To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Council report describes the discussions and actions taken in 11 meetings held from September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014.

Each Executive Council meeting included a report from Chair Jose Wudka on issues reviewed at Academic Council meetings, the Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings, and other critical issues raised by the faculty or the administration. Chair Wudka also gave regular updates on the various subcommittees on which he serves in his capacity as the Chair of the Senate.

At its first meeting of the year, Executive Council approved its Conflict of Interest statement and noted as “Received” the Conflict of Interest Statements from all Senate Standing Committees.

Issues considered and/or actions taken by the Executive Council include the following:

**Bylaw/Regulation Submissions:**

**Bylaw 8.9 - Merging of the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communications with the Committee on Academic Computing & Information Technology:** A proposed revision to bylaw 8.9 was received by Executive Council, with a request that Executive Council approve the action in lieu of the Division. Justification for the revision included agreement that within the separate committees is a wide area of overlap in all technology-assisted instructional matters, neither are overly busy committees, and the proposed new structure will improve the efficiency of both groups (now combined) without imposing unreasonable burdens on their members. In order to allow the Committee on Committees to appoint members effective immediately, a motion was made to approve bylaw 8.9 in lieu of submitting for approval at the next Division meeting (which was longer than 30 days away). After discussion, the motion passed with 17 voting yes (one by mail), none voting against and no abstentions. Executive Council encouraged the newly formulated committee to review these bylaws and change the committee name to something more reflective of its duties. The Division was updated at its meeting on November 26, 2013.

**Bylaw HS2.8.3 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences:** The proposal will allow students in the minor, to take one or two courses in the major as long as the courses are not applied to the major itself. The college suggested the change due to the large number of interdisciplinary students within CHASS. Executive Council received the bylaw proposal and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

**Bylaw 8.12.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Educational Policy:** CEP proposed a change which would not require membership from a representative of each of the professional schools. The proposal was initiated because of the unavailability of faculty from some schools and colleges due to the small population of its eligible senate members. The members of Executive Council suggested alternative language to CEP and the proposal was ultimately forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.
Bylaw SOBA4.2 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the School of Business Administration: SOBA Faculty Chair Barry Mishra offered that the proposed changes were intended to allow flexibility for the school. There was also general discussion of the role of the Dean or other senior administrative officers within sub-committees of the Executive Committee of a college (or Division or School). Chair Mishra advised that the SOBA Executive Committee will be reviewing the originally proposed revisions and asked that the bylaw proposal not be forwarded to the Division at this time. The bylaw was subsequently resubmitted and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.1.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Riverside Division: Executive Council discussed the proposal to revise Division Bylaw 8.1.1 so that Senate members holding administrative positions higher than department chair may not serve as chairs of divisional committees or serve as divisional representatives on systemwide committees. There was considerable discussion about what constitutes an administrative position and the lack of clarity in the proposal. The proposal was rescinded and Executive Council was advised that the proposal would be revised and re-submitted at a later date.

