GRADUATE COUNCIL

MEMBERS' HANDBOOK

2016 - 2017

(Latest revision: August 2016)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GRADUATE COUNCIL
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

2016-17

Ryan Julian, Chemistry (Chair)
Amit Roy Chowdhury, Electrical & Computer Engineering (Vice Chair)
Jayna Brown, Ethnic Studies
Michael Coffey, Plant Pathology & Microbiology (CCGA Representative)
Byron Ford, School of Medicine
Ted Garland, Jr., Biology
Venugopala Reddy Gonehal, Botany and Plant Sciences
Cassandra Guarino, GSOE/SPP
Chris Laursen, Political Science (Chair, Fellowships Subcommittee)
Rene Lysloff, Music
Barry Mishra, SoBA
Hyle Park, Bioengineering
Robert Ream, GSOE (Secretary)
Freya Schiwy, Media & Cultural Studies
Christiane Weirauch, Entomology (Chair, Courses & Programs Subcommittee)
_____ (ex officio), Dean, Graduate Division
_____, Graduate Student Representative
_____, Graduate Student Representative

Sarah Miller, Graduate Council Committee Analyst
Academic Senate
University Office Building (UOB), room 230
951-827-5538 (x-25538)
Sarah.miller@ucr.edu

Graduate Council: Attendance and Participation Policy

The business of Graduate Council is of vital importance to the health and wellbeing of graduate instruction on the UCR campus. For that reason, regular Council meetings are scheduled in advance for the third Thursday of every month, from 9 to 11 a.m. (except in instances of holiday or break, when slight alteration in the schedule occurs, usually moving the meeting forward by one week). When Senate faculty are appointed to serve on Graduate Council, it is expected that they will be available to attend all of these meetings except under special circumstances, such as out-of-town conference attendance or research. When a special circumstance arises, faculty members of Graduate Council should notify the Graduate Council Senate analyst as far in advance as possible; the analyst will also notify the Chair of Graduate Council.

In some cases, attendance may be enabled through online teleconference or other videoconferencing, but only with prior approval of the Chair. Remote attendance is not encouraged and the Chair may place a limit on the number of remote attendances, such as two to three per academic year.

When a faculty member of Council misses a meeting without notifying the Senate analyst in advance, the Chair shall make an inquiry, urging the member to keep in mind that attendance is importance to the smooth functioning of all Council business.

When a faculty member of Council misses two consecutive meetings with or without special circumstances, it shall be up to the discretion of the Chair to recommend that the member resign, and to ask the Committee on Committees to begin a search for an immediate replacement.

The same general principle about attendance and participation applies to Graduate Council subcommittee meetings, including Courses and Programs, Fellowships, and program review subcommittees. In addition to attending meetings, subcommittee members must read materials in advance, rank applications (on occasion), and participate in the writing of draft documents related to graduate program reviews. If any Council member is lax in these additional duties, it will be up to the Chair to determine if the member is still willing and able to serve on Graduate Council.

Revised June 2, 2016
Approved by Graduate Council on November 21, 2013

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is a compilation of relevant bylaws of the Academic Senate related to the Graduate Council, a standing committee of the Senate; various documents and policies prepared by the Council; and descriptions of common practice. The handbook is intended to provide Graduate Council members with an overview of the committee's responsibilities and procedures and to assist them in carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

A. Senate Regulations Pertaining to the Graduate Council

Senate bylaw 8.14 establishes the duties and membership of the Graduate Council. It is reproduced in full as **Appendix 1**.

B. Composition

The Council is composed of at least 15 members, including the Dean of the Graduate Division, non-voting ex officio. The Council has three officers, a CCGA Representative, and two subcommittee chairs. The officers are Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. One member, who may also hold one of the other positions, serves as the Divisional representative to the University Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). There are two standing subcommittees: **Courses and Programs**, and **Fellowships**. In addition, Graduate Program Review Subcommittees will be formed for each graduate program review scheduled. These review subcommittees will consist of at least two members, one of which will act as the review subcommittee Chair (appointed by the Graduate Council Chair). All Council members will serve on at least one review subcommittee in addition to their other standing subcommittee assignment.

There is also an **Administrative Committee** composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, Chairs of the Courses & Programs and Fellowship Subcommittees, the CCGA representative, and the Graduate Division Dean, *ex officio*.

Per Bylaw 8.2.5, each committee must annually adopt a Conflict of Interest Statement to ensure committee business is being conducted with the highest possible degree of credibility. The Council's full Conflict of Interest Statement can be found as **Appendix 2**.

C. Leadership Roles

The **Chair** of the Council is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Chair's responsibilities include conducting Council meetings; writing correspondence on behalf of the Council; representing the Council on the Academic Senate Executive Council; and assisting with the organizing and facilitating of graduate program reviews.

The **Vice Chair** of the Council is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Vice Chair serves as Chair in the Chair's absence and along with the Chair, assists with organizing and facilitating graduate program reviews.

The CCGA Representative is appointed by the Committee on Committees. **Appendix 3** below summarizes the duties of the CCGA Representative.

The **Secretary** of the Council is appointed by the Chair of the Graduate Council. The Secretary is responsible for proofing and finalizing the draft of the minutes produced by the staff analyst.

Subcommittee chairs are appointed by the Graduate Council Chair. Their responsibilities include chairing meetings of the subcommittees and facilitating their work (see sections on subcommittees below).

D. Meeting Schedules

The Council meets on the third Thursday of every month from 9-11am. Meetings are scheduled with consideration of the Academic Senate meeting schedule to prepare business for submission to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Council, on which the Chair serves, also meets twice a month.

The Courses and Programs subcommittee also meets monthly, on the Thursday prior to the full Council meeting (the second Thursday of every month from 9-11am), to prepare business for presentation to the full Council. The Fellowship Committee meets once or twice each quarter. The Administrative Committee meets whenever business needs to be done and the full Council cannot meet, normally in the summer and over holidays, particularly Christmas-New Year's. The CCGA meets monthly. The review subcommittees meet as needed, determined by the schedule of reviews.

E. Online Resources

Graduate Council maintains its own page on the UCR Academic Senate website at http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=13 . Many materials regarding the policies and procedures of Graduate Council are posted there for the convenience of members and for the campus faculty at large.

GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Appendixes 4 and 5 provide detailed explanations of the processes of conducting external and internal graduate program reviews, one of the most important functions of Graduate Council. What follows here is an explanation of practical matters not fully covered in the Appendixes, especially those related to the formation of review subcommittees and their duties.

A. Composition of Review Subcommittees

Each Council member is appointed to serve with at least one other member on one graduate program review subcommittee for each year of his/her service on Graduate Council. Over the course of a normal three-year appointment to Council, each member will serve on at least three reviews. At the beginning of each academic year, it is the duty of the Council Chair and Analyst to determine the membership of each review subcommittee.

B. Responsibilities of Council Members

Each graduate review subcommittee is thus comprised of at least two members (one or more "regular" members and a subcommittee Chair). These members share the following duties:

➤ Review for completeness and accuracy the materials assembled in an electronic binder compiled through a joint effort of faculty and staff from the program under review and the Graduate Council Staff analyst. Typically, the Chair of the subcommittee will call a meeting to discuss these materials prior to sending them to the extramural review team members. For a complete overview and listing of the materials included in the electronic binders, please see **Appendix 4.**

➤ Participate in two meetings with the extramural review team members while they are visiting campus. The first of these meetings is held at the beginning of the first day of the review team's visit, and the second at the end of the second day. This is the "exit interview", when the deans and Provost are present, and the extramural review team members provide a preliminary overview of their findings.

➤ Read the extramural team's final report when it becomes available (typically two weeks following the review), and also any first-round "corrections of fact" in relationship to the report provided by the program faculty.

➤ Prepare a draft **Findings and Recommendations (F&R)** document that summarizes the major findings of the review and specifies any actions that Graduate Council deems necessary (Guidelines for Writing Findings and Recommendations is attached as **Appendix 6**). The Findings and Recommendations document should be prepared in a timely fashion, no later than two to three weeks following receipt of the corrections of fact from the program.

