CCGB Minutes
September 25, 1998


Members absent: J. Hopcroft, M. Thompson

Ex-Officio: K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon, J. Belina (EE)

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of September 18, 1998 were approved as read.

Undergraduate Programs Announcements: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, at a recent Associate Deans meeting several colleges indicated an interest in creating a dual degree program with Engineering. Currently Engineering has dual degree programs in conjunction with Arts and Sciences, Departments of Art, History and Architecture and Urban Studies in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning. The Hotel School, CALS, and Human Ecology are the three colleges most interested in offering a dual degree with Engineering. generating the most interest.

Discussion: Typically the dual degree programs require five years to complete with the exception of some international students, who come to Cornell with lots of AP credit, who can complete it in four years. The initiation of more dual degree programs in Engineering could be used as an effective marketing tool. An example of a typical dual degree program would be Operations Research Engineering and Economics. It is not know how the tuition is split between the colleges for students enrolled in the dual degree program.

D. Maloney Hahn, Advising; announced that the advisor evaluations were sent to all Directors/Chairs in each school/department. Advising asked the field coordinators to double-check the data to be sure the raw data is matching the data on the excel spreadsheet. In one case the data did not match so spot checking needs to take place to ensure inconsistencies are not occurring.

F. Shumway, Advising; a potential CCGB agenda item may be advanced placement and its current policies and how it folds into graduation. A potential problem may be developing based on the growing trends of students coming in with lots of AP credit. Two documents (attached) were distributed. The first one is a flyer that is sent to incoming freshman regarding the Engineering polices of AP credit for the most common courses. The Engineering policy differs from the university policy in areas such as math, chemistry and physics. The second document is a copy of the general university rules governing AP credit, such as liberal studies.
Continued Discussion of Course Evaluations  John Belina, Electrical Engineering, was the chair of the Evaluation of Student Experience sub-committee in 1981 when the evaluation process was first developed. His recollections of what transpired is as follows:

- Members of the CCGB at the time of the creation of the evaluation forms included Lionel Weiss, Fred Gouldin, Ben Nichols and Dick Lance. Advice was additionally sought from Maas and Kramer from Arts & Sciences.
- The process of course evaluations started with the common courses
- Some of the departments were not conducting evaluations on a regular basis.
- The evaluation form being used that the time was a form developed by Prof. Maas. The form was a 100-question evaluation, which took a half-hour to complete. The CCGB wanted to create a shorter version of this form.
- The “Maas evaluation form” was to be used as a tool to improve teaching. Prof. Belina recalled that Maas urged that the form be used for the purpose it was intended and not for other purposes such as faculty evaluation.
- The evaluation form currently in place in almost exactly the same as when it was first developed.
- A policy, that all courses be evaluated (undergraduate) in Engineering, was approved by the CCGB. (We are searching for a record of this approved motion.)
- The Physics department developed the optical scan form. This enabled Engineering to share the results with Math and Physics departments.
- Evaluations were required for all courses for which the CCGB had oversight responsibility (mainly the distribution and introduction courses). The CCGB suggested that the fields adopt this evaluation form for field program courses as well.
- The CCGB suggested the fields make the evaluations or appropriate summaries available to students.
- When the evaluations were distributed to students, a suggested paragraph was devised by the CCGB to be read to all students when the evaluation form was distributed. In the initial years the field honor societies were involved in the distribution and collection of the evaluation forms. Due to the steps involved in processing the forms the results were not made available to the departments until after the following semester began.

Discussion: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, In the early 1990’s a task force regarding course evaluations came up with a recommendation to the dean. The recommendations concerning evaluations were only a portion of the report. Those interested in re-evaluating should review this study.

Others recalled Prof. Maas’s opinions concerning the difference between evaluations to improve teaching and evaluations to evaluate teacher performance.

Several members commented that the “written comment” section in our current evaluation form is the most useful. This is where you can find what is the best and worst part of the course.

J. Jenkins, T&AM, The math/engineering curriculum has developed a qualitative evaluation form to evaluate the small math section pilot program. This can be made available to CCGB if they are interested.
K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, Distributed a draft of the charge to the CCGB of things that might be done. This draft is just an idea or framework of the charge. (Attached)

1. Collect, review and make recommendations for college legislation and policy concerning the short and long-term evaluation of teaching and learning.
2. Review and make recommendations concerning teaching and learning evaluation procedures to assess immediate and long-term reaction to, and benefit from, the classroom experience.
3. Review and make recommendations concerning the instruments used to evaluate teaching and learning.
4. Review and make recommendations for the interpretation of evaluation data and for its appropriate use in assessing utility of courses in the curriculum, faculty performance, student learning and educational benefit, and student satisfaction.

Discussion: The difference between point 2 and 3 is that point two is the overall procedures (format and process) and number three is specifically the instrument. (Evaluation). Point one is the overall policy, point two is how that policy is implemented, three is how the information is gathered with four concerned with what to do with the information.

There is more to the evaluation process that the snapshot of the students perception at that moment in time when the evaluation is actually filled out. There are short term and long term issues. The key is to know what we are using the evaluation for, to improve teaching or for personnel decisions.

The terms “teaching” and “learning” are being used in the broader sense of how the course is transmitted and received. The wording of “improve” instead of “evaluation” should be used to convey the goal of improving teaching.

The current evaluation forms are not being used just for improving teaching; they are also used for evaluating teaching. If this evaluation provides only numerical results, then only the numbers will also be used to evaluate faculty.

Since there are two separate goals (improve/evaluate) then two separate evaluations should be used to meet both criteria. A teaching evaluation form should be done later, after the course material is relevant in the next course.

If the CCGB has jurisdiction only over the common curriculum than should another committee in Engineering, such as the Policy committee, be involved? The Dean must convey the charge for CCGB’s jurisdiction to reach beyond the common courses.

In order to obtain “ownership” of the evaluation form it may be beneficial to bring the committee recommendation to the full faculty for a vote rather than just a recommendation for the dean to implement.

Task force members should consist of not only members of the CCGB but also faculty across the college. The policy committee should be informed of this charge.

The wording of “utility” of the courses in the curriculum is too vague, isn’t this the responsibility of the faculty? How effective is surveying in finding out how we are serving our customers (students) and faculty outside engineering (math, physics)?

Given the nature of this issue we want to be sure that we are working on the correct problem. The sub-committee may need additional resource persons across campus consult with us. It would also be useful to look at different models both inside and
outside the university, and we should collect data from our peer institutions to find out what they are doing.

**ABET Update:** Any addendum or additions needs to be in the Undergraduate Programs office by October 1st for a mailing to the ABET team.

Next week at CCGB faculty who have already been through the ABET process will attend the meeting to give us an overview of what will transpire when the evaluators come to campus.

The NY Board named Ms. Rose Mary Wargo as the Cornell observer. We have been asked if we know of any conflicts of interest with her. She is only here as an observer and does not actually evaluate any of the programs.

*Action:* F. Gouldin, MAE, with ask visiting Prof. Sahay if he knows her as Prof. Sahay was asked to observe the Cornell evaluation but could not due to his visiting prof. status on campus. S. Conlon will check the ABET web site to see if any more information regarding Ms. Wargo is listed there.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

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

CCGB Agenda
Friday, October 2, 1998
1. Approval of September 25, 1998 minutes
2. Undergraduate Programs Announcements
3. ABET Update with G. Rehkugler, J. Stedinger, T. de Boer, L. Albright
4. Further consideration of course evaluations