The Executive Committee of the HSSoE (ExCom) was invigorated during the 2018-20 academic years. The committee concerned itself with representing the school’s faculty in all aspects of faculty governance and academic administration. The ExCom made significant changes in its operations and mode of engagement with various entities, including the Senate leadership and School and Campus Administration. The ExCom’s main accomplishments were bringing transparency, demanding accountability, and positioning itself as a committee of the Faculty for the Faculty. During the past two years, the ExCom took on topics such as revising the HSSoE Bylaws on Standing Committee meeting and voting rules, advising School administration on resource allocation decisions, engaging with the campus Administration and the Senate leadership on the selection of the Interim Dean and the Dean search committee membership. The committee addressed ongoing issues related to faculty housing and graduate/undergraduate education. The following sections are prepared to summarize the working of the ExCom in the past two years. References are provided to the ExCom meeting minutes, all of which are presented in Appendix A. Where confidentiality could have been compromised, documents are directly sent to the Senate leadership.

### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Faculty on Campus Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Russ Detwiler</td>
<td>Nader Bagherzadeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feng Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Faculty on Senate Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Tim Rupert</td>
<td>Jean-Daniel Saphores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyroz</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Zoran Nenadic</td>
<td>Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>Elliot Hui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Filippo Capolino</td>
<td>Russell Detwiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Payam Heydari</td>
<td>Rainer Doemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Gregory Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Washington</td>
<td>Gregory Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings

The ExCom decided to have scheduled monthly meetings (Ref: ExCom meeting minutes of 1/17/18) set for the third Wednesday of each month to minimize conflict with other departmental and campus committee meetings. Except for the first couple of meetings, the meeting time was scheduled for 1:00 to 3:00 PM.

The ExCom decided to reorganize the quarterly Faculty meetings (Ref: ExCom meeting minutes of 1/17/2018) to occur during the 7th week of each quarter to facilitate HSSoE Faculty participation and to ensure meaningful preparation for elections could be carried out according to HSSoE Bylaws. The ExCom also decided that Standing Committee Chairs should report about accomplishments and progress, issues, and opportunities of their respective committees. Further, the ExCom decided the Faculty meetings should be focused on addressing School issues and challenges through frank communication between the Faculty members. It was recommended that the Dean’s presentation focus only on critical issues (i.e., challenges, opportunities, and accomplishments) and leave ample time for Q&A. Therefore, the ExCom desired a smaller staff presence during Faculty meetings with only key staff to be invited when especially needed for those presenting. Finally, the committee decided the Faculty meetings ought to have a theme that is aligned with one of the Standing Committees; Undergraduate Studies in Fall, Research in Winter, and Graduate Studies in Spring.

Description of The ExCom’s Role in HSSoE

According to HSSoE Bylaws, the ExCom shall represent the Faculty in all aspects of the government and academic administration of the School of Engineering, authorize the Dean, at the Committee’s discretion, to administer Divisional and Senate regulations, and appoint all committees of the Faculty not otherwise provided for. Upholding these cannons of shared governance gradually diminished in the past decade. To address this concern, the ExCom of 2017-18 academic year unanimously passed a resolution on 2/15/2018 expressing their concern stating: “We, the executive committee of the HSSoE, are very concerned about the continuous erosion of joint governance and the lack of substantive dialog between the administration of the HSSoE and HSSoE faculty. Furthermore, we believe that the current spending of limited resources without faculty input undermines the quality of research and teaching in the HSSoE.”

With the backdrop of the 2/15/2018 resolution and lack of meaningful participation of the ExCom in the shared governance of HSSoE, the ExCom of 2018-19 academic year decided to take a determined approach and actively engage with school administration to uphold measures of shared governance. This work continued into the workings of the ExCom in the 2019-20 academic year. An outline of actions taken by the ExCom in 2018-19 and 2019-2020 is presented in the next sections of this report. In its current state, the ExCom is a highly vibrant and successful committee that recognizes its mission and is poised to positively engage with the Administration to represent the HSSoE Faculty in all aspects of academic governance. The committee has the respect and trust of the HSSoE Faculty. One of the main achievements of the ExCom is encouraging and increasing transparency and accountability in the academic administration of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering.

Summary of Actions Conducted and Attempted

1. Faculty representation on Dean search committee,
   Several HSSoE Faculty approached the Chair, asking whether the ExCom was consulted in the selection of the Dean search committee, and voiced various concerns. Further
investigation showed that an error on Senate leadership has led to them not asking the HSSoE Executive Committee to submit nominations for the formation of the Dean search committee contrary to the ‘Guiding Principles and Best Practices for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Review Committees.’ To rectify the situation, the Interim Provost requested the ExCom to submit a list of nominees via the Senate Chair. The Interim Provost determines how many and who from that list is added to the current Dean search committee. The ExCom proposed: “The Chair of the Executive committee (ex Officio) will serve on the Dean search committee as the delegate from the HSSoE Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will host town halls with the visiting candidates and be asked to weight on their suitability as a Dean expressing the summary of the town hall meetings collectively.” The Interim Provost Office turned down this proposal. The ExCom made a second proposal to appoint Chair-Elect, Prof. Hamid Jafarkhani to serve on the Dean search committee, which was accepted by the Interim Provost (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 8/20/20).

2. Revising the Bylaws to Include Voting Procedures

The committee discussed the insufficiency of the bylaws to govern voting procedures. There have been violations and irregularities of traditional and approved voting procedures in the past few years. The committee discussed these issues and suggested the addition of two articles to the HSSoE Bylaws. These articles were put to the vote by the entire HSSoE Faculty (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes on 10/19/19, 11/20/19, 1/15/20, 4/15/20). The approved addition to the bylaws was communicated with the Senate leadership. After approval by the CRJ on 5/30/20, they are forwarded to the Senate Assembly for final approval. The text of the approved articles are:

“For each Standing Committee, a quorum consists of more than 50 percent of its voting members. A simple majority of the votes cast is needed for approval of motions made in each Standing Committee. Upon the request of any voting member of a Standing Committee, vote shall be taken by a secret and/or off-line ballot.”

“An observer (from the members of the HSSoE Faculty) may be assigned by a voting member of a Standing Committee to monitor and participate in the Standing Committee meetings in their absence. An observer shall convey the thoughts of the voting member in their absence, they shall not present an independent viewpoint during Standing Committee meetings. Such observers do not have voting privileges nor can make or second motions.”

3. HSSoE Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022

The Dean presented the HSSoE Faculty Allocation Strategy of 2018-2022. A subcommittee was formed to investigate the HSSoE faculty needs and advise the Dean and the Executive Committee about the proposed Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022. The members of the subcommittee included the Department Representatives to the ExCom, or the ExCom member substitute, with the Chair of the ExCom as a tiebreaker for voting purposes. The subcommittee met with the Dean’s representatives, and a document was formed to advise the Dean on Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022. This document was further polished and was submitted to the Provost Office. (Ref. meeting minutes of 1/16/19, 2/20/19, 4/17/19).

4. New TA/Reader Budget Allocation Model

The proposed and later implemented model weighs in departments’ research expenditures for allocation of TA/Reader support. According to the new model, funds will be distributed
with 80% weight on credit hours and 20% weight on research expenditures by the unit. The ExCom argued against the new model as TA/Reader funds directly affect the quality of education of the undergraduate students and should not be affected by measures other than student credit hours. The committee argued that allocating TA/Reader funds as a reward for research expenditure of productive faculty at the school-level are flawed because there is no reasonably practical mechanism to ask departments to distribute their TA/Reader budget to those productive faculty. The Dean decided to implement the new TA/Reader budget allocation model. (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes 1/16/19, 2/20/19, 4/17/19).

Discussion on the TA/Reader budget allocation model led to a related discussion on research productivity metrics. Associate Dean of Research and Innovation was invited to the ExCom meeting on 5/15/19 to discuss this ongoing matter (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 5/15/19).

5. **Communication with Senate Leadership on Violation of HSSoE Bylaws and Erosion of Joint Governance**

There have been severe violations of HSSoE Bylaws, ignorance towards established shared governance norms and processes, and significant misleading statements from critical officials in previous years. The Senate leadership has the critical documents alluding to such infractions. It is heartwarming to hear that the efforts put in the past two years to inform and engage with the Senate leadership on these matters has resulted in possible changes in the shared governance processes. The ExCom has also taken active steps to address some of these issues, and as much as its sphere of authority extends. These actions include sharing meeting minutes of standing committees and Faculty meetings in a central repository with HSSoE Faculty and revising HSSoE Bylaws to include voting procedures explicitly.

6. **Discussion on The Financial Impacts of COVID-19 on The HSSoE**

The ExCom had a Special meeting to discuss strategies that minimize the impact of the current budget cuts to HSSoE and the potential of loss of some of our staff/faculty colleagues due to the financial situation. It was suggested to rethink the current hiring offers whose process of hiring is not yet finalized to save resources (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 6/1/20).

7. **HSSoE Faculty Housing**

The committee was informed about significant issues regarding new faculty purchasing homes in University Hills. It was brought to the committee’s attention that in contrast to made promises during hiring interviews, not all new faculty are receiving homes upon arrival. This is a problem for current and upcoming recruitment and for those who have started in the past few years, affecting their retention/morale. (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 6/17/20). Discussion on this issue continues.

8. **Discussion on Professional MS Program**

The committee discussed the roll-out of the professional MS Program (aka MEng) in detail. Given that the MEng program proposal was not discussed in HSSoE Standing committees (i.e., the ExCom and Graduate Studies Committee), members of the ExCom invited Associate Dean for Graduate and Professional Studies to their meeting on 1/15/20 for
discussion (Ref. meeting minutes of 10/16/19, 11/20/19, 1/15/20, 2/19/20). Many items were discussed, including the governance of the MEng program, resource and revenue distribution, concurrent classes with state-run graduate programs, and faculty compensation. The information about and constraints associated with the MEng program is continuously changing, so it was suggested to keep the dialogue open.

9. Correspondence with HSSoE Faculty on Election Matters
The bylaws of HSSoE Faculty was followed religiously in election matters. In contrast with previous years, the Secretary of the HSSoE Faculty prepared and distributed ballots. Department Chairs were asked to conduct elections for representatives on HSSoE Standing Committees.

10. HSSoE Faculty Meetings and Annual Chancellor and Provost visit the HSSoE
Regular meetings of the Faculty (once per quarter) was maintained throughout the two years. The Faculty meetings were scheduled in such a way that Chairs of HSSoE Standing Committees updated the Faculty about issues and action items conducted under their tenure. The Dean addressed the school, focusing on critical issues (i.e., challenges, opportunities, and accomplishments) and left time for Q&A. Key staff needed for those presenting were invited. Faculty meetings had a theme aligned with one of the Standing Committees; Undergraduate Studies in Fall, Research in Winter, and Graduate Studies in Spring. Meeting minutes were provided to the faculty after the meetings. The ExCom studied the outcome of each HSSoE Faculty meeting during its regular meetings.

Annual Chancellor and provost visit was maintained with high quality and faculty/staff participation. Questions were collected from the Faculty and Staff and communicated with the Chancellor and Provost Office before the visit. Meeting minutes were prepared and shared with the HSSoE Faculty and Staff, and the Chancellor and Provost Office. The ExCom studied the visit’s outcome in its regular meeting right after the visit.

11. Dissemination of HSSoE Standing Committee Meeting Minutes with HSSoE Faculty
A motion was passed on 11/20/19 asking each HSSoE Standing Committee shall publish their meeting minutes, and an annual report that will be shared with the HSSoE Faculty containing a summary of (i) the work of the committee completed that year and (ii) a summary of member attendance for that year. These reports will be archived in a location accessible to all HSSoE Faculty and select AP Staff. The platform for sharing of such data is prepared, and meeting minutes are posted for HSSoE Faculty.

12. Correspondence with Senate Committees and HSSoE Standing Committees

b. The ExCom Engaged with CFW about UCI Parking LPR and faculty lots. Various issues were raised. (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 1/16/19, 6/19/19). No significant outcome resulted.

c. The ExCom engaged with CORCL on negotiations between UC and Elsevier. It appears that UCI was not represented in these negotiations (Ref. ExCom meeting
minutes of 4/17/19). The ExCom had a meeting with the Associate University Librarian on this topic on 6/19/19 (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 6/19/19).

d. The ExCom discussed various ways for working with CUARS and Admission Office on undergraduate admission criteria and process. (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 2/19/20 and 4/15/20). No positive feedback was received.

e. The ExCom discussed various ways and means to increase the accessibility of school various facilities with UCI’s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (OEOD). (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes of 6/17/20)

f. The ExCom discussed standardizing Ph.D. requirements at HSSoE. The decision about the issue was delegated to the HSSoE Graduate Studies Committee. (Ref. meeting minutes of 1/16/19, 4/17/19). Each graduate program will decide on adding language to the UCI catalog addressing this topic.

g. The ExCom discussed a motion from the HSSoE Graduate Studies Committee to increase the GSR level to Step 5 for those Ph.D. students who have BS degree effective Fall 2020 (graduate programs can adjust percentage in Fall 2020 to maintain the existing offer). This motion was passed.

h. The ExCom discussed establishing a Research Day by the HSSoE Research Committee to energize the school. (Ref. ExCom meeting minutes on 11/28/18, 1/16/19, 4/17/19).
Appendix A

The Executive Committee of the HSSoE Meeting Minutes.
Meeting Minutes  
Fall 2018, 1st Meeting of the  
HSSoE Executive Committee  
October 17, 2018 from 3:30 – 5:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4171

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:41pm.

0. Introductions – 9 members present  
   a. The Chair was asked to summarize the purpose of the EC.  
      i. EC charges are identified in the bylaws of HSSoE. Accordingly, EC oversees the Standing Committees.  
      ii. EC represents the faculty in all aspects of governance and academic affairs.  
      iii. EC is to address any issues brought forth by the faculty and/or EC.

1. Approval of June 2018 EC meeting minutes  
   a. No corrections were brought forward by the EC.  
   b. EC members agreed that EC meeting and HSSoE Faculty meeting minutes should be posted to the Academic Senate website.  
      i. Action Item: Chair and Secretary are to ensure this is accomplished for each EC meeting and general Faculty meeting.

