

College of Engineering Executive Committee

April 30, 2010 MINUTES

Bourns Hall A171, 12:00pm

Attending:

Reza Abbaschian  
Jay Farrell  
Bahman Anvari  
Gianfranco Ciardo  
Chinya Ravishankar  
Ashok Mulchandani  
Albert Wang  
Cengiz Ozkan  
Marco Princevac

Also Attending:

Rod Smith  
Nikki Measor

Absent:

Robert Bonderer  
Mark Matsumoto

1. Call to Order
2. Approvals:
  - a. The minutes from the April 2, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved.
3. Announcements
  - a. Dean: Reza Abbaschian
    - i. Campus is asking the College to do Academic Planning as a result of the Strategic Plan. Abbaschian is requesting that any recommendation or suggestions for programs occurring over the next five years be forwarded to him. Programs that may require additional faculty or resources should also be noted. Some examples may include: ENGR 180, foundational engineering coursework or retention initiatives. Suggestions need to be made by mid-May.
    - ii. Abbaschian also noted that Retention is an important problem that needs to be addressed. Two-thirds of our freshmen and sophomores leave the College of Engineering.
  - b. Associate Dean: Chinya Ravishankar
    - i. Ravishankar shared the current status of the number of students that have completed their Student Intent to Register (SIR) Form. The number of SIRs for BCOE has increased 40% since last year, while CNAS and CHASS have decreased, two and nine percent respectively. Ravishankar indicated that 795 students had SIRed to BCOE and by the time of the deadline on May 1, he projected that 850 students will have SIRed. He noted that BCOE had well exceeded the 600 person quota.
      1. There was concern expressed regarding how the campus would fund the students over the target enrollment number of 3850. UCOP says that they

will not fund students over the quota. There is a need for better Enrollment Management and Enforcement.

2. Ravishankar noted that BCOE hopes to raise the quality of students admitted, increasing the ASI cut-off. However, Abbaschian noted that there is not a strong correlation between ASI and student performance/GPA. In addition, for 2012, the SATII scores will no longer be required.
3. Ravishankar noted that although analysis still needs to be done, retention seems to be better this year.

c. Chair

- i. No report.

4. New/Continued Business

a. iGrade System with ABET evaluations (Marco Princevac)

- i. ME ABET Coordinator, Marco Princevac, presented a proposal requesting that instructor course assessments be integrated into the iGrade system as a way to streamline assessment. Because instructor course assessment is required for ABET accreditation, if a course assessment is not completed, the ABET Coordinator must follow-up with the instructor until the assessment is complete. Proposed is, once an instructor submits grades, there would be an additional link or pop-up page that prompts the instructor to complete an assessment. This would facilitate a timely submission of assessment and would hopefully encourage more faculty to submit assessments. Once submitted, forms would be stored as a PDF and would be available for download by departments.
- ii. Bracken Daly, David Ferris and Chuck Rowley are supportive of the proposal
- iii. Sample assessment form included.
- iv. Discussion:
  1. Farrell suggested that the form include text that states "This will be included in ABET form"
  2. Ravishankar suggested that this could be a helpful too in that faculty who teach a new course would be able to see what other faculty did previously.
  3. It was suggested that each course or department may require a different form and that departments will need to give feedback what would need to be included on the form.
- v. There was universal support for the proposal and it was recommended that the form not be compulsory. Ravishankar will schedule a meeting to bring the ABET coordinators together to proceed.

b. General Education Alternative Concentrations: Regulation 6.4—Campus Graduation Requirements (need response by April 30, 2010) (Chinya Ravishankar)

- i. Ravishankar provided an update on the new Breadth concentrations. The campus has a desire to increase the Breadth concentrations offered. CNAS is proposing a change to delete Regulation 6.4: Campus Graduation Requirements on the basis that UCR Division Bylaws 9 and 10 indicate CNAS Faculty had not approved the change. However, Ravishankar noted that Bylaws 9 and 10 indicate that curricular changes just need to be submitted for consideration by the faculty and that the Division or Assembly may impose specific duties on the faculty. CNAS's proposed changes should not impact BCOE. Ravishankar will submit a response regarding CNAS's proposal.

- c. Commission on the Future Recommendations (need response by May 7, 2010) (Anvari, Mulchandani, Wang)
- i. Anvari, Mulchandani and Wang presented on six recommendations regarding access and accessibility to the University of California. The working group assessed the impact on access quality and fiscal challenges.
1. Recommendation 1: It proposed that the UC reaffirm its commitment to CA residents, by continuing to admit 12% of California high school graduates, reaffirming that transfer will be accommodated within UC and that priority for transfers should be given to students coming from the California Community College system.
    - a. Rationale: This recommendation aligns with the UC Master Plan.
    - b. The Executive Committee supports this recommendation. The Committee noted that reduced funding from the state poses challenges to this recommendation.
  2. Recommendation 2: It is proposed that UC reaffirm that it is financially accessible to all students. As a result, the UC needs to find ways to be able to fund the total cost of attendance. A greater emphasis needs to be put on providing aid based on financial need as opposed to scholastic achievement.
    - a. The Executive Committee generally supports the need for financial accessibility; however, does not support the elimination of merit-based scholarships. Elimination of cutback of merit based scholarships would negatively impact the overall quality of students. The Committee was adamant that a focus on need-based aid should not impact the over quality of students.
  3. Recommendation 3: It is proposed the UC continue the growth of graduate student body. The rationale for this recommendation was that the ratio of undergraduate students to graduate students is high. However, there are several challenges to this recommendation. It was noted that graduate student stipends are not competitive and that the cost of education may be deterring students from attending. Additionally, it may be more cost-effective to hire post-doctoral candidates. Further, some graduate programs are not aligned with state needs and while some programs may be less costly, they may not help with the economy of the state. (Reference to eliminated programs on page 63.)
    - a. The Executive Committee agreed with this recommendation to grow the graduate student population. However, they did note that the cost for NRT is high.
  4. Recommendation 4: It is proposed that UC reestablish financial accessibility for California HS graduates that are undocumented immigrants. The financial impact of this recommendation would be about thirty dollars per recipient in order to provide \$4 million for undocumented immigrants. However, as a result the implication may be that 400 legal residents will not get aid.
    - a. Ravishankar noted that the law indicates that if an undocumented immigrant graduates from a California high school, the student is granted instate tuition. He argued that this already is a large subsidy.