Bylaw 8.4.12 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Graduate Council: Members of the Executive Council suggested that CCGA does more than what is listed in the bylaw and that the Graduate Council actually sets policy rather than advises the Graduate Division. After discussion of the proposed revision, Lynda Bell, Chair of Graduate Council asked that the proposal be rescinded to allow additional discussion within the Graduate Council committee. The bylaw change was subsequently forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw ME – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the School of Medicine: There were a series of changes proposed by the School of Medicine, the most significant of them being a clarification of the School’s policy to allow advisory votes for non-senate faculty in as many areas as possible. After discussion, the Executive Council had nominal grammatical suggestions. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.18 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Planning and Budget: The Committee on Planning and Budget submitted a bylaw change which broadens the perspective of the members by allowing participation of junior faculty and increases the likelihood of participation by the smaller departments, schools and colleges who may not have enough tenured faculty to accommodate all Senate committees. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.4.4 and 8.4.5 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Academic Personnel: CAP revised its bylaws to formalize the practice of using Shadow CAP. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.15.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on International Education: The Committee on International Education submitted a bylaw revision to reflect the change to the name of the International Student Resource Center and to clarify the role of administrative representatives and non-voting ex officio members. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.
Regulation 6.12.1 – Proposal to Change Riverside Regulation 6.12: The Committee on Educational Policy submitted a regulation change proposal and offered that a timetable for the full implementation of changes in graduation requirements (general university requirements, college breadth requirements, and major requirements) is currently specified in R6.12. However, changes to prerequisites for courses, majors, or any curricular change not involving graduation requirements, are not covered by existing legislation. Proposed R6.12.1 establishes a default implementation date for such changes. Exceptions to this default may be granted presuming an alternative is specified and approved as part of the change to the prerequisite requirement. According to current regulations, a proposal for changes to prerequisites for courses, majors, or any curricular change not involving graduation requirements could be implemented before students had any time to make adjustments to prepare for the change. More importantly, this stepped up implementation could be inadvertent; it might be the result of an oversight, involving the failure to specify the implementation timetable in writing. This may create a serious and unintended hardship for the students affected. The regulation proposal was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Discussion of a suggestion to change the CAP Bylaws: There was considerable discussion of a submission suggesting the bylaws of CAP be modified to allow Associate Professors to serve on the committee. The proposal introduced several factors and justifications, among them suggesting that women and minorities are not well represented on CAP due to the restrictive bylaw. Several Senate committees reviewed the proposal and while many were sympathetic to the argument, most did not give support. Of considerable concern was the contradiction between the proposal and Senate Bylaw 55, which does not allow Associate Professors a voting right on Full Professor files unless delegated by the department. Executive Council unanimously agreed that per policy, the faculty who submitted the proposal should receive the committee responses along with the comments of Council, including the advisement that continued official review of the proposal will require the document to be submitted in the standardized bylaw review format.

Systemwide Review Submissions: In each case below, Executive Council reviewed the responses from applicable Senate committees tasked with reviewing the proposal and providing input. Executive Council discussion is intended to assist the Division Chair in drafting responses on behalf of the Riverside Division.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to the UC Policy on Supplemental to Military Pay: There was little discussion by Executive Council due to its general agreement with continuation of the policy which provides salary supplements to UC faculty and staff serving on active military duty. There was, however, one point concerning personnel whose salary, fully or partially, is covered by an extramural source that the members of Executive Council felt should be addressed in our campus response. In this case, Executive Council suggests the policy should clarify that the supplementary salary will be provided by the campus. In addition there were two questions that merited clarification: 1) wherefore came the time limit of 2 years on the supplementary salary, and 2) the rationale for including a limiting date of June 30, 2018. Neither of these limitations has an obvious justification, and may be interpreted as a lack of full support for the affected personnel.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to the Compendium: There was prolonged discussion and serious concerns about some of the proposed changes to the Compendium, and general dissatisfaction with the manner in which the proposed changes were presented. In
particular, Executive Council urged for any future revisions to be accompanied by a concise justification. The main concerns related to the proposed revisions to the MRU policies and the new MRP policy:

The contents of the request for proposals for multi-campus research programs (section V.C) is solely the job of the VPRGS, with no Senate consultation at any level required; in fact no consultation at all is apparently required. Given the controversies that have surrounded the VPRGS office in the past this does not seem prudent.

The requirements on the VPRGS in consulting with the divisions when determining the overall research goals are weak in the extreme (section V.C.1). Though in the past the VPRGS convened an advisory group (the Portfolio Review Group - PRG), there is no requirement for him/her to do so in the future; even the PRG is only mentioned in a footnote (presumably as an example of a mechanism the VPGRS might use to elicit input), and its role is qualified as only 'likely to have an effect'. This lack of specificity can lead to the disenfranchisement of one or more of the divisions depending on the whims of the VPRGS, or for the consultation with the Senate to devolve into a pro-forma exchange.