Motion: Syed Jafar, to approve the June 2018 EC meeting minutes  
Second: Filippo Capolino  
Vote: 9 present, 4 in favor, 0 against, 5 abstain  
Motion is Passed: June 2018 EC meeting minutes are approved.
2. **Chair and Secretary Email Accounts**
   a. The Chair proposed the creation of official HSSoE email addresses for the Chair and Secretary in the form of soe_chair@uci.edu and soe_secretary@uci.edu, which would be passed on to successive Chairs and Secretaries.
   b. The proposal was received well by the EC.
      i. **No objections** to action were recorded.
      ii. **Action Item:** Chair and Secretary are to ensure email addresses are created.
   c. Members requested that EC listserv be created and used to ease EC communication.
      i. **No objections** to action were recorded.
      ii. **Action Item:** Chair and Secretary are to ensure EC listserv to be created.

3. **Meeting times for EC and Faculty meetings**
   a. HSSoE Faculty meetings:
      i. The Chair suggested EC consider Faculty meetings be held during the 7th week each quarter to facilitate elections in the 8th week of Spring quarter per the HSSoE bylaws.
         1. **No objections** were recorded.
         2. The EC will hold Faculty meetings in the 7th week of each quarter.
      ii. The Chair reported efforts taken since Sept. 1, 2018 to schedule the first HSSoE Faculty meeting.
         1. The Chair and Secretary coordinated with the Dean’s staff to find a time the Dean and a room are both available for the next HSSoE Faculty meeting.
         2. During coordination, it was assumed the 7th week would be acceptable. However, it was recognized that finalizing the call to meeting would require EC approval.
         3. Standing Committee membership was incomplete carrying over from 2017/18.
         4. The Research committee was reignedited and asked to put forward a Chair.
      iii. The Chair proposed to the EC that Fall 2018 HSSoE Faculty meeting be held Nov. 5th 2018 from 11:30am to 1:00pm in DBH 6011.
         1. **No objections** were recorded.
         2. **Action Item:** The Secretary will move forward with the call to meeting.
   b. EC meetings:
      i. EC members suggested EC meetings be held the 3rd Wednesday of each month and that the Secretary provide explicit dates in future correspondence to facilitate member attendance.
         1. **No objections** were recorded.
         2. **Action Item:** The Secretary will identify each 3rd Wednesday of each month and coordinate with the members in setting the EC meeting schedule for the rest of the academic year 2018/19.

4. **Faculty meeting format**
   a. The Chair proposed changes to the format of Faculty meetings.
      i. Faculty should be invited to submit questions/concerns to EC members well ahead of the meetings for the Dean, the EC, and the Standing Committees.
      ii. During the HSSoE Faculty meetings, each Standing Committee Chair should give a report about accomplishments and progress, issues, and opportunities.
      iii. Faculty meetings should be more focused on addressing issues and challenges, and frank communication between the faculty about HSSoE affairs.
b. EC members agreed, and added thoughts including:
   i. Faculty questions are highly desired, but anonymity should be considered.  
      *See Item 7.
   ii. It is recommended that the Dean’s presentation focuses on key issues (i.e., challenges, 
       opportunities, and accomplishments) and leave time for Q&A.
   iii. It would be desirable for fewer staff to be present, with the exception of key staff especially 
       needed for those presenting. The Dean can organize another meeting to address the staff 
       about relevant school affairs.
   iv. Faculty meetings should have a rotating theme.
   v. No objections recorded.

1. Meetings are to have a theme aligned with one of the Standing Committees 
   (Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, and Research).
   a. EC suggested themes for 2018/19:
      i. Fall – Undergraduate issues, Undergraduate Studies Committee to 
         present a more thorough report, Grad and Research give brief 
         updates.
      ii. Winter – Research issues, Research Committee to present 
          thorough report, UG and Grad give brief updates.
      iii. Spring – Graduate issues, Graduate Committee to present 
          thorough report, UG and Research give brief updates.

2. Time for discussion and dialogue is to be ensured.
3. Regular reports from the Dean and each Standing Committee should be included.
4. Only key staff needed for those giving presentations should be invited to HSSoE 
   Faculty meetings. Presenters will communicate their suggested staff members to 
   the EC.

vi. **Action Item:** The Chair will organize meetings according to the suggested themes and will 
    coordinate/communicate EC requests to the speakers.

vii. **Action Item:** The Secretary will call the faculty to the HSSoE Faculty meeting.

5. **EC and HSSoE Faculty questions for the Dean during HSSoE Faculty meetings**
   a. The Chair suggested that faculty questions be collected in advance of the Faculty meetings for both 
      the Dean and the EC members.
   b. EC members agreed and no objections were recorded. *See Item 7
   c. Members asked if there are any standing questions for the Dean. EC suggestions included:
      i. What is the HSSoE status on transfer student ratios?
      ii. What is the expected distribution of space in the new building? Space for departments? 
          Space for students?
      iii. Classroom sizes and scheduling: Sizes are saturated and threatening departments to require 
          multiple sections of courses. Is this a registrar issue?

6. **EC and HSSoE Faculty questions for the Chancellor and Provost during visit**
   a. The Chair reported that the Dean’s office staff confirmed the Chancellor and Provost visit to the 
      SoE is scheduled for May 21, 2019 from 3:30 to 5:00 pm.
   b. The Chair suggested faculty questions be collected well in advance of the visit.
i. EC members agreed, and no objections were recorded. *See Item 7

7. Online survey for Faculty input
   a. The Chair proposed the formation of some online faculty input mechanism.
   b. Discussion by the EC also applied to Items 4.b, 5, and 6.
   c. EC members suggested that to encourage faculty questions and concerns an anonymous survey tool should be used.
      i. No objections were recorded.
      ii. Action Item: Chair and Secretary are to investigate ways to facilitate truly anonymous question submission platform.

8. Ideas to increase HSSoE Faculty engagement in service rolls
   a. The Chair asked the EC for ideas to encourage faculty to actively participate in service rolls.
   b. EC members suggestions included:
      i. Adding excused and non-excused absence recording for EC and EC Standing Committees may support accountability. Perhaps this will trickle down to department committees as well.
      ii. If faculty see results of their efforts in service rolls they will be more likely to actively participate. The results must be transparent and visible.
      iii. Faculty will likely respond well to the quantification of and subsequent recognition of service performed.
         1. One idea is to ranking the committees and tasks to create a point system.
      iv. EC members volunteered to form an ad hoc committee aimed at quantifying service rolls and activities. The ad hoc committee includes:
         1. Farzin Zareian
         2. Martha Mecartney
         3. Ozdal Boyraz

9. Old Business
   a. EC agreed, no additional old business – No Objections recorded

10. New Business
    a. EC agreed, no additional new business – No Objections recorded

Motion: Martha Mecartney to adjourn the meeting
Second: Pleman Atanassov
Vote: 9 members present, unanimous approval
Motion is Passed: Oct. 17th EC meeting is adjourned. 5:02pm
The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:40pm.

1. Approval of October 2018 meeting minutes – 8 members present
   a. Correction of member Boyraz name spelling.

Motion: Payam Heydari to approve the October 2018 EC meeting minutes
Second: Plamen Atanassov
Vote: 8 present, 6 in favor, 0 against, 2 abstain
Motion is Passed: October 2018 EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Feedback about Fall HSSoE Faculty meeting
   a. Chair reporting based on feedback provided to him.
   b. Positives/complements:
      i. Faculty-only format for HSSoE Faculty meetings was well received by the school faculty.
      ii. The format change was appreciated.
   c. Negatives/complaints:
      i. Speakers went over time, sound was not audible if the speaker moved away from the podium.
      ii. Content of presentations, some details were relatively elementary, others were too complex.
      iii. Desire is to have interactive content.
   d. Discussion brought about suggestions:
      i. Start lunch earlier in order to begin on time
      ii. Changes in time allocation for the theme presentation in following meetings.
   e. The Research Committee is the focus of winter quarter; preliminary planning discussion:
i. Discussion about research issues:
   1. Standardizing Ph.D. requirements, EC members agreed this is an issue and the Faculty need to know the issues. But it was pointed out this is the purview of the Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC). No objections were recorded to tasking this to GAC.
      a. **Action Item:** EC tasks GAC to investigate and propose a boilerplate language to be presented in the Winter 2019 HSSoE Faculty meeting to receive feedback. The conclusion can then be presented in the Spring 2019 HSSoE Faculty meeting (as GAC is focus then).
   2. EC members expressed interest in a schoolwide research day which would bring together industry, grad students, and faculty. Members agreed that this type of event would be very beneficial and exciting, and that partially redefining the purpose of the Research Committee would be appropriate:
      a. No objections were recorded to tasking this to the Research Committee
         i. **Action Item:** EC tasks Research Committee with investigating and planning a “Research Day” event.
         ii. **Action Item:** Research Committee to report on this during Winter 2019 HSSoE Faculty meeting.
   3. Additional ideas brought forth by EC for Winter 2019 HSSoE Faculty meeting focus on Research Committee:
      a. Each research unit could explain the current goal and/or strengths (very quickly) to inform Faculty and foster interdisciplinary efforts
      b. -or- Research Committee could summarize
         i. School’s current initiatives, strengths, weaknesses
      c. Announce the Pivot website proposal resources available to Faculty.

3. **HSSoE Gathering (Staff & Faculty)**
   a. Chair presented the idea of a schoolwide gathering of both Faculty and Staff. Dean Washington agreed that the Dean’s office would support this event. Tentative plans are to hold one at the end of each academic year.
      i. No objections were recorded
      ii. **Action Item:** EC tasked the Dean’s office with coordinating this HSSoE Gathering event for both Staff and Faculty.

4. **School and Department Websites**
   a. Chair/Dean announced schools’ recent/ongoing efforts to update websites. Suggests departments reach out to the Development Office (at HSSoE).
   b. EC members request to Dean Washington / Chair that the Development Office (at HSSoE) be asked to provide templates and/or training for Faculty websites.
      i. No objections were recorded.
      ii. **Action Item:** Chair to contact the Development Office to request training and templates.

5. **Old Business**
   a. Chair and Secretary emails will be investigated by Chair during December and January.
6. **New Business**
   a. Content of the Winter HSSoE Faculty meeting was discussed. This was recorded in item 2 above.

   **Meeting adjourned 5:05 pm**
Meeting Minutes
Winter 2019, 1st Meeting of the
HSSoE Executive Committee
January 16, 2019 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4157

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Faculty Standing Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Russ Detweiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Senate Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Tim Rupert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyroz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Zoran Nenadic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Filippo Capolino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Payam Heydari</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Sub: Mauel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:40pm.

1. Approval of November 28, 2018 meeting minutes
   a. No comments brought forth

Motion by Lorenzo Valdevit to approve the November 28, 2018 EC meeting minutes.
Second: Payam Heydari
Vote: 16 present, 10 in favor, 0 against, 6 abstain
Motion is Passed:

November 28, 2018 EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Member Items
   a. UCI Parking LPR, Faculty Lots
      i. Arash reports on the UCI Transportation and Distribution Services Sustainable Transportation Permits program (LPR):
         1. is now restricted to a few small surface lots (near Engineering), and
         2. anyone can purchase AR/Restricted (faculty) day passes which leads to very limited faculty parking.
      ii. EC members agreed this very negatively affects the ability of the faculty to park their vehicles in the allotted spot, especially for those using the Sustainable Transportation LPR permits.
         1. One member reported UCI Transp. is responsive to feedback. Additional AR spots were added to Anteater Structure recently after complaints
      iii. Additional related items discussed
1. EC members mentioned upcoming changes to the pedestrian crossing and intersection at Eng. Service Rd. and E. Peltason Dr.
   a. Safety is a concern regarding removal of ped. crossing and signalization of intersection - will increase ped. activity dramatically.
2. EC members could benefit from nighttime/off-hours parking access iv. EC members agreed these issues need to be raised with the Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW), EC member Lorenzo Valdevit is the CFW HSSoE Rep. – No objections were recorded
   1. Action Item: EC requests Lorenzo to report the committee’s concerns to the CFW on the following items:
      a. Sustainable Transp. Permits are too restrictive.
      b. AR/Restricted spots are not protected for faculty use.
      c. Eng. Gateway crossing changes will affect pedestrian safety around HSSoE and Eng. Services Rd.
      d. Possibility of night/off-hours faculty passes is highly appreciated.

   a. Chair presented a proposal, submitted to the EC from the Grad Council, to switch from sequential review to concurrent review of Graduate Degree Program Modifications.
      i. The benefits of the proposal, as suggested in the document received from Grad Division was discussed. These suggested benefits include (i) shortened timeline, (ii) addresses perceived authority of each body, and (iii) equitable timeline for all units (not all require grad items to be reviewed by school-level EC).
      ii. The Executive Committee members did not find the suggested benefits strong enough to warrant any changes to the current process.

Motion by Arash Kheradvar for the HSSoE EC to oppose the proposed concurrent review of Graduate Degree Program Modifications by school Exec Committees and the Grad Council.
Second: Lorenzo Valdevit
Vote: 16 present, 11 in favor, 1 against, 4 abstain
Motion is Passed:
HSSoE Executive Committee opposes the proposed concurrent review of Graduate Degree Program Modifications by school Exec Committees and the Grad Council.

Action Item: EC Chair is to inform the Chair of Grad Council about HSSoE Decision on this matter.

4. HSSoE Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022
   a. Dean Washington presented the current HSSoE Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022. Departments have submitted their own plans/priorities. Dean asked for EC members’ input, encouraging the empowerment of the EC in the upcoming decisions on distribution of faculty lines.
   b. EC members discussed several options including no action and various configurations of subcommittees.

Motion by Hamid Jafarkhani to form an EC subcommittee to investigate current HSSoE faculty needs and advise Dean Washington and the Executive Committee about the proposed Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022. The members of this subcommittee will include the Department
Representatives to the EC, or an EC member substitute, with the Chair of EC as a tie-breaker for voting purposes. Members of the subcommittee include:

- Arash Kheradavar (BME)
- Russ Detweiler (CEE)
- Payam Heydari (EECS)
- Lorenzo Valdevit (MSC)
- Manuel Gamero-Castano (MAE)
- Plamen Atanassov (CBE)
- Farzin Zareian (HSSoE Faculty Chair)

Second: Lorenzo Valdevit
Vote: 16 present, 15 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain

Motion is Passed:

The EC subcommittee will investigate HSSoE faculty needs and advise Dean Washington and the Executive Committee on the proposed Faculty Allocation Strategy for 2018-2022.

