Agenda, October 1, 2004  
CCGB Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes  
2. Undergraduate Announcements  
3. Discussion of Revision of Bylaws  
4. Assessing Post-Course Assessments for Spring 2004 Courses  
5. Charges to the Committees  
6. Appeals Process for Students

CCGB Minutes, September 17, 2004

Members: J. Bartsch, D. Gries, D. Grubb, M. Louge, W. Philpot, C. Seyler,  
L. Trotter, A. Zehnder  
Ex-Officio: D. Bell, B. East, R. Evans, R. Robbins  
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the September 10, 2004 CCGB Meeting were approved with a minor modification.

Undergraduate Announcements: M. Louge stated that the Director of L’Ecole Centrale and the Director of International Relations will visit Cornell, along with a French Embassy official in Washington on Wednesday, September 22nd. If people want to meet them, they should let him know and he’ll send the schedule for the visit.

Revising the Bylaws:  
A. Zehnder noted that 2/3 vote of the board is required for a change in a common course or its syllabus. He wondered what would happen if the department wants the change and the CCGB does not want it. D. Gries replied that 2/3 vote of the board can carry or deny a change; it can go either way. D asked if the CCGB would vote to change the Dean’s List criteria. D. Gries replied that it might be the jurisdiction of the Engineering Policy Committee, he doesn’t know.

Dealing with course changes. It was suggested to the Directors and Chairs that we have an Educational Policy Committee to deal with new courses, when big changes are made, etc. The directors were totally against this. They suggested that D. Gries be in charge of that. The senate passed a resolution that if a course is cross-listed, both EPC’s need to approve it. C. Seyler stated that the EPC’s that he knows of handle higher issues, not course issues. B. East added that she has a sense that needs to be an EPC in each college, with communication among them.

Engineering distribution. M. Louge stated that the Engineering Distribution concept has died, so nobody has an objection to changing it because it is irrelevant. There is a possibility that in the future the College will return to the distribution courses, which would force departments to trim or merge courses. The bylaws could be important to set a framework into which to set the rejuvenated distribution courses. Majors might want to return to a scheme of engineering distribution courses. Right now we don’t care, but we might want to look 5 years ahead. D. Grubb said that the bylaws are subject to change. C. Seyler said that the bylaws should be kept as open as possible, and separate rules on distribution courses can always be written later. L. Trotter added that the CCGB has the responsibility of approving courses.

Committee on Minors. D. Grubb asked if there should be a committee on minors that considers rules on them, etc. D. Gries replied that, looking back, there is a procedure to be followed when a new minor is proposed. The CCGB approves it and sends it to departments; the departments say what they want and whether people in their majors are allowed to take it, then the CCGB approves or rejects it.
A list of all of the motions that the CCGB has approved over the years is currently being created.

**Students’ right to appeal.** M. Louge suggested that the rules mention that students can appeal decisions. Sometimes the students don’t know whom to petition for changes. Minors were instituted with the idea that there would be very little overhead. An appeals process should be instituted for all the committees. J. Bartsch suggested that students be notified that they can appeal things. D. Grubb said that ASPAC should be able to deal with this issue. D. Gries added that the word “appeal” doesn’t occur anywhere in the Engineering Handbook. D. Bell said that departments define minors, so an appeal should go to a department’s academic committee. A. Zehnder stated that printing something about appeals in the bylaws seems too specific, and he suggested that the bylaws remain more general.

D. Gries said that the responsibilities of each committee are clearly listed in the bylaws. C. Seyler asked if an Associate Director could override a faculty member’s decision. D. Gries replied that in the handbook it states that if a faculty advisor doesn’t approve a petition, the student has no recourse.

C. Seyler stated that he feels that the Associate Director is considered a student’s advisor as well as their faculty advisor. If that were the case, then that would be the student’s recourse. M. Louge said that there is frequently a conflict between students and an advisor regarding course substitutions, and the Associate Director doesn’t want to cause a conflict between an advisor and him/herself. An Associate Director can appoint a different advisor for the student. C. Seyler stated that this is an important issue that has arisen several times. D. Bell suggested that it would be good to review the rules in the handbook; nobody knows who created them.

