CCGB Meeting Agenda, October 20, 2006

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Undergraduate Announcements
3. Syllabets and Post-Course Assessments
4. ENGRI Courses and Requirements

CCGB Minutes, September 8, 2006

Ex-Officio: B. East, R. Robbins, L. Schneider, F. Shumway, M. Spencer
Other: C. Pakkala

Approval of Minutes: After everyone at the table introduced themselves, the minutes of the May 19, 2006 CCGB Meeting were approved as written.

Undergraduate Announcements: R. Robbins stated that Dan Maloney Hahn took a position in ILR. The College is conducting a search to replace him. E. Fisher asked who students should see while a replacement is found. F. Shumway replied that either she or R. Robbins would be available to meet with students.

B. East thanked everyone for their participation in the orientation events.

Committee assignments: A. Zehnder stated that the CCGB will call upon the various committees during the academic year for assistance.

Reports on Beginning of New Semester: D. Gries asked how the chemistry enrollments went. F. Shumway said that enrollments went better this year with Chemistry 207 and 211. L. Pollack asked if there was a waiting list. F. Shumway replied that there is always a waiting list. It is a matter of finding what all of the students need/want and they figure the enrollments out after that. They tried to emphasize with peer advisors and faculty advisors that students could get into one of the chemistry classes.

Report on Math Test: A. Zehnder said that an online placement exam was developed to determine placement into Math 191. F. Shumway said 36% of the incoming engineering students took the online exam. Of that, 7% didn’t pass the exam and Advising followed up with those students. Most problems with the online exam occurred with students not having a blackboard account or they didn’t have their net ids yet. At the end of this semester they will compare this exam data with how students actually did in their courses and will adjust the exam if necessary. Some students who didn’t pass took Math 001. Some took courses at home during the summer, and one had a tutor. R. Robbins said that we are using Math 111 as a safety net after the first prelim in Math 191 for students who don’t do well on it. B. East said that F. Shumway and A. Zehnder did a lot of work on the exam. F. Shumway added that L. Pollack will be handling the exam in the future.

Syllabets and Course Assessments for Core Courses: D. Gries said that ABET is done every 6 years. They require feedback loops, so we are looking at each of the core curriculum courses to see if the syllabus is right. We also need course assessments. Assessments determine whether outcomes are met and, if not, what needs to be done to remedy that. He will contact each instructor and department to ask
if their syllabet is correct, say that we need post course assessments at the end, and tell them what needs to be included. This needs to be done every two or three years. We need to show ABET that we did our work with this feedback loop. Each department should have their own post course assessments. We don’t need post-course assessments for those courses not taught by the Engineering College (math, physics, chemistry, biology); just syllabets. L. Pollack asked what the word Committee referred to on the list. D. Gries replied that the Mathematics & Science Committee of the CCGB will need to make sure that the syllabets are right. They will work with people on this. E. Fisher said that some departments want any syllabent changes approved by them. A. Center asked if the general assessment is helpful. The general consensus was that it was nice, but not very useful. He and his colleagues didn’t see a significant benefit from the entire ABET process. It would be good for Dean Fuchs to ask directors and chairs if ABET helped or made things better. D. Gries said that the post-course assessment helped him determine how useful his course is. A. Zehnder said that he tried to do this last year and asked colleagues to do this, but he was met with a lot of resistance. He wondered what should be done if colleagues don’t want to do the assessments or syllabets. D. Gries said that this is up to the chair. Each of the committees looked at the courses in their area a couple of years ago and it needs to be done again.