5. Update from Engineering Council Meeting (09-Jan-2019)
   a. Chair reported to the EC members the 2019-20 TA/Reader budget allocation plan presented at the Eng. Council Meeting. The proposed plans weighs in departments research expenditures for allocation of TA/Reader support. (see attachment)
      i. Given the shortage of time, it was decided to further discuss the matter in a future meeting.

6. Grad Affairs Committee: Update on Standardizing PhD requirements
   a. Filippo summarized the discussion at the HSSoE Grad Affairs Committee (GAC) on this matter. No decision was made as diversity across disciplines and research areas makes implementation of any arbitrary standard (e.g. number of journal publications, etc.) difficult and counter-effective.
   b. EC members discussed and made several suggestions. The Chair of GAC will report back to EC on the progress made on this item.

7. Research Committee: Research Day
   a. Solmaz reported progress made by the Research Committee on Research Day, which included a draft summary of the plan.
   b. Solmaz, Plamen, and Payam plan to meet and produce an invitation letter and a list for distribution.

Meeting adjourned 3:13 pm
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**CHAIRS, SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**
Monica Majoli, Claire Trevor School of the Arts
Lee Bardwell, School of Biological Sciences
Philip Bromiley, Paul Merage School of Business
Deborah Vandell, School of Education
Farzin Zareian, Henry Samueli School of Engineering
Geoff Abbott, College of Health Sciences
Glenn Levine, School of Humanities
Stanislaw Jarecki, Donald Bren School of Information & Computer Sciences
Shauhin Talesh, School of Law
Sasha Chernyshev, School of Physical Sciences
Saewung Kim, School of Physical Sciences
James Smith, School of Physical Sciences
Jeffrey Streets, School of Physical Sciences
Gregory Weiss, School of Physical Sciences
Keramet Reiter, School of Social Ecology
Evan Schofer, School of Social Sciences

**RE: Proposed Concurrent Review of Graduate Degree Program Modifications by Graduate Council and Executive Committees**

Currently, some UCI Schools require that their Executive Committees (EC) review graduate degree program modifications before they are submitted to and reviewed by Graduate Council (GC). This level of EC review is in addition to the reviews and approvals at the School level required for GC review: i.e., by vote of the program faculty and the signed approvals by the Program Director or Department Chair, and Associate Dean or Dean. Following extensive discussion in Spring 2018, GC recommends that all such modifications be reviewed *concurrently* rather than consecutively for the following reasons.

1. Simultaneous review would expedite the review process for units appreciably, since they would potentially receive two sets of revisions that they could attend to at the same time. Given that one review does not serve as a precondition for the other, the current two-step process slows down the modification review by at least one month—and this is the shortest delay for unproblematic items that garner approvals on first review by both entities (School EC, then GC). The burden and delay are greater when an item is approved by one entity but not the other, and considerably so when both entities require revisions before re-reviewing and approving. To illustrate:
If an item is returned only once by the EC for modest revisions, the review process is extended by at least one month at the School level, i.e., until it can be re-reviewed and approved. If, after clearing EC review and moving on to GC, it is then returned for revision—virtually always for different concerns than those flagged by the EC—the process is extended by an additional month, minimum. This assumes that the revisions requested are relatively modest and that the proposers are adept at turning around the revisions in a timely manner—alongside their research, teaching, etc.—and that the program faculty or subcommittee do not need to review the revisions. At this point, the item would require a minimum four-month review (greater than one academic quarter); and, in most such cases, the timeline has been longer, simply due to the calendar of meetings by the reviewing entities. Missing one entity’s deadline by a week means waiting for the next month’s review. Some ECs meet only twice per quarter, and not monthly. If the review in progress falls over the winter break or, worse, summer, the item remains in a holding pattern for an additional month to four months. With concurrent review, the timeline could be cut in half. If an item has been approved by GC but must attend to EC revisions, thereafter, the GC chair could simply approve the revised item without bringing it back to the Council, if the EC revisions do not alter or affect the item as reviewed by GC.

2. On the matter of perceived authority and quality of review: The current two-step process obscures the reality that the criteria and purposes of EC and GC reviews tend to differ greatly. This difference can and should be regarded as an asset: two sets of eyes are better than one. However, when items have been returned for revision by GC after EC approval—or especially if an item has been turned down altogether, i.e., not approved—in the past, some ECs have taken GC’s decision as a rebuke or subversion of their authority. Hence, besides expediting the review process—itself a considerable benefit—simultaneous review would improve the process in two ways. It would:
   a. Acknowledge implicitly—to the proposers as well as the reviewing entities—that one entity’s authority is not beholden or subordinate to the other; and
   b. Ensure that one entity’s review is not influenced by the other.

3. Last but not least, simultaneous review would provide a more equitable timeline for all units across the campus. In most Schools, graduate items are not subject to School-level EC review. Hence, in Schools requiring EC review, items that must be vetted at the School level are subject to a disadvantageous timetable relative to those that move directly from the program to GC.

For these reasons, Graduate Council believes that endorsement of concurrent EC and GC review would appreciably improve the quality and timeline of the review process for graduate degree program modifications. In the instances when Graduate Council requests additional information after the initial review, the degree programs under review are typically expected to respond within three weeks, if the item is to be re-reviewed at the following meeting. This timeline allows the Graduate Council to complete the review as effectively and as timely as possible. The three-week timeline applies to the academic year from September 1 to June 30 and does not include the summer break. For clarification, please note that the proposed concurrent review is applicable to graduate degree program modifications only and not to proposals for new graduate
degree programs which will continue to follow the Senate review process at http://senate.uci.edu/files/2018-19-Workflow-PDF.pdf.

Before proceeding, the Graduate Council is seeking a response from your School’s Executive Committee, whether it endorses concurrent review—i.e., GC and School EC review at the same time—or consecutive review—i.e., School EC before moving on to GC. If the School EC would like to opine on the matter—whether supporting, opposing, differing, questioning, or clarifying—GC would welcome such comment, as well. The Graduate Council looks forward to your response. If possible, please reply by December 10, 2018 to gmimura@uci.edu with a copy to Graduate Council Analyst Thao Nguyen at thao.nguyen@uci.edu.

On behalf of the Graduate Council,

Glen Mimura, Chair

c: Linda Cohen, Chair, Academic Senate
    Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Thao Nguyen, Graduate Council Analyst
Introduction

In the 2017-2018 academic year the HSSOE hired 15 faculty. This academic year 2018-2019, we have the opportunity to hire another 10-15 faculty. The upcoming faculty hiring process recently outlined by the Provost will allocate another 10 – 15 faculty to the School over the next couple of years (see below). When coupled with potential retirements and separations, it is predicted that at least 30% of the faculty in the School will be new. Thus, the School will look dramatically different over the next 3 years and these hires will determine the success of the School for at least the next 20 years.

As stated above, the core component of this future hiring will be positions provided by the Provost. The Provost has asked each School to produce “comprehensive recruiting plans to be informed by considerable consultation with the faculty, department leadership, and in partnership with interdisciplinary centers and programs, as appropriate”. The Provost's goal is to hire about 95 new faculty FTE over the next two upcoming academic years (2019-2020 and 2021-2022), contingent on the availability of resources.

Towards that end, I’m formally asking departments to develop a plan that addresses how your unit will be structured in the future. Inherent in this plan are the following components:

1. A component for how the unit will redistribute new positions from the Provost's Process. It is expected that the School will get at least 10 positions. In terms of how the School will request this portion of the allocation, EECS and MAE should expect 3-4 positions and all other units should expect 1-2.
   a. Keeping in alignment with the Provost’s requirements units must provide a prioritized list of new faculty FTE needs and opportunities (including LP/SOE series). This may include clusters, if appropriate. Rank is assumed to be Assistant Professor unless otherwise stated. The total requested should fall within the range provided above so that efforts to coordinate recruitment plans are consistent with the scale of available FTE. Units must outline the rationale for each FTE on the basis of workload needs, opportunities to leverage existing research excellence, anticipated partnerships, and impact toward strategic goals of the campus, school, and department.

2. A component for how the unit will redistribute positions from “future” retirements. This will vary from unit to unit and only future separations or retirements can be considered. It means that units will need to project how many retirements or separations they expect over the next three years, starting with 2018-2019.
   a. Each unit must, briefly outline the top priorities as positions become vacant (e.g. gaps in rank, research opportunities, build on research excellence, workload coverage to maintain or improve student: faculty ratio, impact on doctoral growth, leadership needs, etc.)
3. A component for how the unit will contribute to its own growth through revenues from self-supporting programs. All units are expected to create at least one position through self-supporting programs.
   a. Please work with Professor Fadi Kurdahi on this item as he can help units project their future potential. If your unit has not developed a plan for a self-supporting program, you are required to develop a plan to receive any positions from the other categories.

In alignment with university's guidelines, each plan must include acknowledgement of the School’s commitment to inclusive excellence. The School’s commitment to Inclusive Excellence is highlighted in the School’s strategic plan and in its performance over the last five years where about 40% of our faculty hires have been women or people from groups underrepresented in engineering. Finally, we have developed new tools to help faculty in this process. I have been working with our School’s Diversity Advisors and with Dr. Sharnnia Artis (our Assistant Dean for Access and Inclusion) to develop a new draft evaluation tool and rubric that has been shown to be helpful to at least one other UC (UC Berkeley). This tool has been developed and will be required of all search committees.

The total size for this plan is no more than two pages.

The Process
While this process is not considered traditional, it does put the power for what areas will be determined in the hands of the faculty in the departments. Each department will develop “its” plan and submit the plans, along with a faculty vote or process validating faculty engagement by January 3, 2019. A special committee determined by the Dean in collaboration with the Department Chairs and the Faculty Chair will evaluate the proposals. The committee will be led by the Dean and Professor Diran Apelian. This group will evaluate the plans and will develop a Schoolwide plan by February 1, 2019. The plan will be published for faculty feedback and comment before submitting to the Provost on the end of February.

Criteria for Evaluating Plans
We will use many of the same criteria for evaluation of the plans that the Provost uses in their process.

- The unit’s commitment to the School’s stated policy and plan for inclusive excellence;
- Workload needs and past investment
- Expansion of research and graduate excellence. Please be specific of how the proposed positions will support the unit’s research enterprise and excellence in graduate education.
- Opportunities to align research and doctoral growth efforts with external funding.
The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:00 pm.

1. Approval of January 16, 2019 meeting minutes
   a. No comments brought forth

Motion by Hamid Jafarkhani to approve January minutes.
Second: Ozdal Boyroz
Vote: 14 present, 14 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain
Motion is Passed: January 16, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Member Items – none

3. TA/Reader Budget Allocation
   a. Chair presented the school’s proposed TA/Reader budget allocation model.
      i. Funds distributed with 80% weight on credit hours and 20% weight on research expenditures by unit.
   b. A lengthy conversation ensued about the pros and cons of the model, with several members raising concerns and several members with positive comments. The discussion centered around two points:
      i. TA/Reader funds directly affect the quality of education of our undergraduate students and should not be affected by measures other than student credit hours.
      ii. Allocating TA/Reader funds as a reward for research expenditure of productive faculty at the school-level is flawed because there is no reasonably practical mechanism to ask
departments to distribute their TA/Reader budget to those productive faculty. A summary of the discussions is provided herein:

**EC member concerns about the new TA/Reader allocation model:**

a. Credit hours are the appropriate metric for resources affecting undergrad students, such as TA/Readers. Students should not be punished for perceived shortcomings of faculty in their research.

b. The Campus does not distribute TA/Reader funds based on research expenditure; it bases on credit hours.

c. The number of TAs will be examined by ABET, which will likely be critical of removing support for undergraduate teaching based on research expenditures.

d. We are here to teach, and there is a moral aspect to providing resources for teaching.

e. Chairs do not, are not fully free to, and/or are not willing to distribute teaching loads and TA/reader resources based on faculty research loads. It is almost always based on number of students in courses, and often there is no flexibility for someone else to teach a certain course. Dean could consider directly rewarding individual faculty.

f. Research expenditures do not change teaching responsibility; teaching assignments are not correlated to research loads. Faculty with high research expenditure can buy-out courses.

g. There is also variability in teaching load across departments. For instance, faculty in BME tend to teach 2-3 courses as a standard load, while others are 3-4.

h. The Chairs of departments are responsible for assigning classes and TAs where they are needed. The suggested model can lead to faculty with large research dollar expenditure teaching large courses (that get TA/Reader allocations), and other faculty teach small classes. This contradicts the intentions of the suggested TA/Reader allocation model.

i. It is the Dean’s responsibility to direct Chairs to follow a consistent distribution model if the school is going to use the new model for TA/Reader allocation.

j. Measuring research productivity with dollar expenditures is inappropriate, especially if it claims to reflect faculty workload. Faculty across different disciplines have unique funding and workload norms that cannot be measured with a single indicator (at this time dollar expenditure).

k. The mechanism for calculating research productivity in HSSoE is flawed. For example, awards from other schools/ORUs, and CO-PI portion of awards are ignored in how HSSoE computes research expenditures for each unit.

l. Faculty are already rewarded for research through merit cases.

m. The Dean can reward individual faculty directly rather than penalizing students and their educational experience.

n. Not getting TA resources appropriately from the Campus is a major issue. DW should not put the impetus on the faculty to do the Dean’s job. (background: DW noted that campus distributes TA/Reader funds based on a biased version of student credit hours; he asked the EC to engage with responsible campus authorities on this matter.)
EC Member positive comments on new TA/Reader allocation model:
  a. One member in favor of this model encouraged the Dean to go even farther.
  b. One member suggested that among all available models for distributing resources, the workload model is the least contentious. This member agreed with the suggested model for distributing TA/Reader funds.

Dean Washington comments and replies:
  a. This is a workload model, to be applied to all school funds (except Block), aimed at rewarding excellence in research and relieving those managing research grants. Many other top institutions follow this model, some much more aggressively so.
  b. The campus claims to distribute TA/Reader funds based on student credit hours; this is not entirely true. Some schools have not seen a decrease in their funding despite dropping enrollments/credit hours offered. Ask the provost on his next visit to HSSoE.
  c. Department Chairs are responsible for managing their resources. If faculty with large research efforts are not receiving teaching resources, then this is a problem for the Chairs to solve. It is not to the Dean’s place and should not subvert Chairs.
  d. The TA/Reader money (2019: $1.8 million) makes up the majority of funds to be distributed using the workload model, perhaps about $500k more in other lines.
  e. This is a mild approach compared to other institutions (some are 50/50 or even more weight to research dollars).
  f. The EC would benefit from learning more about the HSSoE budget. I recommend inviting HSSoE’s Director of Finance to discuss minutes of HSSoE budget with the EC.