**Who has authority?** M. Louge stated that it is unclear where the authority of majors and the authority of the CCGB are. On workload equity, he imagines that people complain that certain majors are too workload intensive, and this creates a difficulty for the other tracks to upgrade. Distribution is the province of the CCGB, but workload equity should be the province of the majors. D. Gries said that the bylaws refer to general kinds of things, not to the situations of individual students. M. Louge asked if the CCGB has jurisdiction over a course if the course is not in the common curriculum. D. Grubb replied that the CCGB has general responsibility for the common curriculum.

**Minors outside Engineering.** D. Grubb said that there are some minors in Arts called concentrations, and it isn’t clear if they’re available to all students. In principle a minor could be done in economics.

**Independent Majors.** M. Louge said that the Independent Major is presently overseen by D. Gries, but it is not mentioned in the bylaws. The Independent Major might want to create a certificate in international relations. K. Fuchs wants to increase to 20% the number of students that go abroad. The CCGB might have to address the concept of having an international minor. D. Grubb questioned what would be the requirement and effect of this. M. Louge replied that it would indicate that the Independent Major is on par with the other majors. The Independent Major isn’t advertised much. D. Gries stated that this would just be a minor in international relations, and it would have to be offered by a school/department. D. Bell added that there is already a minor in international relations offered by Arts & Sciences. M. Louge indicated that it isn’t engineering-related. L. Trotter said that the College could later offer a minor in the College of Engineering, so we should use that wording in the bylaws now, to avoid making changes later.

**Engineering Distribution Courses:** D. Grubb stated that the CCGB look at what is the current purpose of the Engineering Distribution courses. R. Robbins wondered if there is justification written for distribution courses. D. Gries replied affirmatively. D. Grubb added that originally they were to give breadth to engineering and students had to take courses from numerous areas.

**Circulating the proposed bylaws.** M. Louge requested that the revised bylaws be circulated to faculty of the individual majors. D. Grubb responded that this would have to be circulated to faculty because any changes would need to be approved by them.
Charges to the CCGB Committees: A document was handed out that contained a draft of charges to the CCGB committees for this year, and it was discussed. D. Grubb stated that the committees ought to spring into action. They are supposed to be reporting to the CCGB.

ASPAC: R. Robbins said that the ASPAC data is available in their committee’s annual report. D. Grubb requested that the information be circulated to the CCGB. C. Seyler said that they encountered a large number of women in the appeals process and wondered if it should be noted as a concern. R. Robbins said that the breakdown by gender was done, but anything outstanding had not been noted, although it could be noted. He would like to propose changes in the ASPAC process and wondered if the proposed changes should be brought to the CCGB. C. Seyler replied that they should be brought to him, since he is the chair of the ASPAC Committee.

Committee on the Evaluation of Student Experience. D. Gries spoke with D. Maloney Hahn about the Student Experience Committee. They had surveys done in 1991 and 1998, so it is time for another survey to be done.

Math/Science Committee. M. Louge stated that the Math & Science Committee report was included in the Self-study document for ABET.

Liberal Studies, Humanities, and Electives Committee. D. Gries stated that last year the new liberal studies requirement change went into effect and we have a large list of courses. He wondered how the list is updated and maintained. R. Robbins replied that P. Place has been working on updating the list. J. Bartsch said that the list has been helpful in advising the students. It is hard to keep up with the new stuff, but easier when new courses are tagged.

Engineering Courses Committee. D. Gries said that there are 4 people on the Engineering Courses Committee, including both him and D. Grubb. They discuss what the distribution courses are for, what the rules are, and whether they should be followed. M. Louge said that this topic goes way beyond the CCGB. The individual majors and faculty will provide resistance, because this involves changing the curriculum, taking out courses, merging courses, etc. D. Grubb responded that the committee might think the current way is great. M. Louge said that they should revise the concept of the courses and bring them back. The approval needs to come from Kent. D. Gries stated that Kent is thinking of having a debate on the entire curriculum. D. Grubb added that any changes/recommendations begin with the CCGB. Any proposals are taken back to the faculty for recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 8:59 a.m.