

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
College of Engineering
Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 10, 2023

Attending: Achilleas Anastasopoulos, Jack Baker, Robert Bordley, Yavuz Bozer, Chris Fidkowski, Fei Gao, Saadet Albayrak Guralp, Amir Kamil, Leena Lalwani, Xiaogan Liang, Cameron Louttit, Emmanuelle Marquis, Frank Marsik, Radoslaw Michalowski, Mika Panagou, Anchal Sareen, Ben Spector, Roxanne Walker

Support Staff: Mercedes Carmona, Betsy Dodge, Matthew Faunce

Call to Order: 1:36 PM

Adjourned: 2:46 PM

Agenda:

1. Approval of 9.26.2023 Meeting Minutes (Page 2) – **APPROVED**
2. Re-visit - Non-Attendance Drop Statement Proposal – Action Item (Page 6) - **TABLED**
 - a. After CoE members spoke to their departments regarding this proposal, the following was gathered:
 - i. MECHENG: Main concern was how teamwork and student participation, with certain courses, would be affected if this proposal were to become established. Students need to make a commitment in the beginning of the course and therefore instructors feel there is no need for a policy. There would be no replacement for the student if there were involved on a team or project. Local policy for teamwork and students to make a strong commitment for the course.
 - ii. CEE: Overall, no conclusion was reached and there was little support for a policy to be made. By faculty members having the power to drop a student, there may be an abuse of power that would come with this, and this should be avoided if possible. Department relays comments but also says that this should not stop CoE from establishing a statement if needed.
 - iii. ISD: CoE member states no attendance is taken, but students' participation is measured in assignments, exams, projects, etc. Questions if LSA takes attendance for the policy to implemented and if that's how LSA instructors determine to drop a student or not. Response to this was that no information could be given regarding how LSA uses or enforces their policy based on attendance taken or not.
 - iv. IOE: Lectures are recorded and makes it easier for students who miss lecture to follow up on their own and not get behind in the course. Example given of instructor asking questions in lecture for students that are actively attending and receiving extra credit towards the student's overall grade as a result.
 - v. CLASP: College wide policy would be difficult, and student would have to petition to override if dropped due to non-attendance, creating more work for faculty to complete as a result. Suggestion of EAC being brought in to do a wellness check on the student if there is a consistent absence from the course, gather information from the student if they are given a response, and this is communicated to the instructor before an immediate drop would be taken.
 - vi. NAVARCH: There needs to be an intermittent step taken, like what CLASP has suggested that the EAC is involved and communicates to the instructor as to why the student hasn't been attending the course.
 - vii. NERS: A policy can be drafted and sent to the departments to go over and collect feedback to continue the discussions had regarding this proposal.
 - viii. ECE: Instructors already have milestones throughout a course so that a policy wouldn't need to be in place as this would be harsh and can be achieved by other means. Looking for more feedback from department chairs.

- ix. TCHNCLCM: A group of students to focus on are waitlisted students and how a policy would have an impact. Students not showing up for the first few weeks of classes are hurting waitlisted students who want to take the course and continue their academics. This policy would also affect financial aid students and if these students can be flagged and not to be lost in the process of dropping due to their attendance.
 - 1. International students would also be affected as this would put the student below being a full-time student and cause problems with their Visa.
 - x. ROB: Policy is supported but needs to be executed well. Waitlist example also mentioned as well as EAC or RO to be involved for the student not actively participating in the course and to gather information as to why. This would also help international students take the courses they need while being here for the main terms of the year, Fall and Winter. Example of growing conference and student athletes traveling more as a result would also be in class less, so how would they be affected by this. CoE member suggests to further discuss this to the entire CoE so that everyone can have an opinion or consensus regarding the proposal. Also gives example that their lectures are recorded, and the student completes their work on their own and keeps up with the course, but still not physically attending lecture, so should this student be faulted by this. More clarity is needed and what situations would this policy be applied to. Would each department or course instructor(s) need to establish their own policy for this to be effective?
 - xi. BIOMEDE: Waitlists also brought up as already mentioned by other departments and how larger lectures such as 200 level courses are affected. Counterpoint that reaching out to the student and gathering information is fair, but what is the timeframe for this as if this takes too long, then a waitlisted student could fall farther behind in the course as a result. There needs to be a reasonable time when to reach out to the student after not attending the course.
 - xii. EECS: Agrees with ROB. The department has no attendance required for courses. Reiterates the department used to have an attendance policy in place for students, that was removed due to students viewing this as harmful, negative. The department is not interested in a blanket statement policy to be established.
- b. A point made that if groups for courses are formed immediately and other aspects are not deemed as of importance, then does the policy depend on the course level and what would this policy look like as well as if there is no communication from the student, how do we proceed. Overall, question of how does one measure attendance for a course.
- i. CoE RO states the instructor can do this and that the RO would support, but there needs to be a clear, concise statement that is widely viewed by all that this can happen based on a specific course and what specific actions would be taken. Do we want a generalized statement, to copy LSA's, or for CoE to create our own? What is the best route to go forward?
 - ii. Suggestion that this can also be a statement of attendance for the specific courses that need this to be enforced. Each department can develop their own information to be in this statement.
 - 1. Example that students thought attendance was optional for a course, but there was a message that would be visible and public for students that stated the student would be dropped if there was no participation after a week. This message would appear in Wolverine Access or LSA Course Guide.
 - a. Issue brought up that some students don't get access to the course entirely until after the first week of classes. This is why a statement would be more effective to appear on Wolverine Access.
 - i. Counterpoint that students do not read information given, such as on a Syllabus or Wolverine Access, as there are so many policies in place and reading is getting lengthier, therefore would be overlooked.
 - b. UG Representative states that having statements on the LSA Course Guide and/or Wolverine Access would be helpful. The more redundancy of a statement/policy listed for a course, the better to overall get the messaged across. Agrees that students aren't reading lengthy syllabus, so that another policy/statement would be missed if included.
 - 2. Mentioned if this statement should be put on a CARF, but ultimately deemed that a CARF submitted for just this statement, would not be deemed as the best method.
- c. To end the discussion, a poll was conducted for members with the options listed as, LSA Policy, Modified Policy, or No Policy.
- i. Members voted in favor for the Modified Policy by 81% (13 members) vs No Policy by 19% (3 members).
 - 1. The follow up discussed was that more information is to be gathered and discussed at the next CoE CC meeting on 10.24.2023.

