CCGB Meeting Agenda, October 19, 2007

1. Approval of minutes
2. Undergraduate announcements
3. Reporting of department/school practices for academic actions; discussion of guidelines for notifying parents (CCGB members; B. East)
4. Report on ABET review: Physics/Math Committee
5. Report on ABET review: Engineering Courses Committee
6. GPA requirement for graduation (D. Gries)

CCGB Minutes, September 28, 2007

Ex-Officio: B. East, L. Schneider, F. Shumway
Other: C. Pakkala, N. Peterson

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of 9/14/07 were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: F. Shumway said that early intervention has started. If anyone is teaching the common curriculum courses, i.e. Math, CS, ENGRI’s, etc., and some students are not doing well in those courses, send the names of those students to the Advising Office. Advising is also getting ready for First-year Family Weekend, which will be held on Saturday, October 27.

Proposed Agenda Item: B. East requested that the next CCGB agenda contain the issue of departments and academic actions processes and how we notify students if they are withdrawn or put on LOA. Suggestion: the CCGB draft a policy on how we think it should work and then mesh it with what departments actually do.

Biology: E. Fisher said that the Chair of the Biology Task Force said that they have decided not to pursue Introductory Biology for the Physical Sciences. They decided that there wasn’t unanimous support for it and thus it wasn’t worth the time and effort to develop this version. L. Pollack went along with the decision because she felt that if the course was developed and then not utilized, it wouldn’t be an effective use of anyone’s time and effort. We need to articulate what we want in a clearer way before biology can be offered to our engineering students. R. Harris-Warrick left the door open for further discussion in a year or two. E. Fisher thinks that biology is an important issue, but she wants to find out what other schools are doing.

Advisor-approved Electives: E. Fisher mentioned that the issue of advisor-approved electives needs to be addressed. She has asked B. Isacks and A. Zehnder to work on this. They felt that some wording could be revised for the Engineering Handbook. D. Gries researched the history on the electives, and the legislation is what is currently in the handbook. The entire faculty will need to address this issue. If people feel strongly about this, they can chat with E. Fisher, A. Zehnder, or B. Isacks. A. Zehnder said that he and B. Isacks will try to write something and bring it to the CCGB for further discussion.

Course Assessment: D. Gries said that he has a list of courses for which we have assessments and a list for which we don’t have assessments. He will ask the CCGB reps to contact the instructors for the assessments. We need to have the information for ABET accreditation. We need to get them for last year or this year. We need to look at the assessments and see if we think things are going okay or if changes need to be made. D. Cox had produced some guidelines about how to look at the assessments and see how the outcomes are measured. We need to look at the documentation and results to see if we under-
stand the assessment and whether the improvement plan is suitable. We will then recommend any changes for the common curriculum, etc.

We have various committees who will look at the assessments. We cannot get course assessments for courses outside Engineering; ABET seems to agree with this. The Liaisons Committees do oversee the courses, so we have some information on them. J. Bartsch said that a lot of distribution courses are being looked at by the departments. A. Zehnder asked what should be done if we feel that a course is okay but the assessment is not. D. Gries replied that the instructors should be told so the assessment can be improved.

E. Fisher suggested that a description of the ENGRI’s be distributed to the instructors because we want the courses to do what they are intended to do. When we had ENGRD’s, reports were collected, but we didn’t discuss them. We can’t count on departments to review them. D. Gries requested that the assessments be reviewed by the committees within 3 weeks and the committee members report back to the CCGB.

Committee Reports: W. Philpot stated that the Student Experience Subcommittee was continuing to identify and review student survey and recommendations. L. Schneider said that the student survey results will be reported at a conference next month. R. Bland said that the university surveys seniors every year. He asked if the data was shared with the College of Engineering. B. East replied that the university provides basic survey information but no detailed data unless they are asked for it. L. Schneider said that as an outcome of the survey, she talked to the people at Institutional Research and Planning and asked them to add additional questions to the COFHE survey.

J. Bartsch stated that he would get ASPAC data from Engineering Advising and will produce a report.

E. Fisher said that the Humanities and Social Sciences Subcommittee gave a brief report at the first CCGB meeting. She will contact the subcommittee chairs about these reports.

Fundamentals of Engineering Exam: B. East stated that we are offering the Fundamentals of Engineering exam in April 2008. M. Timmons, D. Aneshansley and J. Bartsch are teaching a professional ethics course in BEE, and part of the course is about ethics and part is review of the exam. An announcement was put in the Sundial. Information is also on the engineering website. We should encourage students to take it. Our students all seem to pass it, and it is harder for them to take it a few years out of college. Our dean helps to fund this exam.

J. Bartsch said that the exam review wouldn’t be possible without support from other engineering departments. The students rate the review as the most important part of the course. F. Shumway asked what the exam does. B. East replied that the exam is the first step toward professional licensing. The students need experience to complete the second part. Then they have a professional license and can say they are a professional engineer. J. Bartsch added that they can sign off on building designs.

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 a.m.