4. HSSoE Faculty Allocation Strategy 2018-2022
   a. The report is imminent, to be submitted to the Dean today or the next day.
   b. Dean expressed his appreciation of the EC to take on this task.

5. Nominations for HSSoE Representatives to the Senate Assembly
   a. Chair reported current HSSoE reps are stepping down this year and HSSoE needs nominations to replace these representatives.
   b. EC is urged to take this issue back to their departments and drum up nominations.

6. Chancellor and Provost Visit May 21, 2019, from 3:30 to 5:00 pm.
   a. Chair: EC Members are encouraged to remind their departments about this upcoming meeting and collect questions.
   b. Chair: The discussion about campus-wide TA budget allocation is a very important topic for this visit.

Meeting adjourned 2:48 pm
Meeting Minutes  
Spring 2019, 1st Meeting of the  
HSSoE Executive Committee  
April 17, 2019 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4157  

Attendance  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent (Excused)</th>
<th>Absent (Not Excused)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Russ Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Tim Rupert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Zoran Nenadic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Filippo Capolino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Payam Heydari</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Sub: Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean Gregory Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:08 pm.

1. Approval of February 20, 2019 meeting minutes  
   a. TA Allocation discussion represented in the minutes  
      i. Some minor language changes requested related to whether a majority or not  
      ii. Item 3.b. to be reworded to include “A lengthy conversation ensued about the pros and cons of the model, with several members raising concerns and several members with positive comments. The discussion centered around two points:…” and “EC member concerns about…” and “EC member positive comments…”

Motion by Russ Detwiler to approve February minutes as revised.  
Second: Plamen Atanassov  
Vote: 12 present, 12 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain  
Motion is Passed: February 20, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Member Items  
   a. Lorenzo Valdevit, as a member of the UCI Committee on Faculty Welfare, reported on the recent failed negotiations between the UC and Elsevier.  
      i. It seems that UCI nor engineering and medical faculty were represented in the negotiations.  
      ii. UC has ended subscription with Elsevier, journals in which many faculty publish (some exclusively) and rely upon.
b. A lengthy discussion followed, with a general consensus that HSSoE Faculty will have to wait and see how the situation progresses since the national and global scientific community seems to be pushing back against Elsevier and its recent controversial actions. Therefore, members agreed that future negotiations may occur, and that faculty should remain abreast of the situation so as to be prepared to participate if the opportunity arises.

3. **Grad Council: Concurrent Review of Grad Degree Prog. Modifications**
   a. Correction to the agenda item: The Grad Council has not communicated a decision on the previously proposed policy on concurrent review of Grad program changes.
   b. Chair presented policy changes recently approved by the Grad Council and passed down to the campus (see attached).
      i. The policy is aimed at providing continuity and consistency in graduate students’ degree requirements and advising. This seems to follow the similar practice as undergraduate programs following subsequent versions of the catalog.

   **Action Item:** The EC requests that Syed Jafar, as the HSSoE GC Rep, to provide a summary of this decision in the next EC meeting.

4. **Update on TA/Reader Resource Allocation Model**
   a. Chair presented summary of several years of data on departmental research expenditures and there is a discrepancy in how expenditure is counted and if this is used in some 80/20 split that will affect teaching quality via TA.
      i. Members call for the Associate Dean of Research, Efi Foufoula-Georgiou, to attend the next EC meeting to discuss how the school will count research expenditures.
   b. CEE and EECS Departments have approved resolution statements opposing the Dean’s 80/20 workload model for TA/Reader funding allocations (see attached).

   **Action:** The EC requests that Efi Foufoula-Georgiou, Assoc. Dean of Research, be invited to attend the next EC meeting to discuss research expenditure accounting and the appropriateness of an 80/20 workload model proposed by the Dean.

5. **Multi-Year Hiring Strategy, Subcommittee Report**
   a. **Discussion is tabled** until Dean Washington is present at the EC meeting and once the school has received feedback from the Provost.

   a. Rankings for 2019 have been published. Some departments improved and some fell in rank, but by in large all have recovered from the 2018 incident of UCI being left off of the ballot.
      i. Brought to committee as a FYI
   b. Reduction in HSSoE Undergraduate Enrollment
      i. Dan Mumm (HSSoE UAC) reported in 2018 there were approx. 4100 admitted and 3,100 in 2019 in an attempt to curb MAE and EECS enrollment. However, yields are projected to still overload MAE and EECS, which means some programs will see a decrease in enrollments.
ii. Dan will share some of this data with the committee.

7. Questions for Chancellor/Provost visit (May 21, 2019)
   a. Have Department Reps collected any questions?
   b. Chair requests EC Standing Committees to submit questions such that they may be passed up
   c. Members:
      i. Elsevier issue may be a good question/comment to raise.
      ii. What are the TA/Reader allocation models for the campus level?
      iii. Grad Committee, please bring forward some questions.
      iv. Grad Committee, please bring forward some questions.

8. Program for upcoming Faculty meeting (April 30, 2019)
   a. Two weeks before Chancellor/Provost visit in order to excite faculty questions for C/P

9. Grad Affairs Committee: Update on Standardizing PhD requirements
   a. CEE, EECS, Dan and Plamen’s departments all approved statements and carried them to DMFs
to be placed in the Catalog. All other departments have not yet approved statements, but some
members report their departments are working on this.

10. Research Committee: Research Day Update
    a. Some discussions were had over the previous quarter
    b. Departments’ grad students have approached GS
    c. Since Efi is invited to the next EC meeting, the committee will discuss.

Meeting adjourned 3:03 pm
The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:07 pm.

1. **Approval of April 17, 2019 meeting minutes**
   a. Minor corrections

   **Motion by Tim Rupert to approve April minutes as revised.**
   **Second:** Lorenzo Valdevit
   **Vote:** 12 present, 10 in favor, 0 against, 2 abstain
   **Motion is Passed:** April 17, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. **Member Items**
   a. EC members concerns about Faculty parking issues (discussed earlier this year) still unresolved.

   **Action Item:** The EC asks Lorenzo Valdevit, as a member of the UCI Committee on Faculty Welfare, to please bring up the issue to the CFW and report back.

   b. EC members still concerned about recent events between the UC and Elsevier.

   **Action Item:** The EC asks Russ Detwiler to invite Assoc. University Librarian John Renaud.

3. **Discussion on Grad Council Policy Changes**
   a. Syed Jafar, as the HSSoE GC Rep, reported to the EC that the Grad Council was receiving many degree modification requests. Many were changes to recently approved modifications; request for changes were occurring too quickly for students and the Grad
Council to keep up with. This alerted the Grad Council to impose restriction policies on the timeline for submitting degree modification requests. No further questions was asked from Syed.

4. Feedback on Spring HSSoE Faculty Meeting  
   a. Student wellness was mentioned by Fadi Kurdahi, Assoc. Dean for Graduate Studies, and he offered to present to the EC during the next meeting (June 19th).

5. Updates from HSSoE Standing Committees  
   a. Research Committee: Solmaz reported to the EC the committee had finished distribution of the CORCOL travel grant.  
      i. Research Day: The format has been in flux with some merging of the original EC idea with a Grad Student-led proposal.  
      ii. The EC encouraged the Research Committee to select a date soon.  
   b. Undergrad Committee: Dan provided an update on admissions  
      - Target for the HSSoE was 750-800, and 863 were admitted (13.8% of campus).  
      - There has been a major problem with admissions this year; many of our undergraduate programs have a smaller number of SIR-yes. The issue is being discussed at the campus level.  
   c. Grad Committee: Filippo reported that in 2019 PhD numbers were up while MS numbers were down.

6. Questions for Chancellor/Provost visit (May 21, 2019)  
   a. The EC asked the Chair to compile the questions (from staff and faculty) for the Chancellor/Provost’s visit.  
   b. Why do units receive only around $4,000 of the $11,000 NRST?  
   c. Why is UCI so resistant to NDA and IP agreements?

7. Micro-Credentialing  
   a. Item was tabled.

8. Discussion on Research Productivity Metrics/Work Load Models with Assoc. Dean of Research, Efi Foufoula-Georgiou  
   a. The EC asked Efi how we can measure research productivity beyond just research expenditure.

   Efi: Metrics are not necessarily the answer. Making everyone feel valued is important. Possible metrics include publications, mentoring of students and their trajectories, research expenditure to some extent but not simply a direct count rather passthrough and matching must be accounted for; and perhaps dollar/paper. Look to other institutions to see if they have more creative models.
Dean Washington noted that he does talk to other institutions; they use a similar expenditure-based model to distribute TA/Reader funds. They use either expenditures or awards for distribution of resources and use publications for promotion and tenure. Rankings look at total expenditures.

An EC member noted that UCLA, and UC-Davis don’t follow the Dean’s suggested model at which point Dean Washington stated that UCI School of Engineering is the first UC that is distributing TA/Reader funds based on a workload model.

Dean Washington noted that we receive one lump sum of resources based on a model that is similar for all units and one based on an over-enrolment model. The workload model considers all the resources in and tries to balance distributions out by the 80/20 split. The model was developed to take into account faculty productivity and help the faculty that are productive in their research. The Dean challenged the EC to provide a better workload model.

EC Member: It seems EC members are not concerned with the details of an overall funding model, but they do not agree specifically with TA funding being coupled with departmental research expenditure.

One EC Member reminded the committee about the side effects of using the workload model to distribute TA/Reader funds. If units are not using a similar model, then how does it motivate individual faculty? TA money is not going to motivate the students, either. The best case is status quo – weak units will be given less resources. Another EC Member asked how the model directly helps him as he is bringing in lots of research money. Conversations from some EC members revolved around two issues: 1) the quality of education is affected if TA/Reader funds are distributed based on indicators other than student credit hours, and 2) the mechanism to reward productive faculty does not penetrate into departments and how the resources are internally allocated.

Dean Washington noted that the 80/20 gives more money to expenditure-productive units to distribute funds among their productive faculty. School financial decisions are under the Dean’s purview; therefore, we will follow the 80/20 workload model to distribute TA /Reader funds.

Meeting adjourned 3:25 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAS</th>
<th>Iter 1</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Iter 2</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95065</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95060</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95065</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27308</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27293</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25931</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>13269</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>13269</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>13269</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8775</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>8775</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>8775</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>11995</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>11995</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>11995</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5234</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>5234</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>6440</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>6445</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc. Prog/IDT</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Science</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>8836</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>8860</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>8836</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ecology</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4282</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>14648</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>14704</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>14648</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11017</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>11067</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7589</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Transfer/288 Comparison | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>Iter 1</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Iter 2</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21504</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21530</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21780</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8899</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8812</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9596</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOCS</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Science</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ecology</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
<td>5646</td>
<td>26.20%</td>
<td>5545</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Transfer/288 Comparison | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>Iter 1</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Iter 2</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21504</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21530</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21780</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8899</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8812</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9596</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOCS</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Science</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ecology</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
<td>5646</td>
<td>26.20%</td>
<td>5545</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>% change since last year</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>% change since last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering: Premed</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Engineering</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science Engineering</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>2399</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
<th>% change since last year</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate (Admitted/Selected) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering: Premed</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Engineering</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0% / 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science Engineering</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>90.0% / 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Minutes  
Spring 2019, 3rd Meeting of the  
HSSoE Executive Committee  
June 19, 2019 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4171

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Faculty Standing Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Russ Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Senate Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Tim Rupert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Zoran Nenadic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC.</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Filippo Capolino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Payam Heydari</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Sub: Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean Gregory Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:15 pm.

1. Approval of May 15, 2019 meeting minutes

Motion by Tim Rupert to approve April minutes as revised.  
Second: Ozdal Boyraz

Vote: 10 present, 8 in favor, 0 against, 2 abstain

Motion is Passed: May 15, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Member Items
   a. Faculty parking issues.
      i. Informational item: Parking office is installing cameras for sustainable transportation enrollees. Estimated time for the system roll out is December 2019.
      ii. Informational item: UCI Transportation and Distribution Services are reluctant in offering ‘faculty only’ parking spaces. Each parking space cost ~$150/month.
      iii. Member request: making single day visitors (e.g., for seminars) not purchase passes especially when there is no kiosk. This request was tabled for the next academic year.
      iv. Faculty are encouraged to use the online system for purchasing visitor passes.

   b. FBI Visit to UCI – International collaboration restrictions
      i. Students in MAE were approached by FBI agents. (reported by Kia)
      ii. NASA has asked PIs not to support students or staff from China. (reported by Mumm)
      iii. There is a blanket ITAR restriction on US Navy grants. (reported by Boyraz)
**Action Item:** Ask Office of Research to give a presentation to HSSoE Faculty about Federal and State restrictions in regards to conducting research with foreign entities.

3. **Updates from HSSoE Standing Committees**
   a. **Research Committee:**
      i. Research Day: Lorrie Green will be brought into their committee for assistance with scheduling the date of the Research Day; tentatively will be held during Fall or Winter of 2019-20 academic year. Student symposium will be held in conjunction with the Research Day.

   b. **Undergrad Committee:**
      i. HSSoE has major issues with UCI campus on how undergraduate admissions are handled. Campus does admissions based on the School’s capacity; this leads to over-enrollment in MAE and under-enrollment in MSE. HSSoE has requested that admissions be conducted with regards to each undergraduate program capacity. Another major problem with Campus’s admission algorithm is its ‘selectivity’ criteria; campus would like to increase its yield statistics, therefore, it tends to admit students that are highly likely to accept the admission offer. The Undergraduate Committee has requested CASA to be involved in the undergraduate admission process; however, CASA has been reluctant to participate due to low manpower.

   c. **Grad Committee:**
      i. E-IDP (Engineering Individual Development Plan is approved by HSSoE Graduate Committee and will be rolled out in Fall 2019-20 academic year. The form is prepared to keep track of graduate students progress, advising, and mentoring. Graduate Students and Faculty are asked to work together and complete this form. Further instructions are transferred to graduate program faculty by their representative on the Graduate Committee.
      ii. Professional Master’s Program is approved by the regents. The program costs ~$43k and goes for 4 quarters. The idea is to leverage the resources generated by this program to bring in FTEs. The financial responsibility of maintaining this FTE is with the associated department.

