Agenda, September 20, 2002
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Updates on state of the Independent Major and departmental approvals of their students’ participation in the Information Sciences Minor
4. Clarification of CCGB Bylaws concerning the frequency of meetings
5. Brainstorming for CCGB 2002-2003
6. ECE Proposals (see below)

   a) Include ECE/CS 314 in the list of courses for the ECE minor program requirement under heading II. On page 80 of the Undergraduate Handbook to read: II. Two (2) of the following:

   Number  Title
   ECE 301  Signals and Systems I
   ECE 303  Electromagnetic Fields and Waves
   ECE/CS 314  Computer Organization
   ECE 315  Electronic Circuit Design

   b) Include ECE/CS 314 and ECE 475 in the list of courses that satisfy the College Computer Applications requirement.

CCGB Minutes, September 13, 2002

Absent:   K. Fuchs, E. Giannelis, T. Healey, J. Saylor
Ex-Officio:  K. Athreya, P. Beebe, D. Cox, B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, K.M. Smith, T. Thompson, D. Worley
Other:  C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes:  The minutes of September 6, 2002 were approved with slight modifications.

Undergraduate Announcements:  T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that there are approximately 111 upperclassmen (as well as several freshmen) that haven’t reported in this semester, many of who are international students. T. Thompson (Eng. Registrar) added that David Yeh (Univ. Registrar) has asked for the total number of students who haven’t arrived due to visa problems. C. Van Loan (CS) asked what percentage of the students is international. B. East (Admissions) stated that 14% of the students in engineering are international, which is a steady rate, and there is no pressure from the university for the international admissions.

Thoughts on the Agenda of the Coming Year:  C. Van Loan (CS) mentioned that he was following up on the course evaluations report and will notify the CCGB of the results soon (i.e. who looks at them and how). The Teaching Evaluations Committee was also polled about them. M. Duncan (ChemE) said that the students in ChemE did exit interviews this year, but the interviews were more ABET A-K sensitive than they’ve ever been, so the results were quite different than those of other years. J. Bisogni (CEE) added that CEE also did a survey of their seniors, but the A-K criteria-based questions that they had carefully developed produced answers that were too random to be useful.

C. Van Loan stated that the Biology Curriculum Committee met with M. Shuler (ChemE) to discuss whether biology and chemistry should be given equal status within the curriculum, of which the Committee is favorably disposed. T. Jordan pointed out that ChemE 110 and 120 were cancelled due to a lack of staff. M. Duncan agreed that staffing is a bit of a problem because there is a vacancy in biology and M. Shuler
will be on leave next semester, which will leave 2 vacancies. R. Kay (EAS) added that freshman advisors should be informed about this type of thing. T. Jordan agreed to talk to P. Clancy (ChemE) to find out what students should be told regarding biology offerings.

Not on the Agenda but Discussed: C. Van Loan (CS) proposed that subcommittees be eliminated and that the CCGB meet alternate weeks (1st, 3rd and 5th Friday each month). His reasoning was that the 2nd and 4th Fridays could be used by people to discuss topics that the subcommittees had been formed to address. J. Bartsch (BEE) expressed his concern that the subcommittees include people outside the CCGB who might not be able to accommodate an 8:00 a.m. meeting time, and J. Bisogni (CEE) and F. Gouldin (M&AE) shared his concern. B. Kusse (A&EP) expressed his view that a bi-weekly CCGB meeting is an excellent idea. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) stated that, given the strategic planning charge that Dean Fuchs has given the CCGB, bi-weekly meetings would likely not provide enough time for the committee to accomplish all of its goals. F. Gouldin agreed that, with the charge Dean Fuchs has given the CCGB, there will likely be a great deal of work to be done, thus making the CCGB busier. C. Van Loan responded that, while he realizes that ABET writing needs to be done, he feels that each committee only needs to write a page or so about its function, and it could be done more efficiently if each committee meets every 2 weeks. P. Beebe (Eng. Comm. Prog.) asked if C. Van Loan’s proposal was made because the subcommittees were not meeting regularly or if the CCGB was viewed as not using its time well. C. Van Loan replied that he doesn’t think that subcommittees are efficient and that a new way of doing business is required, one which would produce tighter coupling between the subcommittees and a larger group. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that the CCGB was historically held bi-weekly, which worked well because it gave people more time to digest the topics that were raised at the meetings. D. Dalthorp (OR&IE) agreed that it would be more efficient to hold the CCGB meetings on a bi-weekly basis, with simple issues resolved via e-mail. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that it is often necessary to spend several meetings to target an issue, so bi-weekly meetings would not be efficient. D. Cox (Assist. Dean) mentioned that the CCGB By-laws designate standing subcommittees. T. Jordan suggested that, because the existing charges to the subcommittees (charges established Spring, 2002) do not encompass the strategic planning objectives requested by Dean Fuchs, new charges to subcommittees should be considered. C. Van Loan proposed the following motion: That the CCGB meet the 1st, 3rd and 5th Fridays of each month, and the 2nd and 4th Fridays be used for subcommittees or other necessary meetings. R. Kay (EAS) seconded the motion. VOTE: 7 in favor, 1 against and 2 abstentions. B. East (Admissions) suggested that the new CCGB dates be input in Corporate Time.