➤ Present the draft **Findings and Recommendations** document at the next regularly scheduled meeting of Graduate Council, and make any suggested revisions resulting from discussion with full Council membership. Within one week's time, the final version of the **Findings and Recommendations** document should be forwarded to the Council Chair and Analyst who then send it to the program as a "working document." (See more on this step in **Appendix 4** below.)

➤ Read the response of the program (due within one month after their receipt of the **Findings and Recommendations**), and conduct any follow-up business associated with closing out the review. This may include many of the following actions: negotiate with the program leadership regarding any disagreements with the F&R document; establish a firm timeline for the completion of any outstanding matters in the F&R document; make a recommendation to the Council Chair about timing for closing (completing) the review.

C. Closing Program Reviews in Timely Fashion

An important issue for Graduate Council is the timely completion and closing of graduate program reviews. There is much potential for slow-downs along the way when deadlines are not met. **Graduate Council members must do their utmost to conform to the schedule presented above (also, for a timeline in table form for external reviews, see Appendix 6, *Guidelines for Writing Findings and Recommendations*).** The Senate staff analyst assigned to Graduate Council will keep everyone on track. The goal is to finish as many reviews as possible within the time frame of one academic year.

D. Internal Reviews and Special Actions

The Graduate Council may conduct internal reviews to evaluate graduate programs as circumstances warrant. For example, an internal review may be recommended to assess the progress of a graduate program following critical findings and recommendations generated from an external review or to evaluate the progress of new graduate programs (three to five years after initiation of the program). Depending on the particular situation, the information necessary for the review may vary. **Please consult Appendix 5** for full details on internal review procedures, and on subsequent special actions that may be taken in the case of unfavorable graduate program reviews.

COURSES & PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE

A. Duties

The main responsibilities of the Courses & Programs subcommittee are to review:

- Graduate course forms for new courses, course changes, and deletions
- Graduate program changes
- Proposals for new graduate programs
- Proposals for new centers

B. Schedule

The Courses and Programs Subcommittee meets monthly, in advance of the Council meeting (on the second Thursday of the month from 9-11am), to prepare recommendations on courses and programs for the Council's final approval.

C. Business

1. GRADUATE COURSE FORMS AND APPROVALS

One of the primary responsibilities of this subcommittee is to review graduate course forms (courses to be offered only once, new courses, deletions, changes and restorations). A copy of the General Rules and Policies Governing Courses of Instruction issued by the Committee on Courses of the Academic Senate can be found at
http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/8/Courses%20Guidelines%20-%2006-20-16%20Approved.pdf

Guidelines that pertain in particular to *graduate and professional* course forms have been extracted from these guidelines and follow here:

Once any new course, change in existing course, deletion of course, restoration of a course previously offered, or other action is submitted in the Course Request and Maintenance System (CRAMS), it is automatically routed to the next review or approval level; upon review or approval, it is again forwarded to the next step until it reaches the Committee on Courses. The routing schedule is listed below:

For Graduate Courses
1. Department/Committee/Program Faculty approve
2. Department/Committee/Program Chair approves*
   · BMSC, EDUC, and MGT courses to route to the appropriate Dean prior to routing to the Registrar's Office
3. Registrar's Office reviews & approves
4. Dean of the College (or Division)/College Executive Committee reviews & approves
5. **Graduate Council reviews & approves**
6. Committee on Courses reviews & approves

For Professional Courses
1. Department/Committee/Program Faculty approve
2. Department/Committee/Program Chair approves
   · If applicable, BMSC, EDUC, and MGT courses to route to the appropriate Executive

Committee prior to routing to the Registrar's Office
3. Registrar's Office reviews & approves
4. College (or Division)/College Executive Committee reviews & approves
5. **Graduate Council reviews & approves**
6. Committee on Courses reviews & approves

Graduate courses are numbered 200-299 and are ordinarily open only to students who have completed at least 18 (or 12 semester) upper division units basic to the subject matter of the course. Graduate courses must be approved by the Graduate Council and by the Divisional Committee on Courses. Professional courses for teachers are numbered 300-399. Other professional courses are numbered 400-499. Individual study or research graduate courses are numbered 500-599 if they may be used to satisfy minimum higher degree requirements, otherwise they are numbered 600-699 (500-699 courses are not in common use in Riverside).

- *287 Interdisciplinary Seminar*
- *290 Directed Studies (1-6 units)*
- *291 Individual Study in coordinated areas*
- *292 Concurrent Studies in department/program (1-4, repeatable for credit; concurrent enrollment by graduate student in undergraduate course, with credit for additional graduate level participation).*
- *297 Directed Research (1-6 units)*
- *298G Internship, Group (1-12, repeatable to 16 units)*
- *298I Internship, Individual (1-12, repeatable to 16 units)*
- *299 Research for the Thesis or Dissertation (1-12 units)*
- *300-399 Professional Courses for teachers*
- *301 "Teaching of _____ at the College Level" or "Directed Studies in the Teaching of _____" (to be graded S/NC. Units must accurately reflect hours of training.)*
- *302 "Apprentice Teaching" or "Teaching Practicum," variable (1-4 units). Open to all appropriate Academic Student Employees (ASE's) with units assigned to reflect teaching activity during the applicable quarter. To be graded S/NC.*
- *398G Internship, Group (1-12, repeatable to 16).*
- *398I Internship, Individual (1-12, repeatable to 16)*
- *400-499 Other Professional courses.*

Number of hours: the number of hours per week proposed by the department should be specified as to lecture, seminar, discussion, workshop, colloquium, laboratory, practicum, scheduled research, outside research, studio, screening, consultation, field, internship, individual study, extra reading, term paper, or other. Under the designation "other," the nature of the activity must be specified. Hours per week per unit of credit may not be less than but may exceed those listed in the following guidelines:

One unit for each hour per week of lecture, seminar, discussion, workshop, colloquium or consultation. Discussion is assumed to mean that the class meets regularly each week for the purpose of group consideration of course materials as distinct from lecture. The designation of one hour for "consultation" implies a regularly assigned meeting of one hour with each student each week. If such consultation is less, the unit assignment must be appropriately adjusted.

One unit for each two to three hours per week of studio, which includes performance or individual practice.

One unit for each three hours per week of laboratory, practicum, individual study, scheduled and outside research, field work, extra reading, term paper or written work, screening, internship, and similar assigned problems.

2. GRADUATE PROGRAM CHANGES

Any change to a graduate program should be submitted to the Graduate Council for review and approval. We request that departments/programs submit the changes to be made in "catalog copy style" which lists the current requirement on the left side of the page (striking deletions), and the proposed changes on the right side of the page (underlining additions); and include the Coversheet for Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements found on the Academic Senate Graduate Council web site - http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=13. We also request that a memo be attached to the copy that briefly describes the requested change as well as the justification for the change. Any courses that are affected by a program change must be input into CRAMS at the time the program change is submitted as the Courses and Programs subcommittee reviews them simultaneously. If affected courses are not input into CRAMS, the subcommittee will return the program change to the program and will not review it again until the courses have been input. It is the subcommittee's responsibility to review the requested change to insure that the change is appropriate.

Graduate Council's policy on graduate program catalog entry requires graduate programs state and detail the following in the General Catalog:

- Admission Requirements
- Unit and Course Requirements – specify course numbers and the number of courses/units required.
- Language, Teaching, and Examination Requirements
- Specializations, concentrations, fields of study
- Designated Emphases, if applicable
- Professional Development Requirement
- Normative Time-to-Degree

The full policy can be found at: http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=13

3. NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

The format for new program proposals follows that specified by CCGA (see documentation on website at http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/AppendixBFormatDegreeProposalsJune 2014.pdf).

The UCR campus review process for new graduate program proposals is spelled out in full as **Appendix 7.** Included there is a useful summary of the process in flowchart form.

