CCGB Minutes
September 4, 1998


Members absent: K. Gebremedhin, J. Hopcroft, J. Jenkins

Ex-Officio: T. Cookingham, D. Cox, K. Hover, D. Maloney Hahn, F. Shumway, S. Youra

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon, D. Fitchen (Chairman, Physics Department), J. Rogers (Director of Undergraduate Studies, Physics)

Welcome new members: Round table introductions of CCGB and ex-officio members.

Appreciation to out-going chair: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, thanked the CCGB out-going chair, J. Abel, CEE, for all his hard work and dedication to the CCGB.

Introduction of new chair: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, introduced and welcomed the new chair of CCGB, P. Kintner, EE.

Minutes: P. Kintner, Chair, EE: Minutes of May 1, 1998 approved as distributed.

Administrative Announcements: None

Physics Curriculum: D. Fitchen, Chair of Physics and J. Rogers, Physics Director of Undergraduate Studies discussed several issues relating to the introductory physics sequence. Most students take Physics 112, 213 (217), 214 (218).

Thermodynamics has been moved out of the first semester (112) to the second semester (213). With the introduction to thermodynamics in 213 other topics were pared down to incorporate thermodynamics. The topics affected were circuit theory and magnetic materials. Physics 213 lab consisted of experiments that were almost independent of lectures. The students complained that the labs were so de-coupled from the lectures that it was hard to grasp the concepts. Physics has tried to change that so the labs are more closely related to the lectures. This focuses students on the topics of the lecture. New experiments in the labs help students to explore and understand concepts introduced in lecture. The Physics department would like to meet with members of the CCGB and Engineering College to get their reaction and help with their ideas for lab experiments and changes to the Physics 213 course.

The third course in the Physics sequence is 214. Physics would like to discuss the role of computers in the classroom. Physics 214 has computer simulation. The physics computer classroom has recently been upgraded but with the coursework on the web most students do not come to class. Should students have more work on the computer in
Physics 213 does not have computer work. Physics bias is not to integrate computers in 213 but would like the opinion of engineering.

Physics 112 has integrated cooperative learning in the classroom at engineering suggestion. Every other week the class has cooperative learning with off weeks devoted to lab learning with pairs of students. Cooperative learning is helped through the assistance of a TA and undergraduate assistant. These people are key to the success of the lab portion and physics is very dependent on engineering for providing these key people.

J. Rogers: Students who wish to take 213 at another university find it difficult to find a course that will transfer because of course content. Physics has been advising students to talk to and get approval from their engineering advisors when looking for a course outside Cornell to fulfill the 213 requirement.

Discussion: Some of the changes are committed whereas others are still experimental. It was confirmed that there were enough facilitators for physics and a new system has been implemented to attract more students to participate as facilitators.

Action: Physics would like to have some mechanism to interact with engineering to get feedback about ideas they have. Suggestion was made that the sub-committee of the CCGB, Mathematics & Science, headed by J. Jenkins, T&AM, would be a reasonable place to start. The CCGB would like copies of the most recent syllabi be sent to keep on record. Physics was asked to provide a detailed summary of changes in the courses to review and give to the Mathematics & Science sub-committee.

ABET: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, presented a brief overview of events that have taken place in regards to the ABET review. At the end of June, to meet the ABET July 1 deadline the materials of volume I and II were submitted to ABET. In July, K. Hover attended a meeting regarding the ABET accreditation review and met our team leader, Phil Borrowman who is a CEE/structural engineer. Calendars have been cleared with President Rawlings, the provost, Dean Hopcroft and Borrowman for a November visit. The review team will be on campus from Saturday, November 7th to Tuesday, November 11th. Evaluators will begin to arrive on campus Saturday. Most of the labs will be evaluated on Sunday with evaluators reserving the right to ask for a different sequence from others. The beginning of the draft report will be started Sunday night. Most of the day Monday will be spent in departments with possible visits to computer labs if not done on Sunday. The second draft of the report will be written Monday night. Evaluators will prepare a short list of general deficiencies from the written documents sent to them prior to their visit on campus. Tuesday the short list will be re-edited to look at key areas of concern with specific questions being asked. Late Tuesday morning and during lunch the team will work on draft three of their report and then meet with the Dean and department heads (separately) to discuss draft three. The team will give an out-briefing to the President and Provost prior to their departure. Sometime in January (date to be determined during the ABET visit) the first draft of the official ABET report will be sent to the college. We then have a chance to respond to any deficiencies that may have been found during the visit. July the final ABET report will be completed.

The reviewer names were circulated to departments this past summer. The evaluators could be rejected only on conflicts of interest. These names have now been approved.
Student transcripts, per ABET instructions of the last 6 alphabetically, have been sent (in all cases except ABEN the last six were from the May 1998 graduating class). All copies sent had names and ID numbers removed but were coded with numbers. The departments were sent corresponding transcripts but with names and ID numbers intact. In a memo sent with the transcripts the differences between the undergraduate and graduate transcripts were explained.

**Discussion:** It was agreed that department degree checklists should be sent to ABET along with an explanation of any irregularities found on the transcripts. If minor irregularities are found they do not have to be explained if the assoc. director is comfortable doing so face to face with the evaluator. The student transcripts should be checked against the department checklist. It has been stressed to make the visit and materials as easy as possible for the ABET evaluators. The criterion for deciding what material should be provided for the visitors is the principle of convenience. Anything that makes the external reviewer’s job easier should be provided.

The course material data consists of things like textbooks, tests, homework, etc. ABET 2000 will no longer focus on microanalysis (such as number of hours completed, course content, etc.) but rather on macro analysis of our objectives and did we complete them. After the November visit there may be additional requests for more information from the evaluation team.

**Action:** The transcript irregularities explanations will be sent to ABET by October 1st so departments need to have them to the Undergraduate Programs Office by September 24th. There is material that needs to be updated prior to the ABET visit per our instructions. Any additions, corrections, omissions, update, etc. should also be sent to reviewers at the same time as the transcript explanations.

**CCGB Agenda Opportunities 1998-99:** K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, listed the following possible agenda items for the 1998-99 academic year (attached).

- ABET – 1998
- ABET – 2000
- Implementation of Minors
  - Definition of originating departments
  - Approval of CCGB (process?)
  - Review and acceptance by other departments
- Physics
- Math – Year 2 of Small Section Initiative
- Technical Communication – subcommittee
- Biology and impact on science requirements
- Business courses
- New CCGB Task Force on Course Evaluations
  - Instrument
  - Feedback
  - Interpretation of data
- Student Organization
  - Liability
  - Registration
• Freshman Orientation
  *Charles Van Loan Orientation*
  Concurrent Lecture Series

• Advising
  New Initiatives from provost’s office
  Statement of advisor responsibilities
  Statement of advisee responsibilities
  Advisor Award Program
  Advisor selection/assignment
  Engineering 150

• Discussion of University/College enrollment model
• Transfer students, Early graduation, Advance placement
• Academic integrity issues
  problems with current system/guidelines?

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

*****************************************************************************
CCGB Agenda
Friday, September 11, 1998

1. Approval of September 4, 1998 minutes
2. Undergraduate Programs Announcements
3. ABET Update
4. Chairs for CCGB sub-committees
5. Continued discussion and prioritizing of agenda items