- b. The Executive Committee did not support this recommendation. The recommendation addresses a political issue rather, which may be at odds with the other recommendations. The Committee had concerns about how this recommendation would impact legal residents. There were also several questions about how financial need is assessed for undocumented immigrants or whether this recommendation aligns with the general UC interest.
- 5. Recommendation 5: It was proposed that the UC adopt a new multiyear fee schedule for undergraduate students that would take into consideration time to degree. This would ideally prevent any major hike to students. For student graduating in over four years, a fee increase would be implemented. The new model would consider a moderate fixed rate and inflation.
  - a. The Executive Committee debated the pros and cons of the current system versus the proposed multi-year schedule. There was a general concern about amount of fee increases and whether they were/are too great for students. Additionally, it seemed unfair to some to raise fees in the middle of a student's curriculum when they enter with an understanding that the cost would be a certain amount. At the same time, if a fee increase is needed, it is unfair to have entering cohorts bear the brunt of the fee increase. It seemed that fees would be raised either every two year or every four year. There was also concern that there could be inequities between freshman and senior fee schedules. The Committee expressed that there seemed to be trade-offs with either model. They recommended that there be an option to increase fees for emergency situations despite the student contract and there be a cap on the amount of increase for fees.
  - b. The Committee noted that the inability to guarantee state funding often impacts our projections and while it is undesirable to raise fees, changes in actual state funding relative to the estimates make fee increases inevitable.
- 6. Recommendation 6: It is proposed that the UC change the name from fees to tuition
  - a. The Executive Committee supposed this recommendation. The general sentiment was this it would better represent the charges to the student.
- d. Compendium: University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units (need response by May 14, 2010) (Ciardo, Ozkan)
  - i. Ciardo and Ozkan reviewed the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Program, Academic Units and Research Units and reported that the first section of the document serves as a manual on how to establish new programs while the second section focuses on the five-year plan for each campus in the UC system. There is a desire to implement stricter, more defined rules in each of these areas and that the Compendium should be followed. For new programs, it was recommended that a joint sub-committee be established to review the program and the joint sub-committee work with both the Administration and the Senate. New

programs should also appear on the five year prospectus. When programs are proposed, viability needs to be addressed before moving forward. On the five-year prospectus, there is a desire to have locale senates/committees have more oversight. The local entities would report to UCOP and should be transparent. There was no discussion of ORA in compendium.

- ii. The Executive Committee expressed no concerns in regard to the Compendium.
  - e. Regulation changes (status update) (Jay Farrell)
    - i. Farrell reported that he presented the Regulation changes to UCR ExComm. They were voted on and approved.
  - f. Bylaw change (status update) (Jay Farrell)
    - i. Farrell met with Rules and Jurisdiction and found that if BCOE approves the regulation change, it will be forwarded on to Rules and Jurisdiction. If there is a violation of UCR policy, they will be told so. Farrell recommended that they bring the change forward for a vote soon in that they may not have another opportunity to put it on another agenda. There was a recommendation to try to do an electronic vote. Farrell will talk to Eileen about the process of doing an electronic vote and to confirm that quorum for an electronic vote is a majority of voters.
  - g. Writing Across the Curriculum (status update) (Chinya Ravishankar)
    - i. There were no updates. The Campus had requested that the Executive Committee make recommendations on Writing Across the Curriculum. Ravishankar and Farrell submitted recommendations based on previous discussion to the Campus.
  - h. BCOE Breadth Concentration (status update) (Chinya Ravishankar)
    - i. BCOE had submitted a concentration asking for an exception for the UCR Ethnicity requirement on the basis that the Breadth concentration provides a global perspective. However, it is UCR policy that the Ethnicity be fulfilled with an American ethnicity course.
  - i. CEP review scheduling with ABET (status update) (Chinya Ravishankar)
    - i. No discussion.
  - j. CS Program updates to the BS/S program
    - i. CS submitted program changes for the BS/MS program. The program needs to be approved and to the Graduate Committee by May 17. Farrell proposed that in order to give members time to review the documents, the Committee should do an Electronic Vote. The Committee was in favor of the electronic vote and Farrell will send out the proposals via email.
5. Adjournment
- a. The meeting was adjourned at 1:42pm.