Present:	**Also Present:**	**Absent:**
Jay Farrell, Chair	Rod Smith	Cengiz Ozkan
Chinya Ravishankar	Eilene Montoya	Albert Wang
Masaru Rao		Reza Abbaschian
Neal Young		
Valentine Vullev		
Ashok Mulchandani		
Mark Matsumoto		
Nathan Martin		

1. **Call to Order – 3:05 p.m.**

2. **Approvals – April 4, 2012 Minutes**

3. **Announcements**
   A. Dean
      i. None (absent).
   B. Associate Deans
      i. Matsumoto
         1. Currently new graduate enrollment for Fall 2012 is at 50%
      ii. Ravishankar
         1. Yield of Freshmen numbers are way up. 442 SIR'd as of today's meeting.
   C. Chair – will make announcements during meeting

4. **New/Continued Business**
   A. Academic Integrity – Per N. Young
      1. BCOE has reviewed previous submissions and responded that previous document was not understandable as it was written. N. Young was asked to represent and make recommendations on behalf of BCOE. The document as it now stands is clearer with the three policies and procedures. This brings the policies and procedures up to date.
      2. There were two points that should be clarified:
         a. On p. 12, the proposed text reads "… will appoint four faculty members from BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS …" which is ambiguous. It should read either: a. "…will appoint four faculty members from each of BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS to …" or "…will appoint four faculty members total from BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS to …"

         b. On p.24, in Section 4.2.1, the text makes clear the consequences for the cases where the Assoc. Dean of Graduate Academic Affairs finds

the "it more likely than not that the student is responsible." It does not make clear whether in the opposite case, the faculty can appeal the decision. Section 4.2.1 should conclude with a clear statement that either the faculty or the student may appeal the decision of the Assoc. Dean of Graduate Academic Affairs.

B. WASC Outcome
   i. Motioned for Thomas Payne, Emeritus Professor, Computer Science & Engineering serve as representative for BCOE and committee unanimously approved.
C. Course Changes – None
D. Program Changes
   1. College Breadth Requirements- update to reflect a broader statement for requirements during upper division standing.
   2. Chemical Engineering – changes to reflect PEO changes and reflect removal of Bioengineering entries as Bioengineering is now it's own department and program.
E. Catalog Changes
   1. Computer Engineering – updated Program Educational Objectives – to meet entries from 2007 submission – Committee reviewed and approved unanimously.
   2. Computer Science - updated Program Educational Objectives – to meet entries from 2007 submission – Committee reviewed and approved unanimously.
   3. Electrical Engineering - updated Program Educational Objectives – to meet entries from 2007 submission – Committee reviewed and approved unanimously.
   4. Degrees Conferred Report – Committee reviewed and approved unanimously.

5. New Items

The variance of the grading curves between different sections of the same Math courses was discussed. The question was whether the distribution of student ability varied so much by section, or whether the instruction and grading were distinctly different. It was stated that because ENGR students have been placed for some years now in special ENGR Learning Community sections, BCOE should focus its efforts and concern on those sections. It was stated that data is available to show that these sections do not have excessive variation. Due to the ad-hoc discussion, the data was not available at the meeting. Others stated that even if ENGR students are not in the sections with wide variation in their curves the issue should be addressed by UCR as a matter of fairness to the students enrolled.

6. **Adjournment – 4:04 p.m.**