4. PROPOSALS FOR NEW CENTERS

Proposals for new Centers are sent to the Graduate Council for review and comments. Such proposals are sent first to the Courses and Programs subcommittee for analysis and suggestions for the full Council concerning their impact on graduate education.

FELLOWSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE

 A. Duties

The Fellowship Subcommittee is responsible for evaluating applicants for Dissertation Research Grants and Master's Thesis Research Grants each quarter. The committee allocates a limited pool of funds on a competitive basis. One goal of the program is to promote and reward effective proposal writing by graduate students. The Fellowship Subcommittee also rates the potential impact of the Earle C Anthony travel awards on the student and/or the field.

In late Winter/early Spring, the full Graduate Council reviews and ranks applications for Graduate Research Mentoring Program (GRMP) and Dissertation Year Program (DYP) Awards. Also in the Spring, Fellowship Subcommittee members review and select awardee(s) for the Faculty Graduate Advisor/Mentoring award.

B. Schedule

The Fellowship Subcommittee meets once or twice each quarter to review rankings for quarterly awards (completed applications are posted for subcommittee members online and read in advance of the meetings). Meetings will be scheduled each quarter on a Thursday morning when the Graduate Council is not meeting.

C. Business

For the quarterly awards programs, committee members rate the proposals, first individually, on a 1-5 scale as follows:

> 5   Excellent: Based on clarity of the research strategy, effectiveness of the presentation, and adequate justification of the budget. Recommend full funding

> 4   Very Good: recommend full or partial funding

> 3   Good: wait for full discussion

> 2   Poor: recommend no funding and defer with suggestions for improvement

> 1   Reject: serious problems with the proposal or maximum award has been exceeded

At the committee meeting, the individual ratings are posted and discussed until agreement is reached. The total commitments are then assessed with respect to the funds available for subsequent quarters and the year to establish a maximum for full funding.

A more complex ranking system is used for the GRMP and DYP proposals (for a brief description on these awards, see below) as these are much larger awards and competition is very stiff. There is no meeting for this ranking process, but each Graduate Council member is responsible for evaluating approximately 18 -24 candidates for the awards and ranking them on a 0-4 scale. As appropriate, diversity criteria are evaluated on a 0-2 scale as well. Comments provided by the reviewers will be shared with the applicants as requested. After the rankings are complete (each candidate is ranked by two readers), the Dean of the Graduate Division makes the final determination of awards.

D. Overview of Awards -- For more detail, please consult the forms and instructions available to graduate students for each of these awards on the Graduate Division website at http://graduate.ucr.edu/fin_aid.html

1. Dissertation Research Grants – quarterly evaluation and allocation

Provide funds to doctoral candidates for research-related expenses associated with the dissertation. Applicants must be advanced to candidacy and plan to be registered during the period of the award. Proposals may be funded up to a maximum of $1,000.

2. Master's Thesis Research Grants – quarterly evaluation and allocation

Provide funds for students enrolled in the following programs only: Anthropology (M.S. degree only), Art History, Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts (main campus), Experimental Choreography, Southeast Asian Studies, and Visual Arts, for the purposes of expenses directly related to thesis research. Proposals may be funded up to a maximum of $500.

3. Earle C. Anthony Graduate Student Travel Awards – quarterly evaluation and allocation

Awards will be made for travel to national or international meetings or conferences, in amounts up to a maximum of $1000 for national travel and $1500 for international travel, to Ph.D. candidates in the biological, physical, agricultural, or health sciences; engineering; or mathematics, including those who employ interdisciplinary approaches in any of these fields. Eligible graduate students must be the first author on the research submitted, which s/he must present at a **top-tier national or international meeting or conference.**

4. Graduate Research Mentoring Program (GRMP) and Dissertation Year Program (DYP) Awards – once-yearly evaluation and allocation (end of winter/beginning of spring quarter)

The Graduate Research Mentoring Program (GRMP) award is intended to enhance the mentoring of domestic PhD students entering their 3rd, 4th, or 5th years of graduate school who are actively engaged in research. The Dissertation Year Program (DYP) Award is intended for MFA or PhD students who expect to complete their degree programs the year in which the award is received. A single application may be used for both awards, which provide stipends and cover fees from 1 to 3 quarters. Eligible students can receive up to three quarters each of the DYP and GRMP fellowships and may reapply if they have not reached this max. **PLEASE NOTE**: In the past several cycles, departments and programs have been required to screen applicants for these awards first, and to put forward no more than 10% of their total number of graduate students as applicants for these awards.

5. Faculty Graduate Advisor/Mentoring Award – once-yearly selection

In spring quarter, faculty members are nominated for the Graduate Advisor/Mentoring Award, a process facilitated by the Graduate Division. Letters of support are vital in this process, as well as a long-standing commitment and success-rate in mentoring graduate students. One or two recipients are chosen each year, and members of the Fellowship Subcommittee play a vital role in evaluating the nominees.

The Graduate Division provides administrative leadership on graduate affairs and works in close collaboration with Graduate Council. It supports the PEVC, colleges and school Deans, senior administrators, and departments/programs in managing graduate education. **The Dean, Associate Deans, and staff of the Graduate Division implement policies and guidelines established by the Council.**

The Graduate Division is currently organized into the following units:

Administration: Deans and Associate Deans

Vacant, Dean
The Dean provides leadership in promoting graduate education at UCR, is responsible for the implementation of Graduate Council policies and oversees all of the units within the Graduate Division. The person in this role represents the Graduate Division on campus, system-wide, and nationally. The Dean has final approval on graduate admissions and works with colleges and schools to construct fellowship and financial aid packages for all new graduate students. The Dean also appoints all graduate advisors.

Kevin Esterling, Associate Dean
Oversees all matters related to graduate academic affairs and employment, grievances, academic integrity, and professional development.

Connie Nugent, Associate Dean
Handles all matters related to graduate recruitment, student success and outreach. Oversees supervision of MSRIP, UCLEADS, and GRAD SUCCESS programs. Special focus is on diversity issues, graduate student awards and grant support.

Kennett Lai, Assistant Dean
As chief staff officer he oversees the budget, staff, and all accounting functions.

Karen Henry, Executive Assistant of the Graduate Division
Works with Fellowships Subcommittee to process the Dissertation Year Fellowship and GRMPS from submission to transfer of awards and is the liaison between the committee and students. Coordinates new graduate student orientation.

Financial Support

Andrea Gonzales, Graduate Student Cohort Funding Analyst
Monitors cohort funding for the various colleges and schools and supervises the Dean's Assistant and Theresa Luther.

Karen Smith, Fellowship Administration
Oversees all fellowship revisions to matriculated student packages and all graduate student employment for compliance with UCR and UCOP regulations.

Sonia Lepe, Financial Aid and Employment Analyst
Oversees employment eligibility of graduate students and processes payroll for Graduate Division. Handles fee deferments and reconciliation.

Maria Pimentel, Analyst, Financial Awards
Processes all graduate student awards that are non-payroll, including fellowships, grants, department block fellowship awards, Partial Fee Remission (PFR), Graduate Student Health Insurance Program (GSHIP), Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition Remission (NRSTR).

Maintains resource materials on extramural funds for graduate students. Audits and reconciles graduate student financial aid accounts.

Academic Preparation and Outreach

Maria Franco-Gallardo, Director of Graduate Recruitment and Outreach
Partners with schools, divisions, and colleges to enhance the number, quality and diversity of the graduate population across the campus. Develops and assists programs in developing publications and internet promotions. Participates in statewide and national recruitment fairs. Promotes and develops special undergraduate outreach programs to assist in the recruitment and enrollment of a diverse graduate student body (MSRIP, AGEP, UC LEADS, NIH Bridges Programs, etc.). Works closely with the Graduate Dean in identifying candidates for the allocation of Diversity Fellowship funds.