UCORP is (appropriately) singled out as the lead committee in most MRU/MRP actions, but there is no explicit requirement that this Committee elicit input from Council. And while this might be implicit, a specific requirement to this effect would be useful, providing an alternative avenue for the divisions to provide input.

It is doubtful that a blanket sunset policy is either sensible or wise.

In addition, there was general confusion about the interrelation between the MRU, MRP and MRPI programs, as well as their differences; Executive Council suggests that a comparison table be included to clarify these issues.

**Systemwide Review of the Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55:** Committee responses indicated no consensus on whether to support or oppose the proposal. This was partly because of ambiguities in the documentation provided, and partly because of genuine differences of opinion within senate committees. Several committee responses included concerns that the proposal violates the spirit of the Regents' standing order 105.2 and of ruling 5.67 of UCR&J. Other committees were skeptical about the possibility of rescinding the voting rights once granted: Council agreed and discussed that while this might be technically possible, it would be very difficult in departments with a large number of non-Senate faculty (NSF) members. It was also discussed that while some departments might opt to extend voting rights to their NSF, others might not, leading to inequalities across the school and increased tensions within the latter departments. It was also pointed out that NSF are employed under a renewable contract and do not receive tenure. Because of this there might be circumstances where they feel pressured to vote in a particular way. In addition, the potential regular fluctuation in the NSF body would require a continuous education effort to ensure consistency in the voting criteria.

Though the proposal is directed towards NSF in the school of Health Sciences, committee members and Council members noted that if the proposal were to be adopted other non-senate groups may demand to be included, and there would be no compelling reason to deny such a request. On the other hand, it was pointed out that the adoption of bylaw 55.E would allow the affected departments to adopt a more inclusive policy that would foster the participation of NSF in departmental matters, leading to increased cohesion and collegiality. Other members opined
that the effect can be restricted to our School of Medicine and did not believe that peer pressure within departments would prevent Senate faculty from rescinding the voting rights of NSF.

During the discussion several members voiced the opinion that there are various modifications to the policy that may be easier to adopt. One example would be to extend NSF voting rights, but only for NSF personnel actions. There was, however, general consensus that Senate faculty should not be excluded from voting in NSF personnel actions.

A main concern was the possibility that adopting this proposal will lead to different standards for the merit and promotion of faculty among departments within the campus, and for equivalent departments between sister campus, and that this will have a negative impact not only on the departments themselves, but on the system as a whole. Several council members noted that their departments have for a long time included votes from NSF members (included as 'advisory' in the department's letter) and this has led to no negative effects.

Council members suggested that the campus response include the request that the proposal be amended by:

- Including the specific list of NSF titles covered
- Changing the measure of NSF participation from 'effort' to a general measure ('effort' does not apply to all categories covered by the proposal)
- Allowing divisions to include restrictions on e-mail voting (or including such restrictions in the bylaw itself): in some disciplines NSF may have minimal contact with the campus so that unrestricted e-mail voting can easily degenerate into a pro-forma process
- Stating whether divisions will be allowed to impose specific restrictions on the scope of NSF Votes