   **Action Item:** Invite Associate Dean Kurdahi to the Executive Committee to discuss various issues regarding the Professional Master’s Program. Ask Associate Dean Kurdahi to provide the EC members with documents on what was approved by the regents for the professional MS program and what is the budget model. Executive Committee Members to develop questions for Associate Dean Kurdahi.

4. **John Renaud, Associate University Librarian – Discussion on Elsevier and UC.**
   a. John Renaud presented the Executive Committee members with information and statistics about how UC faculty interact with Elsevier journals. No handout were distributed, no slides were shown; the data was presented orally.
i. Elsevier has asked for 11 million dollars annually to continue its services with UCI. This is 20% above our current budget for shared journals.

ii. 45% of UC faculty publications end in Elsevier journals.

iii. 86% of usage is for pre-2019 papers.

iv. UCI will lose access to Elsevier journals on October 2019.

v. The library will try to find and deliver faculty’s and students’ publication request. The charge is $25/paper which will be waived. This service is not available during weekends.

vi. Faculty are asked not to subscribe to Elsevier journals.

Old Business

5. **Issues with Undergraduate Admissions:** Discussed. See item 3b.

6. **Micro-Credentialing:** Table for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 3:00 pm
Meeting Minutes  
Fall 2019, 1st Meeting of the  
HSSoE Executive Committee  
October 16, 2019 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4171

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCI Senate Committee HSSoE Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Nader Bagherzadeh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Feng Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCI Senate HSSoE Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Russell Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSSoE Department Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Rainer Doemer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex Officio</strong></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:07 pm.

1. Approval of June 19, 2019 meeting minutes

Motion by Mike McNally to approve minutes.
Second: Syed

Vote: 10 present, 5 in favor, 0 against, 5 abstain

Motion is Passed: June 19, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Standing Committee Membership and Leadership
   a. Membership to HSSoE Committees requires voting within the departments. This procedure is outlined in the HSSoE Bylaws. Based on recent conversation with Department Chairs, not all departments have voted on their representatives for the HSSoE Standing Committees and representative to the Executive Committee.
   b. Practices across departments seem to vary, and this has resulted in some departments not being represented on some committees for 2019-20.
Action Items: (i) Department Reps are asked to remind their department Chair about voting requirements for HSSoE Standing Committee members. The Chair will discuss this issue during the first HSSoE Faculty Meeting.
(ii) Members are asked to think about potential ways to improve activity, participation, continuity of membership, and election practices in the school.

3. Revising the Bylaws to Include Voting Procedures
   a. We do not have a set of rules throughout the HSSoE that governs voting procedures. There are a few rules that are campus wide (e.g.,
   b. There have been violations and irregularities of traditional and approved voting procedures in the past few years; it appears that identifying the proper voting procedures in the HSSoE Bylaws is a way to reduce these cases. It is suggested to add a clause to describe ramifications for violating voting bylaws.
   c. What are the rules that exist? – Let’s collect the data and summarize and then draft an article.
   d. Questions about enforcement
      i. Perhaps it should go into the personnel case? We need to find what are approved disciplinary actions for violation of bylaws (if any).

Action Item: Department Reps are asked to report to the EC Chair what their department voting practices are currently.

4. Professional MS Program
   a. The program with four concentrations across the school has been launched; two others are being added.
   b. Observations from associated meetings, things are not crystal clear.
   c. Funding question – HSSoE taking a loan from the campus, what if we don’t succeed?
      i. Could affect the school in the years to come. So, faculty need to be informed about risks and rewards.
   d. During the HSSoE retreat, one of the chairs asked about the faculties that are hired through these programs: how can departments compensate such faculty if the program closes or becomes inactive. Dean Washington has responded that departments would use a regular FTE line to compensate these faculty.
   e. CPS Degree is running and now in its third year. Participating faculty are compensated as an overload.
   f. Suggestions:
      i. The EC should provide questions for Assoc. Dean Fadi to address:
         1. Program: How many students? How is the $40k paid?
         2. Given expected enrollment and tuition, how is the budget disseminated?
      ii. After more information has been gathered, reviewed, and discussed by the EC, Assoc. Dean Fadi should be invited to give a brief presentation about how this program operates and to answer the committee’s questions.
**Action Item:**

(i) Chair to collect information about the [a] original and approved proposal, [b] process to develop a new program, and the [c] Bylaw associated with program creation with the EC, [d] material communicated with the departments.

(ii) Chair to distribute (i) to EC members. EC members to compile questions for Assoc. Dean Fadi about operations of the Professional MS Programs.

(iii) Russ to look at the GAC minutes to see if they voted for the Program as a whole.

(iv) Chair and Secretary to look into the EC minutes

5. **Undergraduate Admissions**
   a. HSSoE has an issue with undergrad admissions. The process at the campus level is contracted out to a third party.
   b. It is desirable for the EC to join forces with the Dean’s Office and voice faculty concerns about the current admission process. HSSoE faculty want to have a say in the admissions process and hopefully admissions can be conducted at the program level, rather than only at the school level.

6. **Updates from the Engineering Council Meeting**
   a. A new formula for faculty discretionary funds from overhead is being rolled out by the Dean.

7. **Member Items**
   a. EC member request that action items be sent to the committee.

Meeting adjourned 2:48 pm
Meeting Minutes
Fall 2019, 2nd Meeting of the
HSSoE Executive Committee
November 20, 2019 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Gateway 4171

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate Committee HSSoE Rep.</td>
<td>CEP James Brody</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEP Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPB Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORCL Nader Bagherzadeh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORCL Feng Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td>UAC Elliot Hui</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAC Russell Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Rep.</td>
<td>BME Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBE Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEE Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EECS Rainer Doemer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAE Yoonjin Won</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSE Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean Gregory Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:08 pm.

1. Approval of October 16, 2019 meeting minutes

Motion: Hamid Jafarkhani to approve minutes.
Second: Lorenzo Valdevit

Revisions:
- Minor language changes to item 4.a: four concentrations, not four programs
- Assoc. Dean Kurdahi to be invited to EC meeting after the committee has collected, reviewed, and discussed MEng materials in order to form questions for the Assoc. Dean.

Vote: 9 present, 6 in favor, 0 against, 3 abstain
Motion is Passed: October 16, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Recap of HSSoE Faculty meeting Fall 2019
   a. EC Chair reported that positive feedback was provided on the Fall 2019 HSSoE Faculty meeting (was informative, useful, etc.).
   b. EC Chair reported that at the meeting it became apparent that there is an issue with information being passed from the HSSoE Standing Committees the discussion about the E-IDP form made this apparent.
c. EC Chair requested ideas from the EC members about how to improve the flow of information from the HSSoE Standing Committees to the Faculty.
   i. Discussion resulted in the following motion.

**Motion by Hamid Jafarkhani:**
Each HSSoE Standing Committee shall publish their meeting minutes, and an annual report that will be shared with the HSSoE Faculty containing a summary of (i) the work of the committee completed that year and (ii) a summary of member attendance for that year. These reports will be archived in a location accessible to all HSSoE Faculty and select AP Staff.

**Second: Rainer Doemer**
**Vote: 13 present, 13 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain**
**Motion is Passed.**

d. At the Fall HSSoE Faculty meeting it became apparent, based on the observed attendance and the reported scheduling conflicts, that faculty need to be made aware of these meetings with more advanced notice. Further, junior faculty need to be encouraged to attend.

**Action Items:**
(i) Chairs of HSSoE Standing Committees to share their committee’s Action Items with Department Chairs.
(ii) Standing Committee Department Reps and Department Chairs should be encouraged to discuss in their Department Faculty meetings.
(iii) Chair and Secretary to announce at the Winter 2020 HSSoE Faculty meeting well in advance.

3. Draft Voting Procedures for HSSoE Bylaws
   a. Chair presented current UC, UCI, and HSSoE Bylaws that govern current voting policies and procedures.
   b. Discussion related to voting: Faculty participation and the importance of voting needs to be emphasized to the faculty. How to do it?
   c. Chair presented a draft of two additional items to the HSSoE Bylaws that would add
      i. For each Standing Committee, a quorum consists of more than 50 percent of its voting members. A simple majority of the votes cast is needed for approval of motions made in each Standing Committee. Upon the request of any voting member of a Standing Committee, vote shall be taken by a secret and/or off-line ballot.
      ii. An observer (from the members of the HSSoE Faculty) may be assigned by a voting member of a Standing Committee to monitor and participate in the Standing Committee meetings in their absence. Such observers do not have voting privileges nor can make or second motions. Observers can ask for an off-line ballot.

4. Professional MS Program
   a. Questions brought forth by EC members were presented and discussed.
   b. Discussion revealed that there are still many lingering questions.

**Action Items:**
(i) EC members to send the EC Chair questions raised by reviewing the MEng Proposal before December 18, 2019
(ii) EC Chair to send Assoc. Dean Kurdahi the list of compiled EC member questions and request a written response before Jan 8th, 2020.
(iii) EC Chair to invite Assoc. Dean Kurdahi to the Jan. 15\textsuperscript{th}, 2020 EC meeting to discuss these questions and the MEng program.

5. **Member Items**
   a. Report on Action Items from Oct. 16\textsuperscript{th} meeting. (Tabled)
   b. Faculty parking issue raised during last year’s EC meetings. (Tabled)

Meeting adjourned 3:03 pm
Meeting Minutes  
Winter 2020, 1st Meeting of the  
HSSoE Executive Committee  
January 15, 2020 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Engineering Hall 5204

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Nader Bagherzadeh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Feng Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>Elliot Hui</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Russell Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Rainer Doemer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Lorenzo Valdevit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:08 pm.

1. Approval of November 20, 2019 meeting minutes

Motion: Plamen Atanassov to approve minutes.  
Second: Mike McNally  
Revisions: In Action Items, replace first names with “Chair and Secretary”.

Vote: 11 present, 10 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain  
Motion is Passed: November 20, 2019, EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Announcements
   a. Chancellor and Provost Visit to HSSoE: Feb 10th, 3-5pm  
      i. Chair requests that EC members solicit questions from their colleagues and departments  
         and send to Chair by Feb 1st. Chair will compile and forward to Chan./Prov. office.

Action Items:
   • EC Members Atanassov and McNally to draft a statement from the EC about the type of questions sought  
     by the committee for the Chan./Prov. to help draw out appropriate and high-quality questions.
   • EC Members are to send the Chair any collected questions by Feb 1st.

3. Discussion on HSSoE MEng Program and Executive Committee Questions, with Assoc. Dean Kurdahi
a. **EC Member Question (ECQ):** It is unclear who governs the MEng program. For example, governance resides with the faculty associated with each of our undergraduate and graduate programs. Such clarity does not seem to be the case with MEng. Do Faculty have governance over the program, and/or who owns the program?
   
i. **Assoc. Dean Kurdahi (ADK):** It is a fundamentally different type of program and structure. There are Faculty Representatives on the MEng Executive Committee who are elected by the departments that govern the program. Management of the courses, curriculum, etc., are expected to be conducted through DMFs from the faculty in the department for each MEng concentration.
   
   1. **EC members suggest** that the MEng bylaws be modified to include that concentration courses are to be approved by the Faculty in the appropriate department.

b. **ECQ:** How does the answer to item a. (previous question) relate to Q4 from the list of submitted questions from the EC to Associate Dean Kurdahi about the MEng program (the Q&A list)?
   
i. **ADK:** The departments select reps to the school-owned program. The current list of representatives are appointed by ADK and are interim for the inaugural year only. Departments control the technical courses in the concentration, how admissions are made, metrics for graduation.

b. **ECQ:** How will the resources/revenues be distributed?
   
i. **ADK:**
   
   1. HSSoE Dean’s Office takes 30% off the top; then, the net revenue goes into a pot that is split 3 ways: 1/3 fellowships, 1/3 FTE lines, 1/3 discretionary. Concentrations take the revenue in proportion to their enrollment numbers.
   2. Also, TA support is provided for every section taught in the program. So there will be a TA built into the expenses, but this is support for the department (and MS students, if applicable).
   3. Faculty teaching combined MS and MEng courses get compensated per student. This is counted towards consulting hours if they want to pay themselves. The compensation, however, can be deposited in an Academic Enrichment Fund account. Teaching one course as an overload count as 5-6 days of consulting. If funds are deposited in an Academic Enrichment Fund account, then this might not count towards faculty consulting hours, although, Assoc. Dean Kurdahi is working to get this clarified.

    1. Roughly the comparison is $1300/student/course MS vs $1500/student/course MEng.

    2. **Dean Washington:** Keep in mind that Faculty aren’t compensated, currently, for teaching graduate courses (outside of NRT and block, which is based on the number of nonresident MS students in your program, not courses).

    3. **ECQ:** But, now we have MEng and MS (state) students, one set brings a large sum of resources to the faculty and department, the other may bring modest
resources to the department. Would not this lead to differential treatment, and a conflict of interest?