Nancy Cruz, Hobson's Coordinator

Admissions

Elisa Gutierrez, Manager
Oversee the processing of applications and implementation of admissions criteria. Assists the Graduate Dean and College Deans in constructing competitive financial support packages for admitted students. Develops statistical reports on applicants and admits. Provides training and support for department/program staff. Monitors state, national, and international educational policy changes that impact graduate admissions.

Cynthia Davis, **Graduate Admissions Specialist**
Responsible for applicants whose last name begins with A-L.

Mandie Coen, **Graduate Admissions Specialist**
Responsible for applicants whose last name begins with M-Z.

Alicia Serrano, Graduate Admissions Specialist

Graduate Academic Affairs

Kara Oswood, Director
Oversees adherence to Graduate Council, UCOP, and Senate regulations concerning employment, academic matters, and fellowships. Monitors progress of enrolled students, degree requirements, dissertation and qualifying exam committees, advancement to candidacy, awarding of degrees, filing fee requests, transfer units, and dissertation format requirements. Processes student petitions. Oversees graduate student discipline and dismissal for both academic and non-academic reasons. Provides workshops on thesis preparation and handles the filing of dissertations. Conducts training for Graduate Advisors and program assistants. Provides statistical information and surveys concerning graduate students to programs, the campus, the Office of the President, system-wide committees, and outside agencies.

Amanda Wong, Academic Affairs
Handles all enrolled student progress, last names A-L. Main contact for CPT, repeat course work, final degree lists, and Intercampus Exchange.

Trina Elerts, Academic Affairs
Handles all enrolled student progress, last names M-Z. Main contact for change of degree objective and incomplete extensions.

Graduate Success

  Maggie Gover, Coordinator
  Graduate Success is comprised of the Teaching Assistant Development Program, University
  Teaching Certificate Program, Graduate Writing Program, Graduate Student Resource
  Center, the International TA Program, and the Mentoring Program. Also oversees TA
  evaluations.

  Hilary Jenkins, Writing Center Coordinator

  Ashley Ricker, Grad Quant Coordinator

Office of Postdoctoral Studies

  Karen Smith, Director – Oversees the regulations of postdoctoral scholars on campus and
  provides the campus and UCOP with data and statistics on postdoctoral scholars.

Academic Senate By-Laws Pertaining to the Graduate Council

Chapter 8. Committees of the Division

8.14 Graduate Council

8.14.1 Purpose. The Graduate Council reviews and sets policy regarding graduate academic affairs on the Riverside campus. (Am 27 May 14)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.2 Membership. This committee consists of at least fifteen members of the Division, including at least one member from each school and college. The Dean of the Graduate Division serves as a non-voting ex officio, and may not serve as Chair or Vice Chair of the Council. One member of the committee will serve as the Divisional representative to the University Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. (Am 5 Nov 87) (Am 29 May 97) (Am Nov 02)(Am 17 Feb 09)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3 Duties. It is the duty of this committee to:

8.14.3.1 Make recommendations to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, with the prior approval of the Division, concerning (a) the qualifications of departments and graduate curricula for initiating new programs leading to existing graduate degrees, and (b) the establishment of new graduate degrees; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.2 Coordinate the procedures in the Division relating to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's Degree; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.3 Set policies and standards for admission to graduate status; (En 20 Mar 75)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.4 Set standards for appointment of graduate students to be Teaching Assistants, Teaching Fellows, Research Assistants, and recipients of University Fellowships; (En 20 Mar 75)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.5 Admit qualified students to candidacy for graduate degrees; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.6 Recommend the award of fellowships and graduate scholarships, including honorary traveling fellowships, according to the terms of the various foundations; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.7 Appoint committees in charge of candidates' studies, who shall certify that every candidate recommended for a higher degree has fulfilled the requirements of the University pertaining to that degree; (Am 21 Nov 06)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.8 Supervise the conduct of public and other examinations for higher degrees; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.9 Make final report to the Division on the conferring of graduate degrees; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.10 Conduct periodic peer reviews (internal or extramural) of continuing graduate degree programs; and regulate in other ways the work of the Graduate Division, with a view to the promotion of research and learning; (Am 29 May 97)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.11 Report and make recommendations to the Division on matters pertaining to graduate work; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.12 Advise the Chancellor concerning relations with educational and research foundations; Limit at its discretion the number of credit hours of students who are employed; (Am 29 May 97)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.13 Make rules governing the form of presentation and the disposal of dissertations; (Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.14 Recommend and supervise all graduate courses of instruction in the Division. In discharging this responsibility, the Graduate Council presents its recommendations on courses to the Committee on Courses. (Am 26 Apr 79)(Am 1 Dec 15)

8.14.3.15 Set policy and standards for appointment of postdoctoral scholars or their academic equivalent and for their enrollment by the Graduate Division. (Am 21 Nov 06)(Am 1 Dec 15)

APPENDIX 2

GRADUATE COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

Purpose:
The Graduate Council should conduct itself in such a manner that neither the reality nor the appearance of a conflict of interest should be present in any action taken by the Council. This includes recusal of a member if the action or discussion involves their current or former spouse, partner or family member.

Terms:
1. Whenever any matter that affects a member of the Council as an Individual or as a member of a department or program is to be decided, that member should absent himself/herself before the vote is taken. If the member does not leave voluntarily, the Chair should excuse the member. This includes:

   a. The Chair of the Council may ask the member to provide information on the matter before the member's departure.
   b. When confidential information is being provided to the Council, the affected member will be excused by the Chair before the information is provided.
   c. When student petitions are considered, Council members should consider a student matter in their department/program as a conflict of interest for themselves.
   d. When routine matters (e.g., course approvals) are being considered, the Chair may elect to allow all members to participate in the discussion and vote. This section is not meant to include program revisions, review committee reports on a specific department or individual student matters.

2. Subcommittee operations are subject to the same rules as the Council as a whole. The Chair may name a replacement from the Council membership for an individual serving on a subcommittee who has a conflict of interest when necessary.

3. Students are not permitted to be present in Council meetings when matters pertaining to individual students are discussed.

4. In unforeseen cases, the Chair may rule that any member should be excused if the Chair foresees conflict of interest in the matter under discussion. The affected member may appeal to the Council. The member or the chair may appeal to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure if the results of the Council vote are not satisfactory; the matter to be discussed will be held without action pending the decision of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

5. Members with possible conflicts of interest should discuss the matter with the Council Chair before the pertinent Council meeting. If the Chair foresees a conflict of interest on the part of a Council member, he/she should discuss the matter with the affected member. It is to be hoped that a course of action satisfactory to the member and the Chair can be achieved. If this is not possible the Chair should determine the proper course of action. The member may appeal to the Council and/or the Committee on Privilege and Tenure as indicated in Section 4 above.

RIVERSIDE DIVISION REPRESENTATIVE TO THE
COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA) – SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is the systemwide equivalent of the campus Graduate Council. Each campus has a representative to CCGA. The Committee on Committees appoints the Riverside Division Representative to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs from among the Graduate Council members. This representative serves a two-year term and participates in the activities of the CCGA during that time period. He/She reports on CCGA activities to the Graduate Council each month and leads discussions on topics of interest to it. A detailed handbook on the activities of the CCGA is available online at
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/CCGAHandbookJune2014Final.pdf

The membership and activities of CCGA are summarized below:

A. Duties

1. Advise the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
2. Establish basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various Graduate Councils and Divisions.
3. Recommend to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students.
4. Act for the Academic Senate in the approval of new programs for established graduate degrees, including the joint doctoral degrees with campuses of the California State University.
5. Review proposals from Graduate Councils for the establishment of new graduate degrees that require approval of The Regents, and submit recommendations thereon to the Assembly.
6. Review standards and policies applied by Graduate Councils, and policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies.
7. Report annually to the Assembly concerning its policies and practices.

B. Meeting Schedule and Travel

CCGA meetings are held monthly, 9-11 times during the year, at UCOP - 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, or via telephone or video conferencing.

