CCGB Meeting Agenda, September 23, 2005

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Minors in and out of the college (Gries)
4. Credit for ROTC courses (Robbins)
5. Engrd 210 request for 4 credits (Gries)
6. ABET program outcomes in the common curriculum (Fisher)

CCGB Minutes, September 2, 2005

Ex-Officio: B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway, M. Spencer
Other: N. Peterson, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the May 20, 2005 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Introductions: All of the CCGB members and everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Review of Committee Membership: D. Gries mentioned all of the CCGB committees and listed the people who belong on each committee.

Review of Last Year’s CCGB Activities (motions passed): D. Gries said that the list of motions passed would give everyone a good idea of what the CCGB did last year.

ABET, Syllabets & Post-course Assessments: D. Gries stated that the 7 programs in Engineering received 6 years of accreditation from ABET. We can tell people we’re accredited, but not for how long. We need to be prepared for the next accreditation in 6 years. This is process-oriented, and we need to have processes in place that show what we have in place. Syllabets are needed, with course outcomes and post-course assessments. We need to show how the courses did and what need to be improved. For core courses this will be done every other year via post-course assessments. He will email and get hard copies of the post-course assessment forms to each of the instructors of the core courses. He will show everyone what the course outcomes should be and why we need post-course assessments. ABET will need 100% compliance. E. Fisher which courses are considered to be core courses. D. Gries replied that Physics, Math, Chemistry, CS 100 courses, ENGRI courses, ENGRD courses and ENGRG courses are core courses. The post-course assessments shouldn’t take more than an hour to write. A. Center said that he read the reviewers’ final reports. They said that Cornell is doing well, but could do a better job of documenting things. The current process isn’t up to their standard. He questioned whether that is important to Cornell, as an educational institution and suggested that the topic be discussed at a future meeting. D. Gries stated that people should be directed to submit post-course assessments to the CCGB representatives.

Discussion of CCGB on the Intranet: D. Gries said that a list of all of the motions ever passed by the CCGB would be placed on the intranet. He agreed to put on it the bylaws, all minutes, and whatever else people suggest should be placed on it.

Open Discussion of Agenda Items: A. Zehnder stated that there are some items pending in TAM, and he wondered if there were any other topics coming up from other departments.
3-4 credit issue for ENGRD courses: D. Gries spoke about the 3-4 credit issue for ENGRD courses. The distribution courses were always 3 credits, but departments have asked for them to be changed to 4 credits. ENGRD 202 is 4 credits, so the College needs to decide if they should all be changed to 4 credits.

Chem 207/211 issue: F. Shumway stated that it has been difficult for first semester students to get into the proper chemistry course. The number of students interested in chemistry-based majors and pre-med. is increasing. Chemistry 211 was originally designed for engineers, but Chem 207 has been deemed acceptable also. There has been discussion about whether we need Chem 211 or whether we need more space in Chem 207. Engineering needs to have a discussion with the Chemistry Department. This year we have over-enrollment in Chem 207, which is very stressful for students because they are on waiting lists. B. Isacks stated that it is a nightmare for students trying to get into Chem 207, and he wondered why the Chemistry Department can’t deal with this issue, particularly since they must have some sense of enrollment. F. Shumway said that it is partially a fiscal issue regarding availability of TA’s, laboratory space, etc. D. Maloney Hahn said that the majority of majors allow Chem 208 instead of Physics 214, so our students tend to go toward the Chem sequence. This is especially true in the fall semester. A. Zehnder said that a committee will work on this issue.

Discussion of minor situation: D. Gries said that D. Bell noticed that some students have completed 2 or 3 minors, and he wondered if minors should be that easily obtained. B. Fisher said that in minors double or triple counting is currently fine, but maybe there should be a limit. L. Trotter stated that he would like to see some examples of more than one minor because he can’t imagine someone completing 3 minors. L. Pollack wondered how departments would be unaware of the issue, since a minor is approved by the department. D. Gries replied that there could be more than one minor and a department might not know that. A. Zehnder said that there are minors outside the Engineering College, and Engineering should clarify that with respect to what students can and can’t do. D. Gries added that there are no rules against minors in another department. D. Maloney Hahn stated that there are about a dozen concentrations that can be posted on a transcript, and he volunteered to distribute a list of what can be put on the transcript. D. Gries suggested that the Minors Committee could address this issue.