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 (Assoc. Dean) stated the office of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs has initiated an effort to develop a unified Engineering College approach to the suite of Experiential Learning activities that we offer to our undergraduates. She feels that the CCGB should participate in drafting a college-wide statement of the value of “out-of classroom learning” or “inquiry-based learning” in Cornell Engineering undergraduate education. The current opportunities at Cornell include research, design courses, co-ops, study abroad, field courses, etc. The focus of the current initiative is on project teams, undergraduate research, Engineers Without Borders, design courses, and extended field courses. These are currently major activities of many of the departments but for lack of any central coordination, the individual units struggled with manpower and funding without the benefit of shared facilities, resources, or wisdom. As examples, M&AE typically spends a quarter million dollars each year on projects teams, and MS&E invests faculty effort in individual research project for all their majors. There is a need for coordinating fund-raising, funds received and the prioritization of resources, both monetary and manpower. Furthermore, Jordan stated that it would be strategically valuable to the Engineering College if we publicly clarify that the design projects (and other experiential learning activities that we now maintain) are as important as undergraduate research, to avoid the possibility that a future university president or college dean will establish the policy that all Cornell undergraduates must
participate in individual faculty-mentored research projects, as has occurred at some competitive universities. We should articulate that the projects are good for education, in addition to their value in attracting potential students. The chairs and directors have endorsed the Associate Dean’s initiative. She requested that the CCGB come up with a shared statement of the value of the activities. From the student learning experience, the “inquiry-based” learning is valuable because it demonstrates an action-based connection between theory and application. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that all of the above-listed opportunities exist in the ChemE classrooms already. T. Jordan replied that there was obviously value to the inquiry-based learning on small scales within the formal curriculum, although it may be true that the students benefit more from more extended opportunities than can be fit into a classroom-based class. In addition to values to the student, the values to the College faculty are both that it creates more mature students and, secondarily, it could satisfy some of the ABET criteria for professional training and treatment of ethics. She added that coordinating projects would enhance college-wide communication and support a shared facility and vision. As examples of the grassroots need for college-centered organization, R. Andrea, A. George & M. Louge from M&AE took it upon themselves in recent weeks to draft up a plan for a center that they want the college to set up for design teams. C. Seyler (ECE) agreed that the issues are important, and they’re debating them in his department. In response to a question about whether such activities should be required of all Engineering College students, she replied that this is an example of one of the questions that CCGB might want to consider. D. Dalthorp (OR&IE) stated that the faculty in his department are already overloaded and can’t take on any additional work. T. Jordan suggested that this might give them a reason to request additional faculty. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that, although all of the activities are valued and given a high profile, they aren’t suitable for everyone. Some of the students prefer taking courses and it wouldn’t be fair to require projects. R. Kay (EAS) added that, like the undergraduate requirements for communications and computer applications, it might be possible to draft a rule that could be filled by a set of regular courses or the existing suite of experiential learning opportunities, so extra courses might not be needed. T. Jordan suggested that an inventory be made of the activities currently available, and then a family of activities be proposed. C. Van Loan suggested that the Registrar’s Office provide enrollment figures for independent study programs.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.