C. Participants

Meetings are attended by the Chair, Vice Chair, ten additional members from the Divisions, two representatives from the UC Office of the President (UCOP) Planning Unit, two representatives from the UC and campus Graduate Student Associations, one representative from the Council of Graduate Deans, and the CCGA Committee Coordinator. When formal votes are taken, only the 11 CCGA members' votes are recorded and counted. The student representatives' votes are recorded but not counted in the final outcomes. All those attending may participate in discussions.

D. Business

Written materials are typically provided in advance of a meeting. At the meeting matters are discussed, and revised. Subsequent revisions may be made via e-mail or fax and re-discussed at a

subsequent meeting. Voting is done as needed and reports are revised and final drafts are communicated. There are seven types of business carried out by the committee:

1. Consideration of proposals for new graduate degree programs.
2. Consideration of proposals to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue academic programs or academic units or to reorganize them through a combination of two or more actions.
3. Consideration of proposals for new ORUs and MRUs.
4. Review of and commentary on campus's five-year perspectives.
5. Review of and commentary on other matters including proposed changes in policies or regulations of either the Academic Senate or UCOP, five-year reviews of existing MRUs, establishment or major change of schools and colleges, UCOP think pieces and reports of various sorts.
6. Information sharing among representatives of the Divisional Graduate Councils, the CCGA Chair and Vice Chair, the system wide Academic Senate committees, the Planning Unit in the UC Office of the President, the Council of Graduate Deans, the UC and campus Graduate Student Associations, and various guests (ordinarily from the Office of the President).
7. Consideration and development of a position on any new issue that CCGA members themselves believe should be addressed.

APPENDIX 4

GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES
University of California, Riverside
2016-2017

I. Overview

Routine reviews of graduate programs are conducted by the Graduate Council with the aid of extramural review teams. The process has the approval of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The primary aim of the review process is to help improve graduate programs or, if necessary, to close programs found to be undesirably weak.

The Graduate Council determines the sequence and schedule of reviews. The sequence of upcoming reviews is discussed at least annually and can be altered by action of the Council. Normally, five to seven programs are scheduled for review each year. This pattern typically yields a 7 year cycle between reviews.

II. Preparation for Council Review

The graduate program is notified at least 12 months prior to the scheduled review. In the spring preceding the academic year of the review, the program is asked to prepare the following information regarding its program for submission to the Graduate Council and to outside reviewers.

1. Self-Study Report – The Self-Study Report should be a concise document detailing the program's strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since the last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council. The report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the site visit interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. Thus, your own presentation of your program will be available to everyone who receives the review report and recommendations. The report should be five to fifteen single-spaced pages depending on the size and complexity of the program. Summary tables and graphs should be included where appropriate.

2. Faculty List - List of faculty must include faculty names, department (for interdepartmental programs), title, email address, and UCR Net ID.

3. List of Faculty by Rank – List of faculty must include department affiliation and participation in other graduate programs.

4. Ph.D. Placement Data – Placement data for all Ph.D. degrees awarded since the program's last review. The table must include the students name, graduation date, dissertation Chair, first position, current position, and current email address.

5. Digested Faculty Biographies - Brief biographies for faculty members.

6. Program Material Distributed to Students - A page listing links to website materials available to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).

7. Faculty Grant Activity Summary – a summary of your faculty grant data. The Senate Graduate Council Analyst will provide you with the raw data from the Office of Research after receiving your faculty list.

8. Customized Coversheet for eBinder of review materials (optional)

The Graduate Council gathers statistical information from sources around the campus. The Office of Strategic Academic Research and Analysis (SARA) provides:

1. Departmental budget and expenditures.
2. Faculty (ladder and budgeted) FTE and Staff Personnel FTE as of Fall (current year).
3. All courses taught by ladder Instructor (for past three years).
4. All course enrollments – Cross-Listed Included (for past three years).
5. Student workload FTE and faculty FTE adjusted (for past two years).
6. General Campus Headcount Enrollment by Student Major (for past two years).
7. Summary of financial support provided to all graduate students (for past two years).

The Graduate Division provides:

8. Admissions profiles, applicant data, enrollment data, degrees awarded (and time to degree), dropout rate, and UCR Doctoral Exit Survey data.

The Academic Senate Graduate Council Analyst provides (via the Office of Research):

9. Faculty grant data (for grants awarded since the last program review).

The program, with the help of the Graduate Council and Graduate Division, should summarize the data to make it most useful for the external review team. Grant data should be summarized with charts, tables or graphs and discussed in the Self-Study Report. Items 1-9 are sent to the program before dissemination to anyone else so that any differences concerning the statistics can be resolved.

A questionnaire dealing with academic program quality matters including space for written comments is sent to each faculty member. A separate questionnaire is sent to present graduate students and Ph.D. awardees since the last review (master's awardees in the case of a master's only program). Statistical summaries are provided where appropriate, and a compilation of all comments, copied verbatim, is included in the review materials. These questionnaire responses are only seen by the review team and members of the Graduate Council review subcommittee. They are to be kept confidential and responses are *never* shared with members of the program or campus administrators.

III. Composition of Extramural Review Team

When first notified of the pending review, the program is asked to provide a list of distinguished, **neutral** reviewers as shown in the following excerpts from a letter of request:

> An extramural team will be used to assist in the review. Please provide Sarah Miller (sarah.miller@ucr.edu) with a list of at least 15 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other campuses of the UC and the rest from other places throughout the U.S. Because we will use a three-member review panel, please divide your list of names into three topical areas corresponding to the organization of your program. It is important to have one UC reviewer who can advise the others of what is possible within the UC and of how the University works. However, no topical area grouping should include more than three names of UC faculty. *The names of potential reviewers should be solicited from your **entire** faculty, and the list should be approved by the faculty, in part to assure that there are no conflicts of interest.*

The Graduate Council asks to be *assured in writing that the proposed extramural reviewers can carry out a neutral review.* The Council is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty and potential reviewers: (1) personal friendships; (2) reviewer and UCR faculty member have been in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) cooperative research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these relationships applies to a potential reviewer, the individual should be eliminated or the Graduate Council should be informed of the facts of the relationship.

The Graduate Council would also like to ask that your program rank the list of reviewers based on the selection criteria of their academic, teaching, advising and administrative experience for graduate programs and any other additional information the program may have on the potential reviewer's qualifications and the likelihood that they will be a productive member of the review team. Experience with running or advising similar graduate programs, the reviewer's stature as a researcher in the field, and their ability to provide objective and critical reviews of programs should also be taken into consideration. Each of the three areas of your list should be ranked so that three highly ranked reviewers can be selected to review your program.

The Graduate Council review subcommittee Chair vets the lists of suggested reviewers and either agrees with the rankings or makes revisions. If other names arise from these queries; they are sent to the program for comment. The Graduate Council Analyst contacts and assembles the review team members and coordinates their travel arrangements. Team members receive reimbursement for travel expenses and a $1,000 honorarium.

The Graduate Council provides a 'standard' set of questions that the Extramural Team may (not "must") use to guide its deliberations; most of the questions are used for all programs, but some are program specific. The program examines the questions before they are sent to the Extramural Team.

About thirty days ahead of the scheduled visit, the information above is sent to each member of the extramural review team (contents of package follow below). An identical information package is provided to the members of the Graduate Council review subcommittee. The program, College Dean, Graduate Dean, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor receive a copy of the package from which the questionnaire responses have been deleted for purposes of student/faculty confidentiality. The questionnaires are destroyed after the site visit and are only seen by the external review team and Graduate Council review subcommittee responsible for the review.