4. **ADK**: We have a similar model in Access UCI. But for the MEng program, it is even a better deal because the MEng students are being selected/admitted by the Faculty. Also, MEng brings TA support.

e. **ECQ**: Doesn’t this raise an ethical issue? Why would departments take students in their MS programs? Won’t these programs die?
   i. **ADK**: Regarding the MEng is, the goal is to keep MS enroll flat.

f. **ECQ**: The programs (i.e., the MEng proposal) were approved on the basis that the MEng courses were different from those currently in the MS programs.
   i. **ADK**: Concurrent enrollment is a transient problem, and not the final solution. The plan is to deploy courses piecemeal over a few years and add MEng-only courses as the programs become financially solvent. Then MEng electives from MS courses will be the only instances of concurrent enrollment.

g. **ECQ**: Is it to the discretion of the instructor that MEng students can enroll?
   i. **ADK**: They are the department’s programs and so it is up to them to decide, via the MEng program representative, which MS courses are applicable for MEng students.

h. **ECQ**: How do Faculty get paid for teaching MEng courses and how is the teaching load handled?
   i. **ADK**: Compensation ~$19,500 to teach a separate course
      1. Can be stipend on top of the faculty salary
      2. Or bank in Academic Enrichment Fund account, cannot take as salary later
      3. Can split, only under concurrent enrollment

i. **ECQ**: What if students choose existing courses (not P) and then P courses are not enough to cover the cost of the P course (a P course is an MEng course separate from MS courses)?
   i. **ADK**: As the MEng program ramps up, the MS courses will need to be limited to avoid underfunding the MEng program.

j. **ADK Comment**: There needs to be a tighter feedback loop in place for MEng course improvement (especially initially) to ensure the quality of the MEng programs are attractive and meeting the expectations of the MEng students.

k. **EC Comment**: The MEng program that is rolling out is fundamentally different compared to what was presented to my department.

l. **ECQ**: Taken to the limit, it seems that MS ought to or will minimize, maybe it’s best to just remove it?
   i. **ADK**: There are core courses, and as program ramps up the regular courses (perhaps those originally proposed) will need to be limited to avoid underfunding the MEng program.

m. **ECQ**: How will MEng and MS student reviews be counted or separated in retention and promotion cases?
   i. **ADK**: This remains to be determined. It is a discussion that needs to be had across the departments and the school.

n. **ADK Comment**: Self-supporting programs are reviewed to see that they are not hurting the state programs.

o. **ECQ**: Are there FTEs arising from the MEng program? Would some faculty only be teaching MEng?
   i. **ADK**: Professors of Teaching (LSOE) will be hired to teach professional courses and run/supervise projects, they will have a home department (i.e., will be FTEs).
p. **ECQ:** In regular MS programs, departments/faculty can decide not to admit students in a given year. What about for the MEng Programs?
   i. **ADK:** I advise against doing this.

q. **ECQ:** What if faculty aren’t available to teach MEng courses (for whatever reason)?
   i. **ADK:** Hiring lectures from outside would solve the problem, just as it is done in other situations.

r. **ECQ:** What is the qualification for outside lecturers to teach MEng courses?
   i. **ADK:** The CCGA requires all lecturers to be of comparable quality/qualifications to that of Faculty.

s. **ECQ:** What about potential conflicts of interest when reviewing personnel cases? For example, the director of the program evaluating the personnel case of a faculty who is teaching MEng courses?
   i. **ADK:** This would be conflict, so this should be stated and the person should recuse themselves from the review of the case. We are getting clarification from Campus about this as well.

t. **ECQ:** The advertisement on the Grad. Division website has 5 programs, one of which is in fact not being offered.
   i. **ADK:** This is an error and will be corrected.

u. **ECQ:** What is the procedure to fix bylaws
   i. **ADK:** Mechanism is in place, but it is probably a good idea to get MEng faculty leadership in place first (through elections) before making revisions to the bylaws.

v. **ECQ:** Plan was to hire regular FTEs (and/or endowed). If MEng program crashes, what happens to these faculty members?
   i. **Dean Washington:** If enrollment dries up, look to retirements/separations. But this type of situation probably won’t happen in a vacuum.

**Action Item:** Executive Committee will send Assoc. Dean Kurdahi follow up questions.

4. **Voting Procedures for HSSoE Bylaws**
   a. Discussion on draft language. The two draft items slightly modified.

**Motion** by Mike McNally: *For each Standing Committee, a quorum consists of more than 50 percent of its voting members. A simple majority of the votes cast is needed for approval of motions made in each Standing Committee. Upon the request of any voting member of a Standing Committee, vote shall be taken by a secret and/or off-line ballot. If approved, be forwarded to the HSSoE Faculty for general voting on adoption to the HSSoE Bylaws.*

   **Second:** Plamen Atanassov
   **Vote:** 12 present, 12 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain
   **Motion passed**

**Motion** by Mike McNally: *An observer (from the members of the HSSoE Faculty) may be assigned by a voting member of a Standing Committee to monitor and participate in the Standing Committee meetings in their absence. Such observers do not have voting privileges nor can make or second motions. If approved, be forwarded to the HSSoE Faculty for general voting on adoption to the HSSoE Bylaws.*
Second: Russ Detwiler

Discussion: Can observer be a voting member? EC decided: Yes, but this person will not have a second vote.

Vote: 12 present, 12 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion passed

5. Member Items
   a. What is the process for hiring directors of Centers? Should the Dean more heavily consult the department on the selection of final candidates?
   b. EC briefly discussed with Dean Washington. The specifics of the center do enter into the appropriate actions.

Meeting adjourned 3:27 pm
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1. How is faculty governance exercised in the M.Eng program? The faculty governance consists of an M.Eng Program Director, who reports to Dean Washington, industry advisory board, and executive committee. The executive committee will be comprised of a concentration director from each concentration and potentially specialization advisors, if warranted by enrollment. The M.Eng Program Director will be advised by the industry advisory board and will manage the executive committee. Membership in the program faculty list is open to all UCI faculty who thematically match the program’s scope. The M.Eng program faculty will then elect the executive committee and vote on adding membership to any other UCI faculty member.

2. How are the M.Eng concentration directors elected? Starting in Year 1 of the M.Eng program, concentration directors will be elected by the M.Eng program faculty within that concentration. They will serve a two-year term. In Year 0, the appointments were made by the M.Eng Program Director in consultation with the Department Chairs of the related concentration. They will serve until June 30, 2020.

3. Who is academically in charge of the M.Eng program and how? The Program Director is academically in charge of the M.Eng program. He or she will work with each concentration director to develop and assess academic outcomes. The current Program Director for Year 0-3 is Associate Dean Fadi Kurdahi.

4. Whom are the faculty members associated with each concentration? How are they selected? The M.Eng faculty list is as follows:
   BME: Michelle Digman, Michelle Khine
   CEE: Sunny Jiang, Farzad Naeim, Farzin Zareian, Diego Rosso
   EECS: Ozdal Boyraz, Lee Swindlehurst
   MAE: Derek Dunn-Rankin, Manuel Gamero-Castano, Ken Mease

5. Voting (Appendix 4) shows departments approved the concept of M.Eng and not the entire proposal. Does this proposal have the buy-in of the HSSoE faculty? Several presentations were made to the departments at their retreats and/or faculty meetings. Prior to the vote, an executive summary was distributed to the departments prior to voting. The proposal was also made available to those who asked for it.

6. The M.Eng proposal refers to Core Faculty, Program Faculty, Graduate Committee, and Graduate Advisors. These positions are loosely defined or undefined in the proposal. How are these positions connected to the M.Eng program? The Core Faculty listed in the proposal pertains to those who drafted and created the curriculum for a concentration or specialization. Moving forward, the Core Faculty will be the M.Eng Program Director and executive committee. Program Faculty will consist of any faculty member who is teaching a course in the program and/or who seek affiliation for other reasons. The program faculty will also consist of outside lecturers hired to teach specific courses. Graduate Committee refers to the executive committee and graduate staff who will advise the students. Graduate Advisor is another term for concentration director but will be officially known as concentration director in any future communication.

7. Does teaching M.Eng courses affect the teaching load of faculty? If so, how? It is an individual faculty members decision to supplement their existing and regular teaching load in order to teach an M.Eng course. If they do, it is in excess to their existing teaching load and the course will be compensated as consulting days.

8. The March 2018 proposal shows four concentrations (i.e. from BME, CEE, EECS, MAE) but the website of the M.Eng program is advertising for five concentrations (i.e. addition of MSE). Is the MSE program approved? The M.Eng website nor the School of Engineering website advertises
MSE concentration since it has not yet been approved by the campus. Currently, the MSE concentration addition is waiting on approval from Council of Planning and Budget.

9. What aspects of the M.Eng program have changed compared to the March 2018 proposal document? For example, the list of EECS concentration courses in the proposal (which has now evolved into 2 specializations on DSP and circuit design topics) have changed (but no CpE topic). The concentrations and specializations in the proposal were proposed by the departments and have not changed since the proposal was submitted.

10. Since self-supporting programs must separate themselves from state-supported traditional degrees, we understand that courses are run separately (in different classrooms). Is this indeed the case? If not, how are expenses separated? What is the relationship to current (i.e. traditional) MS programs in terms of cross-enrollment and enrolment impacts? Courses created for this program will be taught as different sections in different classrooms. In some cases, M.Eng students will enroll in state-supported courses via concurrent enrollment. For concurrent enrollment, the payment structure is as follows: the department will receive $1,500 per M.Eng student per seat/course. Out of that $1,500, they will be strongly encouraged to provide $500 to the instructor. The other $1,000 could be used to support a PhD student as a TA for that course. Concurrent enrollment would only occur for a course as long as the instructor approves. With that, state-funded students would have priority registration for the course.

11. How many of the suggested M.Eng concentrations and courses are developed already? What are the plans for the coming year for course development? All four concentrations included in the submitted proposal have been approved. All courses in the proposal are developed and added to the Course Inventory Management system. We are currently working with each concentration director to confirm the 2020-21 course offerings. There may be minor tweaks to course outlines, but those changes would fall within the guidelines of the campus.

12. In at least one M.Eng concentration, the set of M.Eng course titles/topics appears to be a close match with existing course titles/topics. Are the performance expectations for students different? For concurrent enrollment courses, we encourage the instructor to incorporate course learning outcomes related to the M.Eng program.

13. What is the admission process for the M.Eng program? The admissions process will be handled centrally via the Associate Director of Recruitment and Admissions. That being said, the application review and admission decisions will be primarily determined by the program faculty. Each concentration director will serve as the admissions chair for their specific concentration.

14. What are the statistics on the number of applications of prospective students to M.Eng concentrations? Since the admission deadline is still pending and applications are still coming in, we will provide the most up to date numbers by the meeting date.

15. The M.Eng program is listed as 40 units: nine courses (3 core and 6 specializations) are 36 units, and a capstone is 8 units, for a total of 44 (which shows a mismatch). What are the time-to-complete, and the number of units required to complete the M.Eng program? Similar to most of the MS programs in Engineering, we will be referring to degree requirements in terms of courses. As such, the requirements for graduation are 3 core courses, 6 specialization technical courses, and 2 Capstone Project courses. Students will be required to complete all of the courses within one academic year. One exception is that students can extend the length of the program for up to 6 months in order to complete the Capstone Project.

16. What is the accreditation status of the M.Eng program? Will M.Eng be reviewed by APRB? If yes, then what is the criteria for such evaluation? The M.Eng program will be required to submit an
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annual progress report to Graduate Council. Three years after the admission of the program’s first cohort, Graduate Council will conduct an independent review. In the preceding years, M.Eng will be reviewed annually by the Office of Planning and Budget. Following a successful third year review by Graduate Council, M.Eng will be incorporated into the Academic Senate’s standard program review process. Criteria includes: program intent and recruitment, congruence with University mission, ladder faculty involvement, relation to state-supported academic programs, curriculum, financial, graduation metrics, participant evaluation, facilities and staff, and professional engagement.  

17. The M.Eng proposal indicates that proposers have conducted a detailed cost/benefit analysis; different financial scenarios have indicated that the M.Eng program will be profitable and self-sustaining in year 1 and beyond. What are the details of this analysis and what is the current projection? Please see Appendix 10 and 11 in the proposal for the details.  

18. What is the cost per student and how it is paid (e.g. single fee, course-based) for the M.Eng program? The program cost per student is tentatively $42,000 to be paid on a quarterly basis. This does not include campus-mandated fees and health insurance. It also does not include program costs for extend length of program (student choice).  

19. How do the finances get allocated (UCI share for registration and space, instructor/TA costs) for the M.Eng program? Please see Appendix 10 and 11 in the proposal for the details.  

20. How will net revenues of the M.Eng program be distributed and with what restrictions? The net revenue will be split into 3 equal funds: PhD student fellowships, FTE funding, and discretionary. Funds will be distributed to the concentrations in proportion to their enrollment numbers.  

21. What is the difference between the M.Eng and the traditional MS programs in terms of resource allocation (per student) to HSSoE and Departments? The two programs are fundamentally different. MS is a state-supported program so tuition/fees are paid to campus which allocates budget to schools based on a campus-wide policy while M.Eng is a self-supporting program where the School collects the tuition and manages the expenses/profit locally. Currently Campus returns $4000/student/year of the MS NRST paid. By comparison, we project the M.Eng program to return over $10K/student initially rising to over $20K/student when enrollment grows as projected.  

22. Will block funding be reduced if the number of students in the traditional MS program collapses, or does block funding only depend on Ph.D. enrollment? Our projections assume that the MS enrollment will remain flat. Furthermore, Graduate Division’s current Block algorithm does not give much weight to MS enrollment. MS students are counted at 0.15 for enrollment (as compared to 1.0 for PhD Year 1 and 2 and .05 for Year 3+) and .1 on 3-year average of degrees awarded (as compared to 1.5 for PhD degrees awarded).  

23. How is the TA recruitment administered and conducted? Who determines TAs? Do faculty advisors have a say? For TA appointments in concurrent enrollment courses, it will be determined by the instructor of the course and department administration with consultation from M.Eng Program Director if needed. For M.Eng courses, TA appointments will be administered and appointed by the instructor, M.Eng Program Director, and/or concentration director. Payroll for all M.Eng funded TAs will be handled by GPS staff.  

24. Will there be a coordinated strategy to advertise the new and the traditional MS programs? For example, will prospective students see a home page for all MS programs offered by the HSSoE, listing the differences? GPS staff has been actively recruiting for all Engineering graduate programs including PhD, MS, and M.Eng programs. Departments are also encouraged to conduct recruitment activities for their PhD and MS programs as well as M.Eng concentrations.
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if applicable. Currently, there is a Programs and Concentrations webpage (found at http://engineering.uci.edu/admissions/graduate/programs-and-concentrations/programs-and-concentrations) that is hosted on the SSoE website. On this webpage, there is a link to a comparison chart, which details the differences between the professional vs. traditional MS programs.
The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:15 pm.

1. Approval of January 15, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion: Lorenzo Valdevit
Second: Manuel Gamero-Castano

Vote: 11 present, 11 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain
Motion is Passed: January 15, 2020 EC meeting minutes are approved.