Ultimately Council supported version 2 of the proposal with a vote of +11-5-2.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition: The Executive Committee reviewed the draft policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) and echoed the concerns raised by several of the reviewing committees. The greatest concern raised by Graduate Council and Planning and Budget was the lack of coordination between the supplemental tuition and self-supporting program policies, and the limited discussion of the implications these policies will have on the structure of the University of California. Executive Council suggested the division respond with a strong recommendation for a thorough joint discussion of supplemental tuition and self-supporting programs, especially of mechanisms to ensure that the core mission of the institution will not be damaged by the adoption of the recent policy proposals. Council is very concerned about the UC giving its imprimatur to exclusive programs that may erode the commitments to the UC to academic excellence and availability of education. Other suggestions include adding to the policy the requirement that the Senate be consulted at those times where faculty consultation is elicited; including an expectation that the programs soliciting PDST should maintain the level of academic excellence expected from the University of California. Concerns included the onerous nature of the procedures described in the draft policy and the suggestion that this policy could lead to a lack of uniformity within the UC system, leading to formally equivalent, but de facto tiered set of programs.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 025, 670 and 671: Executive Council discussed the proposed APM changes and supports the recommendations made by the reviewing committees. Specifically, the School of Medicine suggested that the discussion
surrounding the $40,000 earning threshold be clarified. On pg. 4 of the introductory material the fourth bullet point refers the 'first' $40,000 earned, and it is unclear whether this refers also to the $40,000 on bullet point 2, or to subsequent earnings. In addition, the Committee on Research suggests that further details be provided on how APM025 affects employees in the Professional Research series. Similar clarifications are needed for students working under an SBIR (small business innovation research) and STTR (small business technology transfer) grants.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 190, Appendix A: All committees reviewing the proposal indicated support which was echoed by Executive Council.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 510 and Sections Within the 600 Series: Several committees of the Riverside Division opined on the proposed changes to the various section of the APM under consideration. The following is a summary of the recommendations and concerns discussed at Executive Council:

- **APM 510:** Section 16.d merited a clarification as to which campus covers the sabbatical leave for cases where a faculty member takes leave at another UC campus. In section 18 step c is unnecessary and conflicts with step g
- **APM 650:** there was concern that the restriction on the pay levels for technical assistants would decrease the competitiveness of the campus
- **APM 661:** it was determined that the campus response should include a suggestion that the calculation in section 16.b be maintained using 1/11th of the yearly salary instead of 1/12th as the first more accurately reflects the monthly salary. In addition the language under “Health Sciences Compensation Plan” was unclear and incomplete as there are other paths for earning additional salary.
- **APM 662:** Section 8 should address teaching by emeriti. In Section 16.b there was no reason to forbid compensation for faculty who volunteer to teach extra courses, but to allow it if they are requested to do so. In section 17.i it was unclear why the podium hours are used instead of credit hours
- **APM 666:** there was concern that the 10% cap might cause inequities due to difference in salaries of the affected faculty. The proposed language would restrict issuing honoraria to undergraduate program reviewers in the home campus, which is not an issue at UCR, but might be so at other campuses. In addition (sect. 24.b) the requirement that the chancellor notify the campus may present an unwarranted burden. Finally, there was a concern that faculty may put receiving honoraria as a condition for visiting other UC campuses

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 035. Appendices A-1 & A-2: The committees of the Riverside Division which reviewed the proposed changes to APM-035 were generally supportive of the revision. There were, however, serious concerns about the use of vague and imprecise language that required clarification. Executive Council discussed the committee recommendations and supported a campus response which listed the specific recommendations of each committee.

**Miscellaneous Review Items:**

**Review of Changes to UCR’s Implementation of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan:**
In fall 2011, UCR’s School of Medicine received conditional approval to implement the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. The provision was that the plan be modified to bring it to compliance with the newly revised APM 670. The HSC Plan and Committee responses were
received and discussed by the Executive Council for forwarding to David Bocian, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

**Review of the Proposed Campus Student Absence Statement:** Executive Council supported the statement submitted by Dan Jeske, NCAA Faculty Representative and the effort to have the statement included in the faculty handbook. Executive Council understood that revision to the faculty handbook was an issue for Office of the President and advised Chair Wudka to work with the EVCP to develop a local annual reminder. EVCP Rabenstein agreed to issue a joint senate/administrative memo each fall, encouraging all faculty to take into consideration the suggestion below when dealing with student absences: *Students’ attendance at University classes is always expected. It is recognized that students’ absences may result from external circumstances, as well as from activities that are important to a student's overall educational experience and are consistent with the University’s mission to serve students. Some of these activities are also beneficial for the campus culture and image. Faculty are encouraged to be cognizant of these principles when articulating their procedures for handling absences in their course policies.*

