CCGB Meeting Agenda, October 7, 2005

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Report from Curriculum Transformation Committee (Gries)
4. Brief ROTC Update

CCGB Minutes, September 23, 2005


Ex-Officio: D. Bell, B. East, R. Evans, L. Schneider, D. Maloney Hahn, R. Robbins, M. Spencer

Other: N. Peterson, C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the September 2, 2005 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: B. East said that the Student Experience Committee has been working on a survey for many months. They have the results of the survey and will share them with the CCGB.

Minors in and out of the College: D. Gries distributed a sheet that listed students and what minors they took. He bolded courses that were double-counted. A. Bojanczyk said that he found courses that are required for the major (core courses) were also used for the minors. It may not be a good idea to allow that. J. Bartsch stated that the bigger picture is how many credits the students completed. L. Trotter said that he thought that no double counting was allowed in applied math and he was amazed that a minor in applied math only required one math course. D. Gries agreed to look into the applied math requirements. E. Fisher wondered whether minors with a lot of overlap could be identified and departments not allow them to be taken together. D. Gries replied that the problem is that each department who offers a minor only sees the paperwork for the minor in their department. L. Pollack suggested that students who apply for 2 or more minors should do that through the registrar’s office to eliminate the possibility of too much overlap. D. Bell responded that the Registrar’s Office could put a policy in place to limit minors and double counting. B. Isacks stated that double counting doesn’t seem right because students are getting two minors for doing the same exact thing. L. Lion said that minors are considered a body of knowledge, and some overlap doesn’t bother him. E. Fisher replied that this is an argument toward identifying minors that are almost the same. This may not necessarily be mastering more than one body of knowledge. A. Center questioned the value of a minor and wondered how it would matter to anyone three years or so after graduation. B. East responded that students want them because of how the minors look on their transcript for employers, graduate schools, etc. Peer institutions offer minors and students want them. A. Center wondered what the CCGB is trying to achieve by changing the requirement for the minors. D. Gries replied that some people don’t like the fact that you can get more than one minor by double-counting. L. Trotter suggested that the CCGB clean up things in general so too much double counting doesn’t occur. If someone is hiring a student and sees that the student already has an additional skill, which is of some value, particularly for graduate school. A minor is also certification that a series of courses was approved by a department. A. Center said that it should be made clear that students can’t double count courses in certain cases. He wondered if the responsibility should be placed on departments to limit double-counting. A. Zehnder said that the departments who offer minors should communicate with each other and acknowledge double-counting. Communication could be organized through the Minors Committee. Departments would need to work out the details. He requested a straw vote to determine whether departments view double-counting in minors as a problem. Vote: 7 say double-counting bad, 5 say it is okay. There is a need to address this issue. R. Robbins wondered whether saying one course can’t be counted toward more than 2 minors would be acceptable. D. Gries said that the Minors Committee will look at this issue and report back.
Credit for ROTC Courses: R. Robbins distributed a handout listing the naval courses and their syllabets. Periodically students come to the Engineering College asking for the ROTC courses to be approved as advisor-approved electives. This issue arises every few years. Last year he asked for syllabi for all of the ROTC courses and brought them to the CCGB. This issue was tabled last year and this year he asked for syllabets. Only the Navy responded. Neither the Army nor the Air Force provided syllabets for us. These syllabets need to be reviewed and a decision made about whether these naval courses should be allowed as advisor-approved electives. A. Zehnder said that the CCGB did a straw vote last year which indicated that some type of credit should be allowed. The options we discussed were liberal studies distribution credits or advisor-approved electives (up to a certain amount). In the Army and Air Force they take a 1-credit leadership course. The question was whether the students could accumulate three 1-credit courses to equal one 3-credit course. L. Lion wondered if advisor-approved electives could be applied toward a career goal and said that this could qualify for that. L. Trotter said that some courses had historical content, but not a history focus, which was why the Arts College doesn’t accept ROTC courses for credit. It is an equity issue. The CCGB spoke about granting some credit for the series of courses. B. East said that it is unreasonable to count these as liberal studies courses. The Arts College doesn’t consider these liberal studies courses. A. Center wondered if non-ROTC students would be accepted in the course. If so, he would be more comfortable counting it. R. Robbins agreed to check on this. A. Center stated that Naval Science 310 covers a lot of things, and he would hope that a history course in ARTS would cover this much material. He is not sure that this is not the equivalent of how warfare is depicted in films, which is a class that engineering approves as an elective. We give carte blanche to the Arts College. D. Bell said that a major difference is that the Arts College is accredited and ROTC is not. Accreditation is key. A. Zehnder stated that the two main issues seem to be whether all of the students in the naval program take all of the courses listed and whether the courses are open to students outside the ROTC. R. Robbins agreed to get those answers.

ENGRD 210 Request for 4 credits: D. Gries stated that in 2004 ENGRD 210 was listed as 3 or 4 credits (with the extra lab for the 1 extra credit). This year the course is listed as 4 credits. He wondered if the CCGB gave permission for the course to be 4 credits. He asked if the CCGB should allow the distribution courses to be 4 credits or have them remain at 3. Now two distribution courses (202 & 230) are 4 credits, and 210 is listed at 4. A. Center asked if ENGRD 210 has 4 credits worth of content. B. East said that the CCGB can’t allow departments to raise credits without approval. L. Lion stated that if students are doing 4 credits worth of work and are only receiving 3 credits, that isn’t right. D. Gries said that the purpose of the distribution courses was originally to provide breadth, but that is not what is happening anymore. A. Bojanczyk said that students in the ENGRD 210 lab had a tremendous advantage over students who didn’t take the lab. The lab is well liked by the students and goes with the lecture. It is the best way to teach the course. A. Zehnder wondered if it would be possible to cover less material in lectures and keep the lab in it in order to keep the course at 3 credits.

A. Bojandzzyk replied that covering less material in the lectures would not be an option. A. Zehnder stated that the bottom line is that the CCGB needs to approve any credit increases. D. Gries added that approval (via petition) was sought during the summer, after the course was already listed as 4 credits. A. Zehnder agreed to contact Clif Pollock and have him give D. Gries a request to make the course 4 credits. The Distribution Committee will review the request and bring it to the CCGB for consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 a.m.