Agenda, March 5, 1999
CCGB Meeting

1. Approve the minutes from February 19, 1999 and February 26, 1999
2. Minors Approval Process
3. Department Approval for Applied Math Minor
4. ABET comment (K. Hover)
5. Computing Courses (K. Hover / F. Gouldin)
   a. MAE request triggered action
   b. Background
   c. Computing Sub-committee
   d. Overall review of requirements
   e. Review of existing courses
   f. Action on MAE request
6. Undergraduate Announcements

CCGB Minutes
February 26, 1999


Absent: M. Duncan, J. Hopcroft, M. Walter, F. Wise

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

Others: S. Dennis-Conlon

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 19, 1999 will be approved at the next CCGB meeting.

EngrI 127: F. Gouldin, M&AE, distributed a memo from John Callister which addresses the issue of the open-ended problems in EngrI 127. 60% of the course work consists of open-ended problem solving. As a rule, the subject matter poses open-ended problems. Examples of these type of problems were included in the letter which show that students are required to analyze and predict results. Case studies are also used in this course in which students are required to design products and a company to produce these products.

Resolution:
A motion was made a seconded to approve EngrI 127 as an Introduction to Engineering course in the College of Engineering, which was approved by a vote of 8 approved, 1 opposed, and 0 abstained.

Applied Math Minor: P. Kintner, Chair, EE, asked members of the CCGB to indicate if their departments approve student participation in the Applied Math Minor.

Resolution:
The following departments have stated that students can participate in the Applied Math Minors: EE, ORE, and MAE. Others will report after consultation with faculty.
Engineering Technical Communications: P. Kintner, Chair, EE, asked the members of the CCGB if there were any outstanding questions for the Technical Communications sub-committee. As none were raised P. Kintner asked departments who need to submit materials to the sub-committee to please do so for the evaluation of technical courses to be completed. The technical communications component will be part of the ABET 2000 discussions.

Progress Update – Student Survey: R. Kay, GS, distributed a copy of the student experience survey and data on the number of surveys returned to date (attached). The survey has replicated, as much as possible, the previous survey conducted in 1991-92. Column A was assigned as in the last survey (i.e. CS100, Math 191/193, 192, 293, 294, Physics 112, 213, 214, Chem 207, 211 or any distribution course). (Clarification from D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, came after minutes had been approved. “i.e. CS100, Math 191,193, 192, 293, Physics 213, Chem 211. Column B allowed students to choose a course from the above list and Math 294, Physics 112, 214, Chem 207, 208, EngrD, EngrI.”) Column B allowed students to choose a course from the above list. The surveys were sent to students in all grade levels (over 2,000 surveys sent out). The first round was sent last fall, just prior to finals. The second round went out in mid-January when students returned to campus. (Clarification from D. Maloney Hahn, Advising, after minutes were already approved. “A reminder card was sent 12/11/98.”) To date 556 have been returned compared to approximately 800 returned in the 1991-92 survey.

The survey replicated the same questions, timing and procedures. The statistics will be used for comparisons with the ‘91-’92 survey.

The 1991-92 survey was a key driver for the curriculum changes of 1994.

The survey results should be tabulated in about a month at which time the information will be brought to the CCGB.

Related but separate items:

- Per student comments EngrI’s are a favorite among the students and the students wish for them to remain untouched.
- The course evaluation sub-committee has been assembled but has not met.

ABET 2000: K. Hover, Assoc. Dean, distributed information regarding the ABET 2000 criteria (attached). The next ABET review will take place in 2004, giving the college approximately 5 years to prepare. The college would like to bring in some people from similar institutions who have already gone through an ABET 2000 review, to get their experience in this new process.

The ABET handout lists the ABET criterion abstracted from an article in ASEE Prism magazine. The handout also has a 1997 letter to J. Hopcroft regarding the ABET rules. The letter had levels of preparedness for ABET 2000 to help colleges determine if they should be reviewed under the old or new ABET rules in 1998. From the letter the decision was made to go with the old ABET rules for our 1998 review. In addition, examples of how other schools are determining their outcomes from their objectives are enclosed.

ABET criterion are based on the following:

- Students – how we measure success
- Educational Objectives
  - a. stated objectives
  - b. how we monitor and evaluate our objectives
  - c. mechanism for revising/changing our objectives based on feedback.
- Programs Outcomes Assessment – documented results
- Professional Component (ties back to the original ABET)
- analyzing and interpreting data
- design
- ethics
- communications
- ability to embrace life-long learning

• Faculty (similar to the old ABET)
• Facilities (similar to the old ABET)
• Institutional Support & Resources (similar to the old ABET)
• Program Criteria

Comments:
• We can develop our educational objectives, such as research, graduate programs and teaching.
• The college needs to take the lead on ABET 2000, developing concepts for the whole college to follow.
• Are there resources available to hire consultants to help the college in the ABET 2000 effort?
• One option to start the process would be to have a one-day retreat with consultants to outline what our objectives are and how to document them.
• What aspects of our current curriculum do we have in place because of ABET rules that we would like to review?
• In the last overview of the curriculum (Fall 97) the CCGB generally seemed satisfied.
• Jim Thorp, EE, will be attending an ABET 2000 3-day workshop for EE Directors.
• Later in the semester the CCGB could host a meeting to find out what other departments are hearing in regards to ABET 2000.
• MSE is looking at a total redesign of the curriculum – will ABET mandates be removed from the upper-levels of the curriculum, such as the technical writing and advanced computing courses?
• Currently the 1998-99 ABET draft report, expected to arrive here in late January, is one month late. Once the college receives the report we have 30 days to respond in writing to ABET.

Minors “Case Law”: L. Lion, CEE, the Minors sub-committee drafted a summary of case law on the minor program (attached). The case law proposal contains minimum common elements for a minor proposal. In addition, the case law lists the steps taken to approve a minor proposal.

Discussion:
• Should the word “provisional” be used in the text as it may cause confusion later?
• “Provisional” brings clarity to the process.
• Minor approval involves a two step process where the CCGB gives approval to forward the minor to the departments for feedback and then actually approves the minor into the college.
• Suggestion was made to remove the words “normally two weeks” and add “no less than two CCGB meetings” in the last paragraph.
• The word minor “description” should be changed to minor “content.”

Resolution:
This issue will be the first topic for the CCGB agenda next week.

Announcements: P. Kintner will be out of town next week so asked D. Shmoys to chair the CCGB meeting on March 5. D. Shmoys graciously agreed to do so.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 am.