**Review of Proposed Changes to the Admission by Exception Policy:** Executive Council reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to the Admission by Exception (AxE) policy and the opinions submitted from the committees of Educational Policy, International Education, Preparatory Education and Rules & Jurisdiction. Some of the suggestions provided by these reviewers were already included in the version Council reviewed. The main concern of Council was the exclusion of a standing member from the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE) from the Special Review Committee (SRC). After some discussion Council suggested the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions further modify the policy to include a representative from the College of Engineering. The Proposal was noted as received by Executive Council and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

**Review of Changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy:** Several standing committees of the Division reviewed the off-scale policy and the proposed changes. While there was overwhelming agreement that the policy itself should be reconsidered, the general consensus was that the changes proposed by the administration were in the best interest of the faculty and should be implemented immediately. On advice from Executive Council, Chair Wudka will inform the VPAP and the EVCP that the representatives of the Division would like to engage in a full discussion and review of the campus off-scale policy.

**Discussion of Photo Roster Availability:** Executive Council discussed the proposal to remove restrictions on the availability of photo rosters. The council recognized the usefulness of this change and, though it also understood the concerns that led to the current restrictions, did not find that these represent a compelling reason to continue limiting access to the roster. The Council then voted unanimously to remove all restrictions on the availability of photo rosters.

**Review of Proposal to Establish Two Summer Session Oversight Committees:** Several committees reviewed and supported the proposal, however there was concern that the new structure did not allow for an over-arching member who will serve continuously on both committees. Several committees felt that this lack of overlap may potentially diminish the senate position in summer session decisions and leaves each committee vulnerable to disconnect between the administrative and academic discussions. Vice Chair Hughes confirmed that as the sole senate representative in the current structure she has experienced a process that is not vigorous or effective. Graduate Council too is concerned with the lack of
Senate oversight in the current model and hopes that the proposal may help address that deficiency. After considerable discussion, Council suggest two changes to the proposal, 1) the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education be added as an ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee and 2) to insure regular meetings of both committees, perhaps even set a minimum number of meetings (once a quarter).

**Review of the Draft UCR Libraries Strategic Plan:** While most committees who reviewed the document were impressed with the ambition of the plan, there was significant concern expressed about the lack of articulation of plan implementation. In addition, there was general concern from several committees about the lack of clarification of future maintenance or growth of a physical, print collection. The CHASS Executive Committee and Faculty Welfare in particular were concerned that the plan did not include any discussion of either maintaining or improving the current print collection. Faculty Chair Edwards spoke at length of the need for its faculty to have access to print material such as images, musical scores and other print based research material which is not digitized and/or which is costly. CHASS therefore is significantly concerned about the library seeming to phase out its print collection and suggests a disconnect in understanding exists between the library and the teaching and research activities of CHASS faculty and the importance of print material on the CHASS merit/promotion process. Executive Council agreed that the strategic plan process should move forward only with significant faculty (and student) input and collaboration. To that end, the Senate’s Committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication was tasked with forming an ad hoc subcommittee that will advise the University Librarian thorough the implementation of the strategic plan for the UCR Libraries. This subcommittee will include representation from the Graduate Council, Committee on Research, Committee on Educational Policy and the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences; it should provide regular reports to the LIT&SC Committee for the committee chair to present at Executive Council and, when pertinent, to provide recommendations for Senate action.

**Review of the Online License Agreement:** Council reviewed and discussed the online agreement and suggested minor revisions. Specifically that inclusion of an introductory paragraph would be helpful. Chair Wudka will work with campus counsel to finalize the document.

**Review of the Priority Enrollment Policy Proposed by the Committee on Educational Policy:** Executive Council discussed the proposal submitted by CEP to introduce a policy of undergraduate priority enrollment. The policy will be used to identify which body has final authority in deciding who gets priority enrollment (CEP); will establish the criterion by which CEP will make its determination; and, describes the procedure that interested parties will use to request priority enrollment. Absent of this policy there is no written documentation used by the campus to address these issues. It was clarified that this policy is not intended to address issues such as priority enrollment for certain courses for majors. The policy was forwarded to the Division for approval at its next meeting.