The following items are included in packets sent to extramural review team members:

1. Program Review schedule/campus map
2. Set of general questions for reviewers
3. Program self-study report
4. Materials available to graduate students
5. A list of faculty members by rank and digested biographies (Brief Bio-Sketch)
6. Graduate student placement data for Ph.D. recipients
7. Confidential Questionnaires (former students, current faculty, current students)
8. Faculty Grant Data
9. Graduate Division Admission data (Admissions profiles, applicant data, enrollment data, degrees awarded (and time to degree), dropout rate, and UCR Doctoral Exit Survey data)

10. Graduate student support data, courses taught, enrollments, student workload, number of majors
11. Departmental budget and expenditure data
12. Ladder rank faculty FTE and staff FTE
13. Program Self-Study and Vision from previous review (if applicable)
14. Post-review documents (reviewers report, program's response, etc.) from previous review (if applicable)

*No other materials may be provided to the review team other than the materials that are vetted by the Graduate Council and included in the review eBinder.

IV. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

The reviewers are asked to provide an assessment of the quality of faculty, students, and the program; areas of strength and weaknesses; advice on areas to remove or strengthen; adequacy of facilities, morale, and any other issues they wish to address. They are asked to participate in an exit interview and to furnish a written report of 10-15 pages within two weeks of their visit.

A typical team visit begins at 8:00am with a briefing by the Graduate Council review subcommittee. The review team then meets with the Graduate Dean. The briefing includes discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the program being reviewed and any particular areas of concern. The team then meets separately with the relevant College Dean. Following the morning meetings, the Team meets to organize itself and then meets the program chair and graduate advisor, after which the Team begins to meet with faculty and students in the program. Students must be given the opportunity to meet with the review team without faculty present. At noon the Team usually meets with chairs of closely related programs for lunch. These chairs are chosen by the Chair of the program being reviewed. After lunch, the team meets with faculty/students and examines the physical facilities. The afternoon of the first day (after 4:30pm) is reserved for an optional department/program hosted reception. The reception must be on campus and graduate students must be invited to the event. Graduate students should have the same amount of access to the reviewers that the faculty have.

The second day of the visit continues with more interviews with faculty and students. The reviewers have a working lunch on this day. The last on-campus activity is the exit interview. At 4:00 p.m. on the second day, the Team meets with the College or School Dean(s), Graduate Dean or Associate Dean, Graduate Council review subcommittee members, and the Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor to discuss their findings. In this meeting, Team members usually present their findings, followed by free questioning by Graduate Council review subcommittee members and members of the administration. Sometimes the whole session is devoted solely to question-and-answer. The Chair of the Graduate Council review subcommittee chairs this exit interview.

When the Team report is received, the honoraria are processed. The Team report is reviewed by the Graduate Council review subcommittee for matters of confidentiality, and the report is sent to the Program with a two-week response deadline for preliminary comment about factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. **The reviewers report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.**

V. Graduate Council *Findings and Recommendations*

The Graduate Council review subcommittee integrates its knowledge of the history and status of each program, together with the information and material generated by the program during the review process (including the extramural team report), to formulate a draft of the *Findings and Recommendations* -- a cohesive plan of action for improvement of the program. The first draft is written by one member of the Graduate Council review subcommittee assigned to the review in

consultation with the other member(s). If the draft *Findings and Recommendations* appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Graduate Council review subcommittee can meet with the chair and/or graduate advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document. On occasion, the Graduate Council review subcommittee has met with the college dean and limited numbers of faculty members to discuss the *Findings and Recommendations*. Where the *Findings and Recommendations* appear to be non-controversial, the Graduate Council review subcommittee does not usually meet with program chairs or other representatives. When the Graduate Council review subcommittee has prepared a draft set of *Findings and Recommendations*, the document is discussed at a full meeting of the Graduate Council for its approval. For its consideration of the draft *Findings and Recommendations*, the Council is provided with copies of the extramural team report and the program's preliminary response to the extramural team report. Not usually sent to all individuals on the Council, but available to members upon request, are all other data available to the Graduate Council review subcommittee. If substantial problems are anticipated, arrangements are made to have all members of the Council become familiar with the entire data set. When a draft acceptable to the Council is achieved, it is sent to the program as a working document with a request for a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The program's response to the Council's *Findings and Recommendations* is due within 30 days of receipt, unless the document is received late in the Spring quarter, at which point the program's response is due the following Fall quarter. The *Findings and Recommendations* is a policy document, and failure to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on graduate admissions or other actions.

Escalation Chart for Non-Responsive Programs

1st Notice	Academic Senate Graduate Council Analyst
2nd Notice – reminder	Academic Senate Graduate Council Analyst
3rd Notice	Graduate Council Chair/Vice Chair
4th Notice	Academic Senate Director
5th Notice	Academic Senate Chair
6th Notice - FINAL	Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

When the Graduate Council is satisfied that changes are being implemented by the program as suggested by the *Findings and Recommendations*, Graduate Council will close the review and provide the program with a letter so stating.

Copies of the unedited extramural team report, the program preliminary response, the Graduate Council *Findings and Recommendations*, and program final response are sent to the Chancellor, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor, College or School Dean, Graduate Dean, and the Academic Senate Chair and Executive Director. A brief summary of the programs reviewed and Graduate Council actions are included in the Graduate Council Annual Report to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

The review of the master's level programs follows the same format, but the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee may play the role of the extramural team at the option of the Council.

Graduate programs may be asked to provide Graduate Council with a progress report 3 to 4 years after a review has been closed.

VI. Summary of Confidentiality

Graduate Program Reviews are treated as confidential until officially closed for two reasons. First, confidentiality protects the program under review by ensuring that the program has a chance to respond to the extramural team report and correct errors of fact and potential misconceptions

before it circulates. Second, confidentiality protects faculty governance of academic programs by ensuring that reviews are carried out in an atmosphere free of undue pressure from on or off campus.

After Graduate Council has completed and officially closed a review, it shall be normal practice to forward to the Chancellor, the Provost/EVC, the College Dean(s), the Graduate Dean and the Senate Chair the following materials: the unedited extramural team report, any and all written responses from the program under review, the final version of Council's Findings and Recommendations, and associated correspondence accumulated in the course of the review. Ordinarily, other materials compiled for the review (the program's "binder" of materials) will not be forwarded to administrators unless specifically requested. **Under no circumstances will the questionnaire responses (from program faculty and students) be made available to anyone other than members of Graduate Council and the extramural review team.** Likewise, upon request and for good reason, other UCR faculty members may request access to the same materials made available to administrators upon completion of a graduate program review.

APPENDIX 5

Procedures for Internal Reviews of Graduate Programs

A. Internal Review to monitor unfavorable or changing conditions for a graduate program
Graduate Council may mandate an internal review when an external review has been problematic or when circumstances are changing dramatically for a program. This review will be an abbreviated version of a routine external review, targeted to the problematic issues.

   1. Information to Program Chair and Deans. The Graduate Council Chair will prepare a letter to the Program Chair, college Dean, Graduate Dean, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor informing them of the decision to have an internal review and provide reasons and suggested timing.

   2. Internal Review Team. Each internal review team shall have at least two members (a minimum of one regular Graduate Council member as well as a review subcommittee Chair).

   3. Internal Review Activities. The internal review team shall become familiar with the most recent previous review and outstanding issues. Members will read the previous extramural review report, all responses from the program, college Dean, and others. The team will schedule a one-day review meeting (without external consultants) and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted to the remaining problematic issues.

   The following information may be collected and evaluated by the internal review team prior to the review meeting (please note: not all of these data may be necessary, depending on the circumstances and timing of the internal review):

   - A statement concerning the program's vision (Program Self-Study Report). This statement should include –

      a. Self-assessment of the program status – include strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies which might exist.
      b. Progress on response to issues raised in the findings and recommendations from the external review.
      c. Long range goals.
      d. Graduate student recruitment plans.

   - Up-to-date biosketches for all faculty members.

   - Departmental material distributed to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).

   - A brief statement outlining how graduate student advising is conducted.

- Questionnaires sent to faculty and students currently enrolled in program.

- Graduate student support data for last three years (Office of Strategic Academic Research and Analysis - SARA).

- Admissions data - GPAs, undergraduate institutions, GRE scores, degree objective (Graduate Division).

After evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair of the program and Graduate Advisor to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to planning for the future. The Dean of Graduate Division and the College Dean should also be interviewed. If the subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional interviews with faculty and/or students.

4. Draft Findings and Recommendations. The internal review team is responsible for a draft *Findings and Recommendations* that will follow the same procedures as required for a regular review report. The report should explain why an internal review was recommended and what was accomplished since the last review; identify what remains to be done to address recommendations of the review and how it will be accomplished; and suggest the year for the next review. **The report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.** The Graduate Council Chair's letter to the program Chair and college Dean should be included in the attachments. The internal review report will be provided to the external review team at the time of the next regular review.

5. End of Review. At the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting after the internal review report becomes available, the Graduate Council will consider the Findings and Recommendations from the internal review team. The voting will be handled exactly as it is for programs closed immediately after a satisfactory response to the Findings and Recommendations.

6. Close of Review. When the internal review team decides sufficient progress has been made and recommends that Graduate Council close the review, Graduate Council shall confirm the recommendation to close the internal review and set the date for the next review (normally 7 years after the last external review). At this time, they shall also write a memo to the program informing them that the review is closed and describing any further actions that Graduate Council recommends the program take prior to the next review. This letter will be provided to the review team at the time of the next review.

B. Internal Review Procedures for Reviews of New Graduate Programs (3rd to 5th year)
Graduate Council will conduct an internal review of all new graduate programs three to five years after the initiation of the program to evaluate the progress. This Internal Review will be an abbreviated version of an extramural review, targeted at the program's progress and plans for the future of the graduate program.

1. Information to Program Chair and Deans. The Graduate Council Chair will prepare a letter to the Program Chair, college Dean, Graduate Dean, and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor informing them of the decision to have an internal review and provide the following information: a) reason for the review – routine internal review of new program; b) what needs to be done, by whom, in order to conduct the review; and c) target date for closing the review.

2. Internal Review Team. Each internal review team shall have at least two members (a minimum of one regular Graduate Council member, as well as a review subcommittee Chair). It is up to the internal review team to monitor progress and decide when sufficient progress has been made to recommend an end to the review.

3. Internal Review Activities. The internal review team shall become familiar with the review materials provided by the program. The team will participate in a one-day meeting (without external consultants) and will follow the same procedures as required for a full review, but in an abbreviated fashion targeted at the program's progress and plans for the future of the graduate program.

> The following information will be collected three years after initiation of the program and evaluated by the internal review team:
>
> - A 3-5 page statement concerning the program's vision (Program Self-Study Report). This statement should include–
>
>   - a. Self-assessment of the progress of the program to date -- include strengths and weaknesses and current plans to address any deficiencies which might exist.
>   - b. Long range goals.
>   - c. Graduate student recruitment plans.
>   - d. Plans for interactions with other campus units.
>
> - Up-to-date bio-sketches for all faculty members.
>
> - Departmental material distributed to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).
>
> - A brief statement outlining how graduate student advising is conducted.
>
> - Questionnaires sent to faculty and students currently enrolled in program.
>
> - Graduate student support data for last three years (Office of Strategic Academic Research and Analysis - SARA).
>
> - Admissions data - GPAs, undergraduate institutions, GRE scores, degree objective (Graduate Division).
>
> After evaluation of the above material, the subcommittee will meet with the Chair of the program and Graduate Advisor to discuss any concerns and/or to provide guidance with respect to planning for the future. The Dean of Graduate Division and the College Dean should also be interviewed. If the subcommittee feels that additional interviews are necessary, they may request additional interviews with faculty and/or students.

4. Draft Findings and Recommendations. The internal review team shall be responsible for a draft *Findings and Recommendations* that will follow the same procedures as required for a regular review report, and will serve as the basis for the Graduate Council consideration for ending the review. The report should explain what was accomplished during the review, identify what remains to be done to address recommendations of the review and how it will be accomplished, and suggest the year for the next review. **The report should not directly quote faculty or student questionnaire responses. If it is useful to include the opinions of the faculty and/or students in the report, these responses must be paraphrased to protect anonymity.** The Graduate Council Chair's letter to the program Chair and college Dean should be included in the attachments. The internal review report will be provided to the review team at the time of the next regular review.

5. End of Review. At the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting after the internal review report becomes available, the Graduate Council will consider the Findings and Recommendations from the internal review team. The internal review team Chair shall be responsible for finalizing the final Findings and Recommendations.

6. Close of Review. When the internal review team decides sufficient progress has been made and recommends that Graduate Council close the review, Graduate Council shall confirm the recommendation to close the internal review and set the date for the next review (normally 5 to 7 years after the current review). At this time, they shall also write a memo to the program informing them that the review is closed and describing any further actions that Graduate Council recommends the program take prior to their next review. This letter will be provided to the review team at the time of the next review.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

C. Early Review
On rare occasions, when compelling need has been demonstrated, Graduate Council may decide to review a program earlier than scheduled. The request to consider an early review may be initiated by either Graduate Council or by students, faculty members, or administrators directly associated with the program. The Graduate Council will decide whether there is cause for considering the request. If so, they will carry out preliminary fact finding to decide whether to grant the request. It is expected that requests for early reviews will be made infrequently.

D. Reviews of Programs also being reviewed by Accreditation Teams
The reviews of programs that are also reviewed by accreditation teams should, as much as possible, be coordinated with the accreditation evaluation, assuming the program wishes such coordination. In scheduling the year of the next review, consideration may also be given to evening out the number of reviews conducted by the Graduate Council in a given year.

E. Suspension of Admissions ("Moratorium")
The suspension of admissions to a graduate program is also called a "moratorium." Cause for imposing a moratorium includes, but is not limited to, a program's failure to fulfill its teaching or research mission; disregard for student and/or faculty welfare; and/or the inability to deliver its programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts. Graduate Council can also impose a moratorium on a graduate program for failure to respond to or comply with Council's Findings and Recommendations resulting from a graduate program review (internal or extramural). A moratorium initiated by Graduate Council may also be cause for the recommendation of academic receivership.

F. Receivership
Academic receivership is defined as the appointment of an individual external to the unit who will be vested with sufficient administrative authority to oversee implementation of the

recommendations of the Graduate Council. The appointment of a receiver falls under the purview of the relevant Dean or Provost. The receiver may be appointed Chair, or may be charged to work closely with the Chair as a temporary administrative adjunct. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations issued at the close of program reviews may include a recommendation to the relevant administrator that a unit be placed in academic receivership. Cause for the recommendation for receivership includes, but is not limited to cases where an academic unit is unable or unwilling to govern itself in accordance with the principles of shared governance; where it is in noncompliance with the Academic Senate's Program Review process; where it is failing to fulfill its teaching or research mission; where disregard for student and faculty welfare is evident; or where the inability to deliver its programmatic offerings in an adequate manner to current or prospective student cohorts is in evidence. In each case, the recommendation for receivership will be accompanied by a recommendation for an early review.

G. Appendix 7 Actions
Should the unit under review prove to be unwilling, unable, or incapable of adequately addressing the issues that led to a suspension of admissions and/or a recommendation for receivership, the Graduate Council may initiate any of the actions as stipulated in Appendix 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate (UC Riverside Procedures for Discontinuance of a Program).