2. Recap of:
   a. Chancellor and Provost Visit
      i. The EC members discussed the Chancellor/Provost answer about the recent undergraduate admissions numbers not being “primarily” motivated by increasing yield.
         1. Generally, the committee agreed that there are likely many factors (as the Chancellor described) involved, outside of just SAT and GPA scores. However, the consensus from the discussion was that the admissions process needs to consider undergraduate program goals and not only a few high-level yet low-resolution school-level goals.
      ii. EC member urged the UGSC that action needs to be taken soon before admissions occur this year and agreed that perhaps the EC may need to help the UGSC put more pressure on CUARS and the Admissions Office.
iii. ITAR – Lorenzo is on a campus wide task force (or committee) to assess the systems UCI has in place to address IP security concerns. A report to the Chancellor will be released to all on campus within a month or so. There is a screening system in place for visitors (there is a website for this).

iv. Faculty Housing –
   1. There are transportation issues for new development areas. Usage of land currently under the Los Lomas apartment area, and areas off-campus, have contractual issues. It appears that faculty housing is an issue that has many parties involved each of which is looking into one or two challenges. There should be a concerted effort to tackle these.
   2. New faculty waitlist issue – Three EC members expressed concerns about housing for new faculty. Over the past 2-3 years, new faculty did not receive new homes in the lottery system, are left waiting on an ever slowing Resale waitlist. Meanwhile, the current ICHA/UCI policy limits new faculty to have priority on the resale list to only two years. The policy risks forcing many new faculty members out of University Hills, while the benefits of living in the University Hills community were used in their recruitment effort.
   3. Resale price issue – One EC member mentioned that the valuation of resale homes might also need to be revisited.
   4. Retirement issue – People are living alone in 4-bedroom houses, but things like Prop 13 (which froze real estate taxes in the late 1970 and early 80’s) and soaring real estate prices in the area are restrictive for folks to move, even if it is to downsize. This locks up housing for those waiting on housing. Therefore, the University may need to consider developing a mechanism that helps retired faculty to downsize and move out of the homes in University Hills to free up homes.
   5. This situation could have retention ramifications after newer faculty are forced to the outside housing market, which is entirely unaffordable anywhere near campus.

v. Retention efforts
   1. The Provost mentioned that in each of the last couple of years the HSSoE spent about $2 million to retain faculty.
   2. There was a discussion about keeping faculty satisfied and avoiding retention situations
      a. EC members commented about new hires having time restrictions for their setup funds and lab space, and this is causing friction and dissatisfaction.
      b. Some cases approach missed commitments from offer letters.
   3. Engagement of Assistant Professor incubation
      a. The school has exploded with Assistant Professors. We need to make sure they are given all the opportunities to become successful and not leave.

Action Item: EC to inform Dean, EC to suggest some items that may help with faculty housing, satisfaction, and retention.

b. HSSoE Faculty meeting Winter 2020
   i. Chair Updates:
      1. Roll out of sharing Standing Committee meeting minutes to HSSoE Faculty. Announced three years of data already posted.
      2. Voting for the two amendments to HSSoE bylaws.
      3. Discussion about the MEng program.
      4. Recap of Chancellor and Provost visit to HSSoE.
ii. Undergraduate Committee updates
   1. Engaging campus authorities for enrollment management.
   2. Implementing the recommendations from ABET from their latest visit.
   3. Engaging Office of Academic Honesty to identify best practices for our faculty to manage cases of academic dishonesty.

iii. Graduate Committee updates
   1. Reduction in Ph.D. and MS applications
   2. The requirement for managing E-IDP and Research Expectation document is under review by the Graduate Council,

iv. Research Committee
   1. Discussion about initiatives, one of which is to start the development of faculty productivity index.
   2. EC member mentioned that transparency was lacking in the past for CORCL money.

3. Undergraduate Studies Committee letter to CUARS
   a. Assc. Dean Mike Green has been in communication with Admissions Office and CUARS on what the admissions criteria are but has received lots of pushback and not much of a response.
   b. HSSoE would like to tune admission on a program-by-program basis and would like to receive the criteria by which admissions are happening now. UGSC has been requesting this for months with no motion.

   Action Item: EC to provide feedback on the letter prepared by UGSC to CUARS and consider drafting its letter to support the UGSC letter if necessary.

4. MEng Program
   a. CEE held a retreat and invited Assc. Dean Kurdahi for a detailed discussion about the CEE concentration in MEng. There are still many questions left unanswered before the program can be rolled out. CEE Dept. did not see viability in going forward. Similar programs have very few students and the department was not given enough time to plan a program.
   b. MAE and EECS are going forward. MCE is waiting for another year.

5. Research Committee Update on “Research Day” (Tabled)

6. Member Items
   a. Faculty parking issues raised during last year’s EC meetings. (Tabled)

Meeting adjourned 2:50 pm
Meeting Minutes
Spring 2020, 1st Meeting of the
HSSoE Executive Committee
April 15, 2020 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, Remote Meeting via Zoom

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Farzin Zareian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joel Lanning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>James Brody</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Daniel Mumm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>Hamid Jafarkhani</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Syed Jafar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Nader Bagherzadeh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCL</td>
<td>Feng Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate HSSoE Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGSC</td>
<td>Elliot Hui</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Russell Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>Rainer Doemer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Tim Rupert (Sab. Sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:15 pm.

1. Approval of February 15, 2020 meeting minutes
   Correction to an ambiguous sentence was suggested. The sentence was removed.

Motion: Plamen Atanassov
Second: Arash Kheradvar
Vote: 17 present, 17 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain
Motion is Passed: February 15, 2020, EC meeting minutes, as revised, are approved.

2. Faculty-Approved HSSoE Bylaws – Voting
   a. Chair reported that the summary of the HSSoE Faculty vote on the proposed Sections 2.A.5 and 2.A.6 collected by the Secretary. Both revisions to the HSSoE Bylaws are approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSSoE Bylaws Section 2.A.5</th>
<th>HSSoE Bylaws Section 2.A.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve: 29 votes (82.9%)</td>
<td>Approve: 31 votes (88.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Approve: 2 votes = 5.7%</td>
<td>Do Not Approve: 2 votes = 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain: 4 votes = 11.4%</td>
<td>Abstain: 2 votes = 5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Update from Dean Washington on Current Hiring and Recruitment (see attachment)
   a. Several candidates have been identified, and negotiations are underway. Several others have been postponed. If departments are/were far enough along in the process and had identified promising
candidates, then they have been able to continue the process. Faculty searches that had not invited candidates (or were half-way through) were postponed.

b. Some positions are passed to next year under the Interim Dean. The campus has informed HSSoE that they can hold on to the allocated FTEs but not recruit.

c. There will be no Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA) this year. However, merit increases, and promotions will be funded.

d. EC members asked about the possibility of furloughs in light of the aggressive hiring campaign at HSSoE. Few universities have entered a hiring-freeze mode.
   i. Dean Washington noted that currently, there are no plans for furlough; however, things are changing so furloughs could happen.

e. EC question about two categories of hirings: general faculty who work with departments (mainly at the Assistant Professor level), and high-level/center directors (e.g., BLI and HiMAC directors). The latter report to the Dean and are hired with significant input from the Dean’s Office. What is the status of high-level/center director hires?
   i. Dean Washington noted that the BLI and HiMAC (HORIBA) positions have doners, and we are working with the campus to move forward with these hires. The hiring for the director of Edwards Lifesciences Center for Advanced Cardiovascular Technology will be put on hold.

f. EC members commented about furlough and salary raise; would it be possible to implement COLA and furlough together? It makes more sense to do COLA and go on furlough if need be.
   i. Dean Washington noted that would be costly.

4. Update from the Undergraduate Affairs Committee (UGAC) on Admissions (See Attachment)

   a. The letter to CUARS from UGAC was not sent due to three concerns: 1) it was too late to be effective for this year’s admission cycle, and 2) Campus has already heard our comments and has made adjustments to Undergraduate Admissions practice, 3) shut-down due to COVID-19.

   b. SIRs are up for UCI but down for Engineering, so far. The numbers are concerning for HSSoE (%45 lower SIR compared to last year this time). We are hopeful that SIR numbers would grow after Celebrating UCI event.

      i. Dean Washington noted that similar numbers, but different kinds of students were admitted this year. The model is wrong and it is targeting very high students.

      ii. Dean Washington stated that Faculty wanted to be part of the process and now that things are down. We will need to be actively engaged in recruitment.

      iii. Chair of EC responded that it was the Dean that initiated the discussion and negotiations with UCI Admissions Office about problems with how admissions are administered for HSSoE [and not the Faculty]. During this process, the Dean’s Office requested HSSoE Faculty’s help by engaging the UGAC. Throughout the negotiations with UCI Admissions Office, it was the Dean’s Office who led the negotiations.

      iv. EC member commented: faculty need to contact prospective students to increase SIR numbers. Dean Washington supports this approach.

c. EC member commented: The number 1 rated students seem not to get admission due to other campus priorities. We need to engage with the UCI Admissions Office to understand their admissions model.

d. EC member commented that in their program, 2 years ago, 71 had been rated number 1 in the holistic review, and less than 20 received acceptance. The department has asked many times, but the campus has provided no answer.
e. There’s some discussion about UCI moving to the UCLA admissions model in which students are admitted into schools and then into programs in a staged manner.

5. **Update from the Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC) on Admissions Grad admissions** (See Attachment)
   a. SIR numbers for MS and Ph.D. Graduate Students are up.
   b. Numbers are not 1:1 with this time last year because last year we were dealing with Slate.
   c. EC member asked if there will be reduced expenses now that we are offering courses in an on-line format. There was no answer to this question.

6. **Update from the Research Committee (RA)**
   a. The Chair of the Research Committee inquired if Travel/Research funds can be used for other related expenses to meet CORCL possible deadline (for using the funds this year), or push the date of use back since so many conferences and events are canceled.

**Action Item:** Chair of RC to communicate with CORL about this.

7. **Member Items**
   a. The Chair reminded committee members about the Spring HSSoE Faculty Meeting on May 11, 2020.
   b. Few members of the EC asked Dean Washington about the Interim Dean. There are concerns about the smoothness of the transition period if the announcement of the Interim Dean is further postponed. HSSoE Faculty are asking questions. Dean Washington responded that he could not comment on this item during the EC meeting.

**Meeting adjourned 2:58 pm**
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The Executive Committee (EC) special meeting was called to order by the Chair at 11:04 am.

The Chair opened the meeting with a statement from the two members calling for the Special Meeting:

The goal is to get together and think about strategies that minimize the impact of the current cuts to HSSoE and the potential of losing some of our staff colleagues due to the financial situation. One example may be to rethink the current hiring offers whose process of hiring is not yet finalized to save money. Altogether, we can all think of other measures as well.

The Chair continued with a summary of the recent letter from UC President Napolitano announcing systemwide actions to address the initial financial impact of COVID-19:

- a systemwide freeze on salaries for policy-covered staff employees;
- a systemwide freeze on salary scales for policy-covered, non-student academic appointees. To ensure a stable faculty pipeline and to maintain our teaching and research enterprise, the regular academic peer-review merit advancement program will be continued;
- current Chancellors and the UC President will take a voluntary pay cut of 10 percent

As we continue to address the current and anticipated shortfalls in our funding, we are also taking the following actions:

- Developing budget scenarios for locations and UCOP that anticipate budget cuts for the coming 2020-21 fiscal year. Each UC location faces unique circumstances which will require different budgetary strategies and actions, so cuts will not necessarily be uniform across the system;
- Initiating discussions with our union leaders to be sure they understand the current reality of our financial circumstances;
- Continuing to look for ways to reduce expenses such as eliminating non-essential travel and renegotiating service agreements.
EC member, Initial concerns and thoughts:
- Since the HSSoE and UCI have undergone many changes recently (i.e., Dean Washington leaving and Mike Green stepping in as interim, as well as having an Interim Provost), it seemed prudent that the EC meet to discuss these issues as we are the key advisory committee for the school.
- It is highly likely that Graduate and Undergraduate students from China have visa problems.
- Some current students have decided to leave and return to Asian countries’ universities to finish their degrees.

EC member, Initial concerns and thoughts: How many hires are in the process of being hired and how many others are in the pipeline? We need to make sure that we are strategic in investments.

Incoming Interim Dean Mike Green (ID Green):
- UCI is in good shape compared to other UCs, HSSoE also in good shape, and gifts are still coming in.
- Regarding hires, a memo dated April 30th went out to Deans and Chairs stating that:
  - Recruitment are paused unless offers had been extended; however, departments were able to make requests to carry forward for allocations for a few cases.
  - For 2020-2021 new FTEs through the multi-year hiring plan and those with failed searches in 2019-2020 will be retained. Departments must provide a plan for these lines for the upcoming academic year (plan by June 5th.).
  - Interim Provost Hal Stern has noted that after next year, basically only replacements hires will be carried out for a while.

EC Member: We might be up against a new economy that will significantly affect our ability to hire, or it may recover quickly. Either way, it behooves us to focus on the quality of our programs and our students.

EC Member: We might not want to be overly conservative and drop our recruitment drastically. We seem to be relatively in good shape compared to many other schools, UCs, and other universities.

EC Member: It is important to have a plan for our Sub-2 Staff.

ID Green: Not aware that anyone is in jeopardy of losing their job, even if they are not on a Sub-1 category. Research centers likely have more Sub-2 staff, but departments may have a few. They do try to shift them to Sub-1 as frequently as possible.

EC Member: We ought to use UCI’s relative health to our advantage in hiring. Raising money is also very important right now. Our focus/job is to find more resources and make things work.

EC Member: Is there a way to ease the process for smaller donors? For instance, small donors seem interested in creating named fellowships, and, maybe, other avenues for showing recognition. But there have been problems that appear to be because the school is focused only on more substantial donation sums.

ID Green: This is an essential item and it ought to be addressed. An offline conversation is likely appropriate to discuss the details of particular cases/opportunities.

EC Member: The campus will do everything possible to ensure we don’t go into the red. The UC shut down hiring in the 2008 crisis and the Univ. of Texas took advantage syphoning away some hires from the UC system.

EC Member: ID Green, any thoughts on the upcoming MEng and the impact of the current events on the program?
**ID Green**: Supportive of the effort, but does not know too much about the finances, yet. It looks like the first-year numbers are pretty good, especially given current events.

**EC Member**: How will Opportunity, Spousal, and Diversity hires be affected?

**ID Green**: Those programs have worked so well and are so important to the school, that it does not seem likely that these will be affected.

**EC Member**: What is the status of the UG admissions? Do we plan to make any changes?

**ID Green**: Central admissions recently conducted two waves of admitting from the waitlist and were able to filter by major. Now Fall 2020 admissions are within 20% of last year’s number; however, for a few programs like civil and BME, the numbers are still down. Students were notified that housing not being guaranteed, instructions may occur online, and full tuition still applies. So that might impact how many show up. Applications are using a holistic review and HS grades only - no test scores.

