1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Update from Technical Writing Committee (The Technical Writing committee has been meeting weekly and is in the midst of investigating possible approaches to improving how the College meets the existing Technical Writing requirement. This week will be an update, seeking your comments and guidance, but they will not yet make a formal recommendation.)
4. We may adjourn early

CCGB Minutes, September 27, 2002
Absent: J. Bartsch, D. Cox, K. Fuchs, R. Kay, B. Kusse, J. Saylor, D. Worley
Ex-Officio: K. Athreya, P. Beebe, B. East, D. Maloney Hahn, K.M. Smith, T. Thompson
Other: C. Pakkala
Approval of Minutes: The minutes of September 20, 2002 were approved with a slight modification.

Undergraduate Announcements: K. Smith (Advising) announced that the Undergraduate Handbook remains in the process of being revised. He and his staff members are awaiting responses from the engineering fields and will hopefully be able to finalize the handbook in the next week or two.

B. East (Admissions) mentioned that Women’s Hosting (with 70+ students) had just ended. She asked for a faculty representative from each department for a welcome dinner on October 17th for the underrepresented minorities hosting weekend.

Report from ECE on the course(s) they propose as Computing Applications course and call for vote: C. Seyler (ECE) stated that his department added ECE/CS 314 as a requirement after the ECE minor was formed. They will add ECE/CS 314 to the list of courses in the Undergraduate Handbook for the ECE minor. ECE also wanted to include ECE/CS 314 and ECE 475 in the list of courses that satisfy the college computer applications requirement. However, based upon the CCGB discussion from last week, they are now asking only for the inclusion of ECE/CS 314. C. Van Loan (CS) mentioned that CS 211 and ENGRD 211 are on the list of courses for transfer students and wondered if that affected the decision-making. C. Seyler said that 90% of the students come in with the equivalent of 211, so this would eliminate many petitions.

Motion: That ECE/CS 314 be approved to satisfy the college computer applications requirement. Vote: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining.

Initial Discussion of the Relevance of the Current Computer Applications Requirement: C. Seyler (ECE) said that the current computer applications requirement (as listed in the Engineering Undergraduate Handbook) isn’t relevant anymore. D. Maloney Hahn (Advising) stated that most fields require a course that meets the computer applications requirement. M. Duncan (ChemE) stated that their 2 capstone courses contain computer programming, and these skills are dependent on in the junior and senior courses. He added that 80% of the ChemE students took CS 241 and did very well. T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) suggested that the requirement become a department rather than college rule. F. Gouldin (MaAE) stated that his department would be the most affected if the requirement were dropped, but added that his department could likely require something in their own curriculum. He pointed out that, in the absence of a college-wide rule, it would fall to individual departments
to determine which courses were suitable to meet the students’ needs, which would be less efficient than the current system in which all the departments pool their knowledge of the content of the computing applications courses. He expressed the desire to obtain feedback from faculty within his department. T. Healey asked that each CCGB member go back and discuss this issue with their colleagues—preferably at a faculty meeting—and that we revisit this topic in a few weeks. M. Duncan suggested that maybe all of the requirements for engineering students (math, chemistry, biology, computing, etc.) should be re-examined.

Strategic Plan Examples Discussion: T. Jordan (Assoc. Dean) spoke about the Strategic Plan for Purdue University, adding that it is an example of what Engineering Dean Kent Fuchs is thinking about for Cornell to adopt. She also mentioned the draft that she created in March 2002 which was inspired by ABET and deals with the general outcome of the curriculum. D. Dalthorp (OR&IE) stated that the CCGB and its subcommittees are working on issues related to the curriculum, but the strategic plan doesn’t seem to mesh with CCGB’s mission. He added that current concerns such as the Technical Writing Program being understaffed may relate to the strategic plan, but the Dean should attend the subcommittee meetings to get a feel for what the committees do. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that the strategic plans that he’s seen thus far have all looked very similar and, in fact, look identical at the bullet level. He suggested that a strategic plan template be used and then details added to it from the subcommittees, chairs and directors. He also said that he is in favor of college-wide faculty meetings to discuss various fun and curriculum-related issues, much like occur in the ARTS College. K. Athreya (Women’s & Minority Programs) said that the Engineering Diversity Seminar series is a fun, college-wide effort but is not well attended. D. Dalthorp suggested that the strategic plan flow from the subcommittees because the current curricular issues facing the CCGB are pressing and time-consuming. He also suggested that a mission statement/strategic planning subcommittee be formed. C. Van Loan (CS) stated that some colleges have very impressive strategic plans with specific targets listed. He added that the details and uniqueness of a strategic plan are important.

As an illustration of an element of strategic plan that mapped out major changes, K. Athreya proposed that the college adopt a competency-based approach to progress for undergraduates. She pointed out that the grades at the levels of math and science that the students take don’t indicate depth of knowledge of those subjects. She suggested an alternative model in which progress requires competency (such as a grade of B or better) with no time limit for obtaining that grade. Students would take the course for as long or short as they need to (in order to gain the building blocks), then pass it and move on to a higher level. D. Dalthorp expressed his concern that this would require some students to remain at Cornell longer. F. Gouldin added that some students might take advantage of the system and purposely do poorly in the course in order to stay longer.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 a.m.