated that the question is whether we want the students to look at something else. D. Grubb replied that it is our duty to provide them with these thoughts. There is a mismatch between what the rules say and what is actually happening. We can talk about individual cases, but it is better to review this overall. M. Louge said that it is not an easy topic and will require hard choices with the majors. It is a SERIOUS PROBLEM, and we’re preventing ourselves from doing international relations by making the Majors so strict. We need to convince our colleagues to review this. It would require courses to be taken out or merged. D. Grubb said that distribution changes would require overall faculty approval. If things are left to individual units, there is ratcheting in one direction. There is a committee that looks at these.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 a.m.