**EC Member**: ID Green, we made a considerable investment in our LSOEs and need to move them into permanent FTE lines.

**ID Green**: Yes, that is the plan.

**Meeting adjourned** – 11:51am
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The Executive Committee (EC) meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:05 pm.

1. Andrew Berk, UCI ADA Coordinator, Office of Equal Opportunity, and Diversity.
   a. Andrew is First ADA Coordinator for UCI, which represents UCI’s significant commitment to Accessibility and Equity for those with disabilities. [https://www.oed.ucla.edu/about/staff.php](https://www.oed.ucla.edu/about/staff.php).  
   Email: anberk@uci.edu
   b. This is an introductory meeting and an effort for the HSSoE Executive Committee to meet the ADA Coordinator.
   c. Please be sensitive to the confidentiality of a student’s disability status.
   d. Please feel free to contact Andrew for any issues related to Accessibility.

Discussion:

EC Comment: We do recognize the importance of ADA. Faculty commonly work with students who have gone through DSC. We are lucky to have DSC physically located in our School’s corner.

EC Question: What about wet labs and other science lab classes?
Answer: We are working on a Fall quarter wet labs, and more information will be available soon. DSC is the first point of contact; if you have a class or lab that you need help addressing disability access, then they will be able to help point you in the right direction.

EC Question: Are you and your office involved with the design of our new buildings (e.g., ISEB) to ensure they are accessible?
Answer: Yes, I do review the plans and coordinate with the architect and fire marshal to work towards solutions if issues arise. Our mission is to exceed requirements, not just meet them.
2. Approval of April 15, and June 1, 2020, meeting minutes.

Approval of April 15, 2020 meeting minutes

**Motion:** Jim Brody  
**Second:** Plamen Atanassov  
**Vote:** 18 present, 16 in favor, 0 against, 2 abstain  
**Motion is Passed:** April 15, 2020, EC meeting minutes are approved.

Approval of June 1, 2020 Special meeting minutes

**Motion:** Ozdal Boyraz  
**Second:** Plamen Atanassov  
**Vote:** 18 present, 15 in favor, 0 against, 3 abstain  
**Motion is Passed:** June 1, 2020, EC Special meeting minutes are approved.

3. Approval of the Standing Committee Elected Chairs for 2020-21

- GSC – Michelle Digman.  
- UGSC – Elliot Hui.  
- Research – Solmaz Kia.  
- No discussion, no objections recorded. Standing Committee Chairs are approved by the EC.

4. Updates and Annual Reports from Standing Committees

**Update from the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) – Russ Detwiler**

a. SIRs numbers - some concerns are growing for the Fall quarter. We are getting requests for deferrals.  
b. E-IDP – Engineering Individual Development Plan was implemented this year in response to a mandate by the Grad. Division. A good amount of feedback has been received; GSC has decided to continue with the E-IDP form for next year. A survey will be announced to seek feedback and suggestions for improvements/update for the 2021/22 academic year. Please watch out for that survey.  
c. GSR Step Levels – To meet UCI-published cost of living expenses, the committee considered raising GSR Step Levels. The discussion was initially to raise all students from Steps 4, 5, 6 to Step 5, 6, 7, respectively. A compromise was reached within the committee and is summarized within the motion below.

**Motion from GSC to Exec. Committee:** “Increase the GSR level to Step 5 for those who have BS degree effective Fall 2020; graduate programs can adjust percentage in Fall 2020 to maintain the existing offer.”

**Comment:** Adjusting the percentage could have an impact on tuition.  
**Discussion:** This should not affect many (if any).  
**Question:** Why a school level and not department level?  
**Answer:** There are so many interdepartmental/inter-program collaborations we wanted to avoid conflicts.  
**Question:** Is this meant to raise the baseline? Will exiting students receive a raise or just starting?  
**Answer:** Applies to all graduate students.
**Question:** When over 25% appointment must pay tuition and fees, but what if supported less than 24% can you then also pay fees separately?

**Answer:** Not entirely sure, but it seems that you cannot pay tuition and fees from grants for graduate students who receive less than 25% GSR.

**Vote:** 18 present, 17 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain

**Motion is Passed:** Russ to inform the GSC and Assoc. Dean Fadi Kurdahi.

**d.** GSC membership in the Bylaws needs to be addressed. Programs such as joint programs and affiliated programs to be considered or otherwise. Grad. Division is moving campus-level programs into schools. It was decided that the Chair of the Executive Committee look into the formation of each graduate program; graduate programs that have gone through HSSoE approval during their inception will be able to have a member on the GSC.

**Update from the Undergraduate Affairs Committee (UGAC) – Elliot Hui**

**a.** ABET accreditation – overall, the result was very positive. Every program is expected to receive full 6-year accreditation; however, final decisions from ABET have not yet been received.

**b.** Undergrad admissions – many issues (see all minutes from EC and Faculty meetings this year), but SIR are not turning out to be as bad as previously feared.

**c.** Other misc. issues were addressed in the committee. See attached slides.

**Update from the Research Committee (Research) – Solmaz Kia**

**d.** The committee continued to discuss additional responsibilities/tasks that the committee could take on in the future. To be further discussed with the Dean’s Office.

**Update from the Chair of Executive Committee – Farzin**

**a.** In the interest of time, please refer to the Spring 2020 HSSoE Faculty meeting minutes, where the Chair’s report was also summarized. During the past year, we covered few essential items together in the Executive Committee, including changing the HSSoE Bylaws to regulate order in standing committee meetings better, Master of Engineering professional degree program, TA allocation and Workload model, and issues related to the status of our school in light of the received information that Dean Washington will be departing from HSSoE for a new position.

5. **Member Items**

**a. HSSoE Rules/Norms for Professorial Appointments**

One of the EC members inquired from the committee if it is appropriate to make an offer – and/or hire – a full professor, a tenured position, before acquiring external letters and receiving the departmental vote. There is not supposed to be an exception to gaining faculty approval for faculty hiring, no matter the level or position.

The inquiry was followed by a lengthy discussion. A summary is presented here.
i. The inquiry is related to the hiring of a center director. Dean Washington informed the Executive Committee on its April 15 meeting that he will put this hiring on hold. It appears that this hiring is moving forward despite the Dean’s earlier promise.

ii. Few members of the Executive Committee questioned the process for this hiring. Especially, the fact that there has been no meaningful consultation with the faculty of the department where the new hire will be housed before the offer was made.

iii. There was a discussion on not completely following procedures for hiring senior faculty. On the one hand, Deans are typically free to hire directors. On the other hand, the handling of such cases in departments needs to be done with exceptional care for APM guidelines and faculty input. Directorship is not a permanent position and can be transferred at the discretion of a Dean at any time; however, a tenured professorship is permanent and will remain with the department.

A special meeting is called by Arash Kheradvar, and seconded by Plamen Atanassov, to discuss best practices for hiring senior faculty who may serve as center directors. The Chair of the HSSoE Executive Committee was tasked to invite all department chairs and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to the Special meeting. [The call for the Special meeting was rescinded by the two members on 06/27/2020]

b. Faculty Housing

One of the EC members informed the committee about issues related to faculty housing.

i. Members ought to be aware:
   1. New faculty are facing increasing difficulty in purchasing homes in University Hills. It is not safe to assume that just because new homes are being built that all new faculty are receiving homes upon arrival.
   2. This is a problem for current and upcoming recruitment and for those who have started in the past few years, affecting their retention/morale.
   3. The Provost and VPAP seem to control UHills, not ICHA. Many faculty tell newer faculty to “just bug ICHA all the time, and they will get you to house sooner.” This is not how it works.

ii. New homes:
   1. Offered only to brand new recruits through a one-time-only lottery (an individual can be in only one lottery).
   2. The number of homes is less than the number of recruits each year. Those that do not get a house are placed on the Resale Waitlist.

iii. Existing homes, Resale waitlist:
   1. Top of the list (Category 1) are newly recruited senate faculty. (see attachment).
   2. Provost/VPAP review Category 1 each year and move some people to Category 2.
   3. Criteria is not communicated, those on the waitlist do not have information upon which to make housing decisions (e.g. “surprise, you’re out”).
4. Few existing homes are being sold each year that being placed on Category 2 is effectively like being taken off the resale list (e.g. at the back of the never moving line).

iv. Effects and problems:

1. Some new faculty are (i) not receiving new homes in their lotteries, then (ii) must wait for years on the Resale list only (iii) to suddenly be removed from the top of the Resale list because they are now no longer considered as new recruits. (vi) Now they are forced to the outside market. Provost/VPAP review Category 1 each year and move some people to Category 2.

2. These people could have made other housing decisions while they waited or decided that it was not worth the wait. Instead, they have lost those years and now face even higher outside real estate prices (in this area, prices do not go down. Irvine has increased 150% in 8 years with the mean Irvine home at over $900k, which is far higher than that within UHills.

3. No one knows (or is told) how much these resale homes cost until you are invited to an open house by ICHA. This information needs to be published by ICHA. Otherwise, no one knows what to plan for financially. This is very irresponsible of the campus. Anecdotal evidence: One member viewed two small homes, one was $350k; the other was $600k.

4. The current system is solely focused on using UniHills as a recruitment tool, but once faculty have accepted their offers (post negotiations) and arrived on campus, they are sometimes becoming stuck in the situation described above.

5. Since housing is mainly taken off the table in negotiations (i.e., recruits do not have grounds to ask for housing stipends, etc., as they may for other campuses), this sends the message to recruits that affordable housing is essentially a given. This is not a good way for the campus to treat new recruits. Word may get around, and UCI’s recruitment efforts may become undermined by this practice.

6. Those stuck in this situation may leave, and since they are newer and high-quality faculty, they typically can do so.

v. Overall, the Provost and VPAP’s office (together with ICHA, although they are just facilitators) have created an inequitable system. It is inequitable because some new faculty get affordable housing while others do not, and when they do not they have been hijacked by this opaque and very frustrating system. This is financially damaging for new faculty especially in the face of the area’s outrageous real estate prices

Meeting adjourned 3:40 pm
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI Senate HSSoE Representatives</td>
<td>Ozdal Boyraz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Jean-Daniel-Saphores</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Manuel Gamero-Castano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td>Elliot Hui</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGSC</td>
<td>Russell Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Solmaz Kia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSoE Department Representatives</td>
<td>Arash Kheradvar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Plamen Atanassov</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Mike McNally</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>Rainer Doemer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Yoonjin Won</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Tim Rupert (Sab. Sub.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>Interim Dean</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting of the HSSoE Executive Committee (EC) was called to order by the Chair at 3:05 pm.

1. **Dean search committee (background),**
   a. The HSSoE Faculty received an email, in July, from the Interim Provost’s office announcing the membership of the search committee for the new HSSoE Dean. Executive Committee (EC) Members and other HSSoE Faculty approached the Chair, asking whether or not the EC was consulted and voiced various concerns. As we know, the EC was not consulted and the Chair followed up with the UCI Senate leadership. The Senate leadership informed the Chair that an error on their side has led to they not asking the HSSoE Executive Committee to submit nominations for the formation of the Dean search committee contrary to the ‘Guiding Principles and Best Practices for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Review Committees.’
   b. To rectify the situation, the Interim Provost requested the EC to submit a list of nominees via the Senate Chair. The Interim Provost determines how many and who from that list is added to the current Dean search committee.
   c. Input was sought from the EC. There was a range of ideas; however, we coalesced around the following proposal:

   The Chair of the Executive committee (ex Officio) will serve on the Dean search committee as the delegate from the HSSoE Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will host town halls with the visiting candidates and be asked to weight on their suitability as a Dean expressing the summary of the town hall meetings collectively.
d. This proposal was rejected on the following grounds (verbatim from the Interim Provost Office). We are given a couple of days to submit a list of possible search committee members for the Interim Provost’s consideration,

   i. *It is not (and will not be) campus policy to include the chair of any School executive committee based on the position.*
   
   ii. *As initially proposed, the Interim Provost will consider possible committee members from a list provided by the HSSoE Ex Comm.*
   
   iii. *Continuing with past practice, there will be a town hall event arranged, but it will hosted by the members of the search committee.*
   
   iv. *Processed group feedback will not be solicited. Individual feedback will be solicited and considered.*

e. The feedback from the Interim Provost office was communicated to the EC members. There was a range of suggested responses revolving around three main ideas: i) suspending interaction with the Interim Provost Office, ii) nominating a single HSSoE Faculty (e.g., the incoming Chair of HSSoE Faculty) to serve on the Dean search committee, iii) nominating a few members of the HSSoE Faculty to serve on the Dean search committee.

f. With this background, the Chair suggested spending 30 minutes of the meeting on discussing the various options (i.e., responses), and others that may arise from the conversations today. After the 30 minutes, the committee will decide on a single plan and may spend 15 minutes to finalize the single solution to be communicated with the Interim Provost Office via the Senate Chair.

2. **Discussion**

   a. Suggestion: We should send the same name since they only objected to the townhall portion of our proposal.

   b. Suggestion: We should look at the current list, and if any constituencies are missing, then we may consider nominating someone to correct this.

   i. Reply: It seems the EC is one of those missing constituencies.
   
   ii. Reply: Post-doc and/or research scientist does not seem to be represented.

   1. Member Reply: It seems that the Interim Provost and guidelines ask for EC representation.

   c. Comment: Hamid Jafarkhani is the elected leader of this group and the HSSoE Faculty. It is reasonable to nominate him.

   d. Comment: If we nominate two members (e.g., current and incoming Chairs), then we will give them the opportunity to at least pick one.

   e. Question: Is Hamid amenable to serving in this role?

   f. Chair-Elect, Hamid Jafarkhani, response: As an independent faculty member, he would not have been interested in serving in this role. However, as the elected representative of the HSSoE Faculty and the EC Chair, if the EC wants him to serve in the position, he would be happy to do it. This committee has been trying to emphasize Faculty shared governance as well as working toward increased transparency. And, the EC has the right and the power to be involved in this type of campus and school decision.
Strawpoll – 11 members present plus Chair

The members of the EC nominate two persons for the Dean search committee: 5 votes (Chair did not vote)

The members of the EC nominate one person for the Dean search committee: 6 votes (Chair did not vote)

The members of the EC nominate Hamid Jafarkhani to serve on the Dean search committee: 10 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain (Chair did not vote)

Meeting adjourned 3:53 pm