CCGB Minutes
September 11, 1998


Members absent: J. Hopcroft, M. Walter, F. Wise

Ex-Officio: K. Clark, T. Cookingham, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of September 4, 1998 were approved and seconded as read with the following additions/corrections; listed in CCGB Agenda Opportunities for 1998-99 the bullet Implementation of Minors should read Definition by originating departments. Additional corrections from F. Gouldin pending.

Undergraduate Programs Announcements: D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, Thanked all who were involved in orientation and freshman advising. Currently there are 740 freshman with 44 faculty advising them.

Course enrollment during pre-registration is actually the student’s wish list of courses they would like to take but not necessarily those in which they actually enroll. After the students have entered courses for pre-registration, course balancing takes place. Most of the other colleges (except Engineering and Arts & Sciences) have automatic course balancing. Meaning that when students enroll during pre-registration what they can enter is what is available. Engineering is looking to switching to this kind of system for all engineering courses. Advising and Student Records are talking with field coordinators and looking at three-year trends of course enrollments. Janet Gray, University Registrar, is assisting with this process and informing Engineering what has worked well and what hasn’t.

Discussion: Students are not closed out of courses very often but it does happen. When course balancing occurs and there are conflicts, students may need to switch sections and labs times, rarely are classes affected. With the new system this won’t happen, students will know immediately if the section or lab is full. The new system does not check pre-requisites. Because the new system will be on a first come, first serve basis students will be more likely to schedule visits to their faculty advisors earlier in order to be ready when pre-registration starts. Lab distribution has been a problem in the past in which the new course enroll system could help.

Action: Advising and Student Records will be fact-finding and developing a process with field coordinators to implement this new system for Spring ’99 pre-enrollment.

ABET: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, several pages were missing from ABEN’s Volume II so we are in the process of checking all the volume II to be sure nothing else was missed during copying.
Action: List of updates and copies of description of course materials will be sent to departments today or Monday.

Chairs for CCGB Sub-Committees: P. Kintner, Chair, EE; the following faculty members have volunteered to chair sub-committees. Several more sub-committees also need chairs.

- F. Gouldin  Engineering Distribution
- M. Thompson  Computing & Computing Applications
- J. Jenkins  Mathematics & Science
- R. Kay  Liberal Studies
- L. Lion  Minors sub-committee

Action: The Dean will write a letter to the faculty asking for volunteers for the various CCGB sub-committees.

CCGB Agenda Opportunities 1998-99: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, reviewed the possible agenda items for the 1998-99 academic year (attached) along with some new additions (attached). The new additions included:

- Minors timeline & catalog copy
- College computing requirements
- College program definitions/clarifications
- ABEN/College of Engineering transfers
- Academic Honors definition/clarification
- Statistics Unit?????
- Department/Program/Degree names
- ABET
  - Admissions/Marketing
  - Internal documentation
- Inter Departmental Options
- Intra Departmental Options
- Minors
- Concentrations
- Transcript Notations
- Certificates

Discussion: ABET accreditation for the current review will be using the old system. If Engineering is accredited this year when accreditation comes up again, in 7 years, we will be accredited using the ABET 2000 rules. It is not clear if Engineering is required to have an interim review in 3 years what rules we will be reviewed under.

7% of engineering students graduated early last year with more expected this year. There are trends developing, is this educational sound, do we like these trends?

Academic integrity handbook has built in conflicts. The provost has indicated that if we would like to tackle this project we could do so.

The calendar and the catalog copy, which is due next February, is the driving force in the development of the minors program. The fields define the minor programs, review and approval is done by the CCGB. Once approved other fields have the option to participate in the approved minors programs. Minor proposals would need to be in to the CCGB by November 7th in order to be approved by the catalog copy deadline. If
departments choose to they could wait to develop their programs and then use other means, besides the course catalog, to advertise their minor programs. Status of the minors programs from each department is as follows:

- ChE Will not be participating
- MSE Almost ready to submit proposals
- CS Discussion of course loads, ease of verification and requirements under way.
- CEE Environmental minor’s proposal is being prepared
- TAM CEE/MAE/TAM joint proposal being developed
- EE On agenda for this semester
- GS Working on developing several proposals
- OR Undecided

Action: Members of the CCGB need to convey the November 7th deadline of the minors programs to their departments if they wish to have them in the course catalog by next fall. Copy of the minors motion will be distributed to the CCGB members.

The structure of the review of the computing requirements had begun to be developed last semester. It is worthwhile to review the computing requirements. Input from the CPC will be requested.

The college needs to take some ownership in the course evaluation process as the evaluations affect serious decisions. If the CCGB takes this charge, it could be forwarded directly to a sub-committee. The scope would have to be specific but limited. The original legislation would help determine how closely we are following the intent of the evaluation process. The Dean, if the CCGB decides to take this on, will submit a charge the committee. He will then seriously read and comment on the outcomes of the study. Several operational changes have taken place including the scanning of the forms, which now takes place in engineering. Andy Ruina developed an electronic version of the evaluation forms on the web, which he has tested.

Action: J. Jenkins, T&AM, will send a copy of Andy Ruina’s web address for course evaluations to the members of the CCGB.

Evaluation of student satisfaction of the curriculum is an issue that should be addressed as it has been four years since the new curriculum was implemented. This type of issue could be forwarded to the Evaluation of Student Experience sub-committee for review.

How do we proceed from here with the list of agenda items? Do members want to think about the list for a week with voting taking place at the next meeting? Last year multi-voting was done. This gave the meetings some structure and goals, while enabling members to have time to discuss hot topics as they arose.

Action: K. Hover and P. Kintner will review the discussion of agenda items for next week. Members should come back with their top three issues they would like to cover this academic year.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

****************************

CCGB Agenda
Friday, September 18, 1998
1. Approval of September 11, 1998 minutes
2. Undergraduate Programs Announcements
3. ABET Update
4. Chairs for CCGB Sub-committees Announcements
5. Open Discussion of Assoc. Directors and CCGB Roles
6. Prioritization of CCGB Agenda