

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
College of Engineering
Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 24, 2023

Attending: Achilleas Anastasopoulos, Sarah Barbrow, Robert Bordley, Yavuz Bozer, Chris Fidkowski, Fei Gao, Robin Fowler, Amir Kamil, Xiaogan Liang, Cameron Louttit, Frank Marsik, Radoslaw Michalowski, Eric Rutherford, Mika Panagou, Anchal Sareen, Ben Spector, Andy Tadd, Roxanne Walker

Support Staff: Mercedes Carmona, Betsy Dodge, Matthew Faunce

Call to Order: 1:35 PM

Adjourned: 2:14 PM

Agenda:

1. Approval of 10.10.2023 Meeting Minutes (Page 2) - APPROVED
2. Re-visit - Non-Attendance Drop Statement Proposal – Action Item (Page 6)
 - a. Undergraduate Education & ENGR: Two issues that arise from this are attendance in the first week or so of the term to establish enrollment in the course and continued attendance/participation in the course throughout the term. A revised policy would make sense for the following as: 1) team-based courses (such as ENGR 100, capstone design, etc.) 2) Lab components that require in person attendance 3) Lecture based courses with waitlists. LSA Policy implies to secure a spot in the course, students are expected to attend the first couple of course meetings and if that does not occur, then instructors have the discretion to drop the student if there is no legitimate reason provided for the student's absence. This process could already be happening currently, but CoE could formally adopt a policy like this for courses. Attendance is an issue for courses that require (team-based courses) vs those that are not as critical for the course/after the first week. Would it be realistic for a waitlisted student to join a class, catch up and be successful beyond the first week of classes? The policy would need to be effective by the 2nd or 3rd weeks of a term. Waitlisted students would be negatively impact by not attending after the first couple of weeks, hence there would need to be a policy so that teams are not left because of a student's absence. Overall, option 2 is supported to create a modified non-attendance statement and procedure.
 - b. CSE: If a student is dropped, this could cause further issues such as a student losing financial aid or student visa. In agreement, from previous meeting, that attendance should be made part of the grade.
 - c. ME: Also in agreement, but states that the instructor should not have the power to drop students. A clear statement needs to be made that will hopefully encourage students to make a commitment to their courses.
 - d. IOE: ABET visit taking priority so no feedback has been retrieved from the department but will follow back up with any information. How are we to enforce a statement if we agree to one? This could lead into more issues such as timing, how this impacts instructors. Making attendance part of the grade is a concern as how would you take attendance for larger courses with 90+ students. What would be the appropriate value for the grade? Are we to come up with this ourselves or would the policy have a specific percentage needed for a course? As a result, this would create a lot of work for everyone involved.
 - e. ROB: Similar concerns to IOE and how can a student be dropped soon enough in order for a waitlisted student to be a part of the course. The statement would affect courses differently. What is the overall goal for this statement as not everyone can attend courses due to working or other conflicts.
 - i. Main purpose is to lessen the waitlist for courses, students to take team-based courses seriously, and overall enforce attendance.
 - f. CEE: No support from the department for a statement.
 - g. CHE: No waitlist concerns, but still reluctant to have a policy in place. Attendance in lab courses or 100 level courses makes it difficult for the instructor to hand out equitable workload due to attendance issues with students. Avoid the policy, but communicate clearly to students, in classes that attendance is an issue, that attendance is going to be factored into the course's overall grade.

- i. Some agreement in an enforcement policy needed along with a statement.
 - h. UG Student: Preventative type of measure is needed before a student is dropped. Perhaps, future course registration can have a flag of some sort that reflects the student had attendance issues so that the instructor is aware.
 - i. Vote taken with the same options listed as the previous meeting. Option 3 (10/17 members) had the majority vote that departments/units are to not allow administration to drop students from classes based on non-attendance.
 - i. In 2nd, was Option 2 (7/17) to create a modified non-attendance statement and procedure, with details to be determined by the CoE CC.
- 3. Re-visit - Review of Professional or Creative Development Courses (PCDC) Degree Audit Rule – Action Item (Page 7)
 - a. UG Education & ENGR: PCDC is only optional for IB and HU is required, it seems that the HU designation should be the stronger determiner, thus I support Option #3.
 - i. CSE, NERS, & ROB: Also, in agreement with this option.
 - b. Vote taken with the same options listed as the previous meeting with Option 3 having a unanimous vote.
- 4. Contradicting Double Counting Policies – Action Item (Page 9)
 - a. UG Education & ENGR: I don't see why a course shouldn't be double counted for a plan of study that doesn't show up on the diploma. If the course is relevant to both the plan of study and major, minor, etc., it makes sense to count it. However, as Fred and Susan mentioned, I think we want to discourage students trying to game the system to get as many of these supplemental studies on their transcripts by taking as few courses as possible and trying to triple (or more) count them, so I think it should be limited to double counting only. I vote for Option 2, to either remove #6 or modify the language of the Supplemental Studies Policy.
 - b. ECE: Split credits among the supplemental studies and minors.
 - c. Minor policy states that credits cannot be shared with multiple minors.
 - i. Policy states: No course can count towards more than two majors, and no more than one major and one minor. A course can only count toward two minors if the credits received for that course are beyond the 128 credits required for the student's major.
 - d. Vote taken with two options listed from the document. Option 2 had a majority of votes to remove contradiction or modify the language for the Supplemental Studies Policy. Most members agree that the #6 bullet point is to be removed from the policy but keep the Double Counting Policy as is.

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
12	SI	565	MOD	Change in Home Department, Subject Change for Cross Listing, Course Credit Type.	FT 2024	NO	YES	APPROVED	Cross listed with EECS 597 and LING 702. The Home Unit can modify the Course Description if needed.	