

Executive Committee Minutes November 18, 2010 – 2:30 p.m. EBU II - 443

Present:

Jay Farrell, Chair Gianfranco Ciardo, Vice Chair Reza Abbaschian Mark Matsumoto Ashok Mulchandani Chinya Ravishankar Christian Shelton Albert Wang Also Present: Rod Smith Eilene Montoya

Pamela Jreij

Absent:

Cengiz Ozkan Valentine Vullev

1. Call to Order - 2:35 p.m.

2. Approvals

A. The minutes from October 14, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved

3. Announcements

- A. Dean
 - i. Provided overview of discussions from Enrollment Management Council
 - 1. BCOE limit for freshman class is 600; anything above that will require BCOE to use a waitlist. Ravi is looking into campus-wide pool; however, per Dean Abbaschian, we will not be using a referral pool.
 - ii. The College has been approved for 11 new academic hires for 2011. Dean has asked the departments to begin the recruitment process. This number, 11, includes replacements for vacated positions and also new FTE.
- B. Associate Deans
 - i. Ravishankar
 - 1. The campus wants to move towards eliminating lower-division transfer students. This is a mistake, since even first year transfers succeed at higher rates than freshmen.
 - ii. Matsumoto No new announcements.
- C. Chair
 - i. Will cover information as each agenda item comes up.
 - ii. Pamela Jreij was introduced to the committee.

4. Continued Business

A. Changes to Courses

i. ENGR 60 – CHASS Executive Committee met prior to BCOE Executive Committee and felt that the syllabus was not detailed enough, especially in the group assignment area. Also, they felt that there should be a more detailed explanation of the discussion section. This will need to be addressed and then the courses need to be resubmitted by both BCOE and CHASS.

B. Certificate of Attendance for Pauline Portes (Ravishankar)

i. Ravishankar presented the information regarding Pauline Portes. She is a student that has passed away and the parents have requested that her degree be awarded. She passed away in late 2007 due to a car accident and was a CEE major. Campus has reviewed the student's records and BCOE as well. The motion was made to approve the parent's request (first by Shelton, second by Farrell – Committee unanimously approved request).

C. Colloquiums and Class Schedules (Jreij)

- i. Ms. Jreij presented a request that the Juniors and Seniors have experienced scheduling conflicts with respect to their normal curriculum schedules and those of the scheduled Colloquiums. Both groups of students would like to attend scheduled colloquiums but are unable to due to the scheduling conflicts. The request was that, to the extent possible, BCOE departments try to avoid scheduling classes at times that conflict with department seminars. Shelton and Ravishankar pointed out that the requirement for attendance is for graduate students and not undergraduates. Mulchandani shared with committee that CEE courses are scheduled around CEE Colloquiums to allow their students to attend them.
- ii. The committee was supportive of the request. Per the committee, this concern will be presented to the Department Chairs and will be discussed with BCOE course scheduling staff (T. McGraw) to look into future scheduling plans.

D. Comprehensive Review Admissions Criteria

- Mindy Marks, Asst. Professor, Economics and representative for the Undergraduate Admissions Committee arrived at 3:23 p.m. to provide insight and entertain discussions with the committee regarding the subject matter.
- ii. Information she presented:
 - 1. Current writing score is 2400
 - 2. The (UA) committee did not use Z-formula
 - 3. Committee is no longer allowed to use SAT scores subject exams
 - 4. In 2012, student needs to be in top 9% instead of top 12% to be considered for admission.
 - 5. Colleges can request to have caveat of having a subject test or have additional review of criteria for example, if BCOE wants to review each application then it would be okay instead of just leaving it to campus for review.
 - a. Per Abbaschian the biggest challenge BCOE will have is to see what additional criteria BCOE will use.
 - b. Per Ravishankar
 - i. Academic Index Score we do not look at applications.

- ii. There is a core criteria and a computed score and the admit status is based on that score.
- iii. In 2012 the admit criteria is different and each campus has been asked to review this criteria.
- iv. UCR has come up with a new scoring system (see handout provided at meeting) – the new system is more heavily academically weighted.
- 6. The committee discussed the proposed new UCR criteria. The proposed criteria were not clearly defined. Shelton and Farrell agreed to prepare a response asking for clarification.

E. CEP review scheduling with ABET (Ravishankar)

- i. Ravi discussed the ABET/CEP review with Jose Wudka for
 - 1. Suggested that the two reviews be collapsed into one but process needs to be looked into.
 - 2. Have reviews be in the same year so this can be done in coordinated fashion.
 - 3. Convert the review to every six (6) years.
 - 4. Ravishankar to submit this proposal before the end of the year.

5. Adjournment – 4:15 p.m.