- ii. CoE member suggests that this might be helpful for Rachael, who represents the ENGR and Undergraduate Education Departments as a CoE CC member, to be of assistance as she represents a large portion of students to be effective by this proposal.
 - 1. Xiaogan to follow up with Rachael.
- 3. Re-visit - Review of Professional or Creative Development Courses (PCDC) Degree Audit Rule – Informational Item (Page 7) – **TABLED**
 - a. Updated responses from Fred and Susan:
 - i. Highlighted areas in document speaks as to why PCDC was created and the intent of this.
 - ii. Question from previous meeting if there was a historical agreement with LSA regarding the PCDC Degree Audit Rule, and there is not.
 - iii. Susan supports option 3 for what way to move forward with PCDC Degree Audit Rules.
 - iv. Fred didn't have an option to move forward with and didn't see this as an issue and really is for the courses that didn't fit any other Liberal Arts or Humanities Intellectual Breadths. Can count both courses towards Intellectual Breadth, but more what the designation is to go to for courses.
 - b. Overall feedback from departments as is follow:
 - i. MECHENG - PDCD optional, HU should be the stronger designation.
 - ii. NAVARCH – Agreement in Option 3 listed.
 - c. Due to the time constraint and needing to get to the CARFs on the agenda, there was an agreement that more feedback is to be gathered by departments and continue the discussion at the next CoE CC meeting on 10.24.2023.
- 4. Upcoming ABET Visit
 - a. A CoE member mentioned that some CoE CC members will have to miss the meeting due to time conflicts with the CoE CC meeting and the ABET visit.
 - i. CoE CC Chair suggests finding a replacement member so votes can be taken, and discussions can continue to be had.

PAGE	SUBJECT	COURSE #	ACTION	SUMMARY	EFFECTIVE TERM	MIN. GRADE REQ. FOR ENF. PREPREQ	Is Course on LSA Course Guide?	APPROVED	NOTES & REVISIONS	TABLED
9	CSE	543	MOD	Change in Cross Listing.	WT 2024	NO	NO	APPROVED		
12	EECS	367	MOD	Change in Home Department, Cross Listing, and Course Components Terms Offered.	WT 2024	C	YES	APPROVED		
15	EECS	495	MOD	Change in Course and Abbreviated Titles, Course Description.	WT 2024	C	YES	APPROVED		
18	IOE	474	MOD	Change to Course Credit Type and Course Components.	WT 2024	C-	YES	APPROVED	Suggestion of Course Title to be modified to be more descriptive.	
21	ROB	103	MOD	Change in Course Catalog Number, Course Description, Full-Term Credit Hours, Grading Basis, and Course Components.	WT 2024	NO	NO	CONDITIONALLY APPROVED	List ENGN 100-Sec 850 for Credit Exclusion. Suggested Course Description corrections, “Student develop...” and “...milling, etc.”	
25	ROB	560	NEW		WT 2024	NO	NO	CONDITIONALLY APPROVED	Course Description needs to list course topics.	

PAGE	SUBJECT	COURSE #	ACTION	SUMMARY	EFFECTIVE TERM	MIN. GRADE REQ. FOR ENF. PREPREQ	Is Course on LSA Course Guide?	APPROVED	NOTES & REVISIONS	TABLED
40	ROB	572	NEW		WT 2024	NO	NO	APPROVED	Cross listed with NAVARCH 569.	

EECS CARFs with Subject Changes to ECE or CSE – Bulk Review

PAGE	SUBJECT	COURSE #	ACTION	SUMMARY	EFFECTIVE TERM	MIN. GRADE REQ. FOR ENF. PREPREQ	Is Course on LSA Course Guide?	APPROVED	NOTES & REVISIONS	TABLED
51	EECS	595	MOD		FT 2024	NO	YES	APPROVED	Cross listed with LING 541 and SI 561.	
54	SI	649	MOD		FT 2024	C-	YES	APPROVED	Cross listed with EECS 548.	
57	SI	650	MOD		FT 2024	NO	YES	APPROVED	Cross listed with EECS 549.	
60	SI	652	MOD		FT 2024	NO	YES	APPROVED	Cross listed with EECS 547.	