Rules for Graduating with Distinction and Completing Honors in Majors: J. Bartsch said that there are clear rules of graduating with distinction. The issue arose with the majors honors programs. In the last year of study you can do departmental honors. But cum laude requires a 3.5 GPA in the final four semesters. A student needs to enter the honors program in their junior year for an honor in their major. D. Maloney Hahn said that students with a cumulative 3.5 GPA should be able to graduate with honors. The Engineering Handbook and departmental honors rules should be consistent. Clearly the rules were not written at the same time. If anyone is eligible for Latin honors, they should also be eligible for department honors. A. Zehnder said that if the CCGB wants to make a change, we should write it up, pass a resolution, and then send to college faculty. J. Bartsch recommended that the wording of a resolution should say that in order for a student to be eligible for a majors honor they should be eligible to graduate with distinction. D. Ruppert said that he was on the CCGB when the honors program started. Students entering the honors program had some criteria to enter it—their GPA at the time. A. Center said that if we didn’t have an honors program in a major, the cum laude would still be there. That isn’t a CCGB issue. We are only talking about the honors program. He feels that each department should decide the honors criteria. Currently the only requirement is a 3.5 GPA in each of six semesters to enter the honors program. D. Gries said that the rules for graduating with distinction say that students need an overall GPA of 3.5 or a 3.5 GPA in each of the last 4 semesters. This would be relaxing the majors honors program to correspond with the distinction honors criteria. J. Bartsch said that students must be on track to earn distinction in order to enter the honors program. L. Pollack said that the language should be made consistent across all of the documents, including the Courses of Study. A. Zehnder said that the wording would be modified, and he requested that J. Bartsch write something, D. Gries help, along with D. Ruppert. He asked if there were any objections to that, and none were noted.

Liberal Studies Courses: D. Gries sent an email to all of the CCGB members regarding the fact that more and more students are petitioning to let them use courses in real estate, management, etc. for liberal studies courses. He wondered if we should liberalize the liberal studies course description to allow something like this. He doesn’t want to eliminate liberal studies entirely. Maybe a new category could be created to allow students to learn about entrepreneurship, etc. It would allow students more
flexibility to take courses that they want to take. R. Robbins added that the majority of people in this situation are juniors and seniors who have used their advisor approved electives and want to take business courses. Freshmen and sophomores are told to use these courses for their advisor approved electives. J. Bartsch stated that some advisees take 3 economics courses on the list and then want to do financial accounting. He feels that is fine. B. East said that the definition of liberal studies is not taking all economics or financial management classes. E. Fisher said that this is a major change and would have to go to the college faculty. A. Zehnder said that what we currently have is pretty reasonable regarding liberal studies. A. Center said that he doesn’t understand why a change would be required because nearly everyone takes more than 128 credit hours. He wondered why a student couldn’t add one more course. Some students come in with AP credit and then only have 9 credits in their senior year. We’re not really precluding them from doing what they want. R. Robbins said that the students want to take primarily AEM courses, real estate courses and others not on the list. C. Seyler stated that some advisors are strict regarding advisor approved electives. Maybe the courses should be changed just to electives. Many advisors want technical electives. R. Robbins said that a lot of students want some business background to go with their major. E. Fisher said that maybe the wording should explicitly say that finance, business, etc. is appropriate. Maybe have an instructor sign a petition saying a course is appropriate with a certain group. J. Bartsch stated that AEM courses would be approved for their students. Students would have the burden to show how a course fits in with their major. A. Center asked if we could see how many hours students graduated with last year. Most students come with AP credit and graduate with many hours. It seems that a surplus of hours isn’t a burden for students and they should be able to take these courses if they want. B. East said that at some point this is a zero sum gain. If they’re taking business courses, they’re not taking something else. E. Fisher stated that she is uncomfortable diluting the liberal studies category by requiring an additional course. Maybe it would be better to relax the approved electives to allow a course instead. L. Pollack asked when students find out about approved electives. She suggested that advisors outline the opportunities for students from the beginning of their freshman year, using the approved electives as a plus. B. East stated that certain departments require certain courses. C. Seyler countered that departments should not require technical courses for approved electives. L. Pollack suggested that faculty be told that approved electives are opportunities for students to explore outside the curriculum. F. Shumway said that there is language in the handbook explaining the overall curriculum and approved electives. E. Fisher said that the advisor approved electives are a major source of confusion within departments and it would be good to work on revising them.

The AEM Minor: B. East said that AEM is willing to allow a small number of students to take the minor. They can only accommodate approximately 5 engineering students in 2 of their AEM courses. AEM does their own selection process from CALS students for their minor. They want some criteria from us about how to select engineering students. They want to accommodate more students in the future. It is great that AEM is letting some of our students do the minor, and we need to figure out how to do this. A. Center stated that this minor will likely require more than 128 credit hours for students. He wondered if the concern is that within 128 credits students will have a broader selection or that they will overload with credits. B. East said that we just need to figure out how to open this minor to students. This is just information for everyone.

The meeting adjourned at 9:03 a.m.