

Agenda, September 13, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Brainstorming #2—Your Thoughts On The Agenda Of The Coming Year
4. How To Better Value The Experiential Or Inquiry-based Learning In Our Existing Curriculum? How Can We Better Serve Our Needs In The Future? (T. Jordan)

CCGB Minutes, September 6, 2002


Absent: D. Cox, E. Giannelis, J. Saylor


Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of May 24, 2002 were approved as written, with a note to add the votes tallied later in May for the BME Minor (8 approvals, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed).

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East (Admissions) announced that the incoming class of the College of Engineering is great in quality. However, the number of freshmen who have registered is lower than planned (likely 710 registered rather than 738 expected) due to an unusually large number of foreign students being unable to obtain visas. Those who were unable to come for the fall because of these visa problems will hopefully be cleared for arrival in January 2003. She also mentioned that the annual Fall Hosting for Women and Underrepresented Minorities will soon occur, and that it would be good for those potential students to see interesting lab demonstrations. T. Healey (T&AM) suggested that A. Ruina’s lab would be good, and K. Athreya (Women & Min. Progs.) suggested Alex Moore’s lab. R. Kay (EAS) suggested that the programs offered to the Engineering 150 classes include several that would be appropriate for the demonstrations that Admissions needs to organize.

T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) mentioned that there have been some organizational changes in Engineering Student Services, with Dan Maloney Hahn now in the role of Senior Academic Advisor, Kerwin-Michael Smith as Acting Director of Engineering Advising, and Gretchen Roberts as Acting Director of the Learning Initiatives for Engineers (LIFE) Program. All three units in the Student Success Center currently report to T. Jordan. J. Bisogni (CEE) suggested that a list of job responsibilities of the Student Services staff be created for distribution to the engineering departments. K. Fuchs suggested that people contact him with feedback regarding the structural changes. F. Gouldin (M&AE) praised the work performed by the staff in Student Services.

Dean Kent Fuchs, Welcome and Comments: K. Fuchs (Eng. Dean) stated that he had heard good things about the CCGB, and he mentioned that he had high expectations for the group, especially pertaining to making curriculum improvements and creating a vision of what Cornell Engineering will look like in future years. He wants the CCGB to work on strategic planning during the next 12 months, by being specific and visionary, with high aspirations. The goal of the College Strategic Planning process in general is to develop a plan that will influence the folks in Day Hall, alumni, friends and companies to donate funds to improve the resources, in support of improved learning as well as improved research. He stated the importance of updated facilities, manageable workloads for faculty, and continuing the excellence of teaching and research. He also mentioned that, while recognizing the reorganization that Engineering Student Services underwent last year, he would like to do another reorganization to improve the structure of the organization and create
stronger links with other departments/areas across the university. He views Student Services as his partner in developing and carrying out the College’s mission. He added that he would be happy to attend any future CCGB meetings in which he would be useful, and he would like to attend the final meeting of the semester to discuss the group’s accomplishments.

**2002-2003 Topics for CCGB:** T. Healey (T&AM) requested that each CCGB Subcommittee submit a report as soon as possible, with the first committee reporting in 3 weeks, the next in 4 weeks, etc. He stated that the committees should be ABET-driven. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) said that the Dean has proposed to the Chairs & Directors that all the ABET-accredited units run a mock ABET review of themselves in the spring of 2004. In preparation, the CCGB should be updated on the status of the college-based assessments that exist, and could be a place for sharing best practices among the departments. F. Gouldin (M&AE) mentioned that his department has some feedback loops in place; although they’re not sure how to use that information, and there is likely to be different information at the actual ABET review. K. Fuchs (Eng. Dean) suggested that a consultant be brought in to give advice and assist with an ABET dry run. He is willing to discuss the dry run with those who are opposed to doing it. T. Jordan suggested that CCGB should re-examine the course evaluations. She observed that the course evaluations do not serve our ABET assessments, and therefore she questioned their actual purpose. C. Van Loan (CS) said that he thought the Student Experience Committee was evaluating the usefulness of the evaluations. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) clarified the distinction between summative and formative evaluations, and pointed out that the current evaluations are summative. K. Athreya (Min. & Women’s Progs.) stated that even the value of the current evaluations for summative purposes is unclear. She noted that it might make more sense for the students to be polled 6 months after they complete a course, to better assess the outcome of the course. For formative value, she suggested that faculty request feedback from the students once a week during the course so they know how to make their teaching more effective. She pointed out the curiosity that women faculty nationally receive lower evaluations than male faculty. T. Thompson (Eng. Registrar) stated that, because the response rate for course evaluations is dwindling, there is not an accurate picture of some courses. R. Kay (EAS) suggested that, at the end of a student’s 4 years at Cornell, the students should evaluate the courses with relation to the entire curriculum. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) suggested that the body of research on course evaluations be examined prior to making any changes to them.

T. Healey stated that non-engineering students view the College of Engineering as insular, but it has a lot to offer those students. He suggested that engineering minors be offered to non-engineering students. C. van Loan (CS) noted that Arts College students can be encouraged to participate in Engineering College courses through inclusion of Engineering courses on the Arts & Sciences College Distribution Requirements list. K. Athreya agreed that such an idea would encourage the students’ interests in engineering. R. Kay said that all of the EAS courses are on the quantitative Arts & Sciences course listing. T. Jordan noted that the Frankenstein book project panel discussion, in which all freshmen participated, included discussion of the vital importance that citizens become better educated about technological issues, and that the Engineering College should better serve the university in this capacity.

**Suggestions for Acknowledging 9/11 Anniversary in The Classrooms:** F. Gouldin (M&AE) asked for ideas on how to address the 9/11 anniversary during class. B. East (Admissions) suggested that faculty mention the non-denominational service at 12:20 that day at the A.D. White House. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that other colleges were not doing anything specific.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.