New ENGRI course from BME: A. Zehnder said that a New ENGRI course has been proposed from BME. The Committee on Engineering Courses will handle this.

ROTC: A. Zehnder mentioned that discussion of the the ROTC courses and whether they can count as electives or distribution courses took place last semester. D. Gries said that R. Robbins has more info on ROTC courses and will present that at a future CCGB Meeting. A. Zehnder added that maybe the ROTC folks will come and talk with the CCGB members.

Other topics from the floor: D. Gries stated that he is looking at the curriculum with other people, and this issue will be discussed with the CCGB members at some point.

A. Center suggested that ENG 150 and the issue of sustainability should be addressed. Currently there is no particular focus, and the content depends on the instructor. If sustainability is something that deserves some attention, ENG 150 might be a good venue for addressing it. It would add value to the student experience. A. Zehnder responded that the CCGB can have a discussion of ENG 150, and some direction might be useful. B. Fisher said that some of the ABET outcomes that MAE finds challenging to incorporate into the curriculum are ethics, international exposure, etc. D. Gries replied that the issues are addressed in ENG 150. Park Doing and Ron Kline do it in junior and senior courses and it is done well. ENG 150 is not effective for freshmen. A play about ethics will be held in the Statler Auditorium in December, which all students will be expected to attend. Ethics should also be addressed in the entire curriculum. A. Center stated that R. Kline was hired to be a professor of ethics,
and it was thought that he would help faculty incorporate ethics into the curriculum. Unfortunately no case studies were put out and no information was given to people that would be useful in a classroom. J. Bartsch added that when the CCGB dedicated 2 weeks to ENG 150s and looked at A-K, the focus was on ethics. Now the topic seems like an optional thing, although we’re still liable for ethics being included in courses. The play is just before finals, so some students might not be at the play. For CALS students in engineering they do a case study for ENG 150. Park and Ron have worked with them on that.

D. Maloney Hahn said that an issue that came up years ago was biology in the curriculum. It would be nice to revisit this. B. Fisher added that the issue of uniformity and advisor-approved electives also came up. She wondered what was resolved, if anything. It seems that different standards within departments and the college are applied. A. Zehnder suggested that maybe the committee on electives can come up with some statement for clarification.

A. Center stated that last year the CCGB talked about the international program, Ecole Centrale. He wondered if it would be useful to have a report on this. A. Zehnder said that there is a committee in the College dealing with this. D. Gries added that there are two students at Ecole Centrale now. The committee is working on doing something similar with India. S. Sass indicated that similar agreements with China will become more important as time goes on.

Undergraduate Announcements: M. Spencer stated that last year Admissions had a visitation day for seniors and their parents. It was very popular, with a large number of students coming. The students want more information about the engineering departments. A general overview and presentations of research was done, but the students wanted to be able to ask questions of faculty members. Maybe a fair with a representative from each departmental would be good. The need is there, based on evaluations from the students and parents. This year’s visitation day will be October 23rd. A. Center suggested that maybe engineering peer advisors would be more effective. L. Pollack said that each department might want to have a couple of seniors do this. B. East suggested that some students and a faculty member should come in on a Sunday for one hour to do this. The parents would be impressed with a faculty member taking the time to do it. M. Spencer said that the Cornell Days are for admitted students and their families. This also involves faculty. L. Trotter stated that he participated in this, and it was very good. M. Spencer said that he will ask department chairs for a faculty representative. L. Lion asked if there exists a list of schools with student peer advisors. M. Spencer replied that he has a list, and he will attach it in an email which asks for a faculty representative from each department.

B. East stated that the Engineering Advising staff did an incredible job with orientation this year, and both parents and students gave good comments.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 a.m.