**Discussion of Implementing an R’Course Program at UCR:** The Committee on Educational Policy received and approved a proposal from the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education to initiate an undergraduate student-led course program. The program is intended to provide undergraduate students with an opportunity to teach classes to their peers on a topic that they have some familiarity with. Usually this is linked to some type of experience they had (e.g., summer intern), and it is on a topic not covered in our regular offerings. Since it is student driven, the cycle to develop, review and deliver the course must be shorter than for regular courses, which represents a challenge to insure adequate Senate oversight with a contracted
cycle - typically one academic year. Per the program process, the solicitation to offer the opportunity to teach a course will be distributed in early fall with a deadline later in the quarter. Students who are selected to teach will spend the winter quarter training and the class itself will be conducted in the spring.

Chair Wudka and CEP Chair Beyermann explained that the Berkeley campus has been offering student led courses since 1965 and now offers 190 of these courses each semester. Chair Beyermann further explained that the Committee on Educational Policy worked closed with the Office of Undergraduate Education to revise the initial proposal so that students were tied to a faculty member, and the course is more like a general topics course (where the Senate approves a template and the specific content can change depending on who teaches it without additional Senate involvement). To streamline the process, the review is conducted by a Governing Board, which includes Senate representation.

After considerable discussion Executive Council supported the R’Course program but asked that the Committee on Educational Policy revise the policy so that there is codification of the number of units each course can have and the total number of units of this type of course each student can accrue during their undergraduate term at UCR. Executive Council also suggested that there be a GPA requirement for the students who apply to teach a course, that duties of the instructor of record be clearly delineated, and that there be an annual report submitted to the Committee on Courses. Chair Beyermann will bring a revised proposal to Executive Council for later consideration.

Proposal to Establish a Master’s of Public Policy Degree Program at UCR: The Proposal to establish a Master’s of Public Policy was reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council and the Committee on Planning and Budget. The Executive Council expressed enthusiasm for the degree and discussed its significance for the campus. The proposal was presented to the Division for a vote at a Special Meeting on November 4, 2013.

Request to use working titles for the Lecturer with (Potential) for Security of Employment Series: Council appreciated and supported the need to adopt a working title as it would indeed clarify the role, responsibilities and ranking of this type of lecturer. Several reviewing committees indicated that the proposed working title might be confused with the existing title of “Distinguished Teaching Professor” awarded by the UCR Academy of Distinguished Teachers. Because of this Council suggests instead that the title of “Professor of Instruction” be adopted instead.

Proposals for Department Name Changes:

Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies: Executive Council reviewed the name change request and noted that the new name seemed grammatically awkward but otherwise the proposal was sound. Per the campus procedure for name change for an Academic Department, the name change proposal was forwarded to the Division for approval.

Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Digital Production: After considerable discussion the Executive Council expressed concerns about the lack of documentation which may have demonstrated consultation with other departments (Creative Writing, Art, Media and Cultural Studies and Computer Science) and the results of such consultations. Some in the committee suggested “bouncing back” the proposal to the CHASS Executive Committee requesting this additional information. However, per campus name change procedures, approval (or disapproval) by Executive
Council is not required; nonetheless a plurality of members did want to have more information from the CHASS Executive Committee. It was determined that the concerns of Executive Council would be forwarded to the CHASS Executive Committee, who would then determine if they wanted the item forwarded to the Division for approval or they wanted to reconsider the proposal. The CHASS Executive Committee asked that the item be forwarded to the Division as submitted. The request was included in the May 2014 Division Agenda.

**Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering:** Several of the committees who reviewed the proposed name change commented that the name change may cause confusion for students given the already existing department of Computer Science and Engineering. Executive Council agreed that the BCOE Executive Committee will be advised of the concerns discussed at Executive Council and offer that the same questions may come up during Division review. Per the campus procedure for name change for an Academic Department, the name change proposal will be forwarded to the Division for approval.
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