APPENDIX 6

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING *FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS*
UCR Graduate Council (latest revision, August 2014)

Among the duties of Graduate Council is the periodic review of graduate programs. A review subcommittee of Graduate Council monitors each review and writes a vital **policy document** called the *Findings and Recommendations of Graduate Council* (hereafter, the F&R). **The subcommittee bears responsibility for drafting and revising the F&R document each step of the way until it reaches its final form.**

A. OVERVIEW

The F&R should be a concise document of no more than **five to seven single-spaced pages**. Do not repeat or summarize the entire extramural report, hit a few high points. The materials upon which the F&R draws are:

- Documents assembled for the purposes of review, usually called the program's electronic "binder"
- Meetings held during the course of the review
- The report prepared by external reviewers (when applicable) after their on-campus visit with the program faculty and students
- Required written feedback/response from the leadership and faculty of the program under review

B. WRITING THE F&R (examples of past F&R are available to Graduate Council members upon request to the Senate Staff Analyst)

Section One: Introduction
Provides a brief descriptive overview of the program and its review, **including**: the name of the graduate program and the unit(s) housing it; the date of program founding; current size of the program in terms of faculty and students; a brief accounting of meetings of faculty and students conducted to prepare for the review; information about the review team (their names and positions) and the date of their visit; and names and brief identifying information for GC subcommittee members.

Section Two: Strengths, Achievements, and Challenges
Explains areas of excellence in the program as currently constructed and explores the most serious challenges facing the program. This information should be gleaned from the program's self-study report and crucially, from the external review team's report. When the external team sees things differently from the program faculty and/or students, careful note should be made of their differences. Also, if the Graduate Council subcommittee has its own point of view on these matters, or has found additional information not included in the written review materials; those issues should be discussed here.

Section Three: Goals and Plans
Explores the future vision for the program as articulated and discovered in the course of the review. Although the program's self-study document should articulate a vision for the future, external reviewers often provide additional recommendations. In addition, deans' interviews in the course of the review may also become a source of information for future planning for the program. Differences among stakeholders in the process should be noted. Problems and prospects for funding for graduate students should be discussed here, as well as any deficiencies in physical plant that have come to light in the course of the review, but with

an emphasis on realistic potential remedies. Blanket statements such as, "This program needs more money," are not terribly helpful.

Section Four: Recommendations
Lists clearly and succinctly a set of numbered recommendations for action. These items should be prioritized (most important first) and should be limited to no more than five or six. If the review subcommittee believes more recommendations are needed, the full Graduate Council will strive to streamline the list in its meeting to discuss the draft F&R before it is sent to the program faculty. Great care should be taken in the wording and intent of the recommendations. Occasionally, some points might reiterate strengths of the program as it currently exists and possible ways that administrators might support areas of existing or future excellence. However, the main goal of the list is to specify areas most in need of improvement for the future health and well-being of the program. For each point, the suggested action should be stated briefly in bold typeface, followed by a one-paragraph explanation for its rationale and specific steps that might be taken.

C. FROM DRAFT TO FINAL F&R DOCUMENT
The table below provides a brief overview of the timing and routing of the F&R resulting from a routine external review, from its initial draft by the review subcommittee to its final form as a policy document. The table is best read across each row horizontally to understand the F&R process and timing.

TIME FRAME	STAGE IN THE F&R PROCESS	ROUTING/WHO SEES IT AND WHEN
No later than **three weeks** after the extramural review team report is received and the program faculty returns to GC its initial "errors of fact";	The first F&R DRAFT is **completed** by the review subcommittee;	For review at the next regularly scheduled GC meeting. After the meeting, the GC Staff Analyst will finalize any changes to the draft and the Chair or Vice Chair of GC will review the draft document. It is then sent to all program faculty for their timely review and full written response.
No later than **one month** after the program faculty receive the draft F&R document from GC, they must respond in writing;	Addressing all of the F&R recommendations, including time frame for their completion;	For review at the next regularly scheduled GC meeting. Changes may be necessary at this stage in the F&R document, and the Chair or Vice Chair of GC will determine the best way to make such changes. Every effort shall be made to expedite revision and to correspond in timely fashion with the program when necessary. When the F&R has been revised, the full GC membership shall VOTE to approve the F&R in its final form. This vote may be taken at a regularly scheduled GC meeting or by email.
As soon as possible, ideally no more than **two weeks** following the GC meeting discussing the final draft;	The F&R document shall be in its final form, along with a memo that closes the review and specifies when the next review shall be scheduled. Sometimes an early internal review may be warranted and should be clearly specified in the close out memo;	For transmission to program faculty, relevant deans, the EVC/Provost, and the Chancellor. **THE FINAL VERSION OF THE F&R IS A POLICY DOCUMENT**. In its final form it is no longer a confidential document and may be shared with other UCR faculty upon request.

APPENDIX 7

New Graduate Program Proposal Review Process

Development of the Preliminary Proposal

The preparation of new graduate programs should be initiated by the interested faculty members in consultation with the College Dean and Associate Dean(s). As soon as a decision is reached by the College Dean that a new graduate program should be developed, the Chancellor should be notified so that this new program can be listed in the 5-year prospectus for the College and Campus – a document sent annually to the Office of the President.

The proposing faculty are advised to meet early on with the Graduate Dean and Associate Graduate Dean and to consult a copy of the current guidelines dictated by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) as well as any other pertinent information which will help the faculty in drafting this document. The proposal must be prepared according to the CCGA guidelines and format, found online at
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/AppendixBFormatDegreeProposalsJune 2014.pdf

During the preparation of this proposal, various drafts of this document should be reviewed with the College Dean or his/her designee and with the Graduate Dean and/or Associate Graduate Dean. These consultation sessions should provide constructive criticism and advice to make the proposal more likely to garner campus approval after official submission.

Development of the "Final" Proposal

After these consultations have been completed and a "final" draft of the proposal is ready, the proposal should then be sent to the following individuals/groups:

- The College Dean - review the proposal and prepare a letter endorsing the proposal and committing appropriate resources to ensure the success of this proposal once approved and initiated.
- The College Executive Committee - render their review and endorsement of this proposal before being submitted to the campus for formal review.
- Related Campus Department Chairs - review the proposal and prepare a written statement concerning the proposal that describes how the new program positively or negatively impacts his/her own programs and what level of interaction the programs will have.
- **(optional step)** The Graduate Council Courses and Programs Subcommittee - who may provide their initial review and comments concerning the proposal [note the comments of this subcommittee should be considered as advisory only and should not be appended in any way to the proposal; the proposing faculty may or may not elect to incorporate the subcommittee recommendations into the final draft of the proposal].

Suggested Timelines for New Program Review

- Various stages of proposal preparation = indeterminate [depends on the proposing faculty] – between 6 – 12 months is typical.
- Graduate Council approval process (after formal submission) = 2-3 months if the proposal is well-prepared and strongly supported by the College Dean; longer if the proposing faculty need to address serious concerns raised by the Graduate Council.
- Campus approval process = after approval by the Graduate Council and other relevant committees, the proposal is forwarded to the Academic Senate Division for review at its next quarterly meeting (if the proposal reaches the Senate in time for the Call – if not, it must await another academic quarter before being voted on).
- Off-Campus approval process = usually 6 months to 1 year.

SUMMARY AND FLOWCHART

SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM
UCR Graduate Council
Approved by the Graduate Council November 17, 2011

1. Preparation should be initiated by interested faculty members in consultation with College Deans and Associate Deans. The Graduate Division Dean should be consulted for initial proposal guidance.
2. Proposal must use the CCGA "Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal".
3. Proposal must include a Dean's letter from each participating college or school. The Dena's letter should comment on the academic merit, resource requirement and the funding priority.
4. The program proposal must include a faculty vote from each participating school, including vote date. If the proposal is for an interdisciplinary program, a faculty vote is not necessary. Instead, please provide letters (a short email will suffice) from all core faculty stating their intent to participate.
5. If proposal is for a self-supporting or professional degree program include a plan for funding.
6. Submit the draft proposal to the Graduate Division (Dean and Staff) for review of policy and procedures. The Graduate Division will communicate directly with the program regarding comments and recommendations for the final proposal.
7. The program should forward the final program proposal to the Academic Senate Chair at senate@ucr.edu.
8. The proposal will be submitted to the relevant Senate committees for review and comment prior to being sent to the Division for Divisional vote.
9. For the remainder of the process, please refer to the "New Graduate Program Proposals & New Degree Title Proposals" flowchart.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM

- ☑ Used CCGA format for preparing proposal.
- ☑