Agenda, September 17, 2004
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Revising the bylaws
4. Engineering Distribution Courses
5. Charges to the CCGB Committees

CCGB Minutes, September 10, 2004

Ex-Officio: R. Evans, R. Robbins
Other: N. Peterson, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the September 3, 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: None.

CCGB Bylaws: D. Grubb stated that the CCGB Bylaws are archaic and need to be updated. He and D. Gries went through them and came up with changes. The gray and yellow highlighted areas are merely updated changes. The green highlighted areas indicate that something should be discussed.

D. Gries suggested that part of the second paragraph should be retained for historical perspective.

A. Center suggested that in the third paragraph, 4th line, the word “oversight” be added after (CCGB) because the group has oversight responsibilities for the courses, which means general oversight on educational issues. He also suggested that #B1 on page two read that the CCGB “Be responsible for evaluating and facilitating the improvement of the courses in the common curriculum.” D. Grubb said that this implies that the CCGB is not proactive. B. Isacks said that “working for” is straightforward, and he sees no problem with that wording. A. Center stated that the CCGB evaluates the course and then works for its improvement. He questioned if we are looking at the evaluation role and then clearing up deficiencies. J. Bartsch stated that the CCGB isn’t here to micromanage, but in figuring out how a course fits into the bigger picture.

D. Grubb said that the Student Experience Committee is described as evaluating individual courses, but this hasn’t been its primary task. The CCGB has a responsibility to make changes to a course. If a faculty member/department doesn’t want to do it, they can appeal to the College faculty members. A. Center asked if the CCGB has the authority to say that we don’t like the way a course is taught and that it should be changed. D. Grubb responded affirmatively. D. Gries stated that with CS 100 the CCGB talked about what language should be used in the syllabus. Changes in the math sequence were also made, and the Math & Science Committee of the CCGB worked on that.

D. Gries said that the CCGB is supposed to elect a Vice Chair. This was done last year, but the term wasn’t mentioned. D. Grubb added that the Vice Chair is also supposed to be chair of ASPAC. He suggested that an election be scheduled for the next meeting. D. Gries said that in the recent past CCGB did
not have a secretary and perhaps we don’t need one, because there is only a need to have the minutes recorded for each meeting.

D. Grubb said that Math doesn’t have a terminal course. D. Gries replied that 4 math courses are required, so the 4th course would be the terminal course. B. Kusse said that the majors require different math courses. A. Center suggested that the word “terminal” be removed. D. Grubb said that three physics courses are taken, so the third one would be terminal, but it is possible to take another physics course. The requirements should be general. He wondered what the substitutions for engineering distribution courses are for. Not everyone could substitute courses. Anything can be petitioned out of. C. Seyler said that R. Thorpe asks departments for approval on course substitutions, and if they say yes, he goes ahead and approves the changes.

D. Grubb asked what guidelines exist for reviewing approved engineering distribution courses. C. Seyler replied that they should consist of 3 credits and be offered each semester. Several members pointed out that these ‘conditions’ are not currently met. B. Kusse added that the function of the distribution courses was to allow students to test engineering fields, and he suggested that the CCGB find the original guidelines.

A. Center said that, in the section labeled IV.B.6, it says that the Liberal Studies Committee makes recommendations to the CCGB about which courses satisfy the requirements in liberal studies. He said that ABET might ask how this is done. D. Grubb responded that it is the job of the committee to recommend a sequence of programs and courses. The original bylaws also say that the Committee makes recommendations for advisor-approved electives, but these guidelines have disappeared. The Liberal Studies Committee could make recommendations about the revision of the paragraph in the Engineering Student Handbook that describes these electives. The committee makes decisions about what courses should consist of. C. Seyler asked whom the CCGB makes recommendations to. D. Gries replied that they are made to the student advisors. A. Center stated that making the CCGB responsible for guidelines, when the student is instructed to talk to their advisor, is not valuable. B. Kusse said that many times young faculty want guidelines, and this process works fine. [Note added later for clarification: the bylaws frequently refer to committees of CCGB making recommendations and imply that these are made to the CCGB for action. The CCGB itself generally makes ‘recommendations’ only to the College Faculty by proposing changes in the curriculum to their vote. However, guidelines on advisor-approved electives are recommendations to the advisors.]

D. Grubb stated that the original bylaws lists distribution areas, but some changes have been made, so we might as well remove the list.

D. Gries discussed the paragraph describing the technical writing committee. He said that currently technical writing is the only requirement but wondered if we should leave the description as it is or add oral communication. A. Center said that students could satisfy the technical writing requirement with a lab course in their senior year. Presumably the CCGB is saying that, whatever the major is, this is the overall curriculum. Departments can say that they have their own technical-writing or communications course to satisfy the requirement. He wondered if the CCGB says that a course is okay with certain content. D. Gries replied affirmatively. B. Kusse asked if technical writing should be replaced with communications. R. Evans stated that he wants to get rid of the technical writing language, but not now. He wants to ask the faculty first. D. Gries said that changing the name of the committee makes sense due to the Communications Program. B. Kusse said that oral communications should be added to it so that the
CCGB has responsibility for that in addition to writing. D. Gries asked for the CCGB members to bring their recommendations to the next meeting. D. Grubb added that the CCGB would need to discuss this issue more, vote on it, and then take it to the college faculty meeting.

Engineering Distribution Courses: D. Grubb stated that a large amount of change has arisen with the engineering distribution courses. The trend has been to reduce the number of courses that the students need to take, and he wondered if this is what the CCGB members want. The CCGB has some control over this issue. The topic will be discussed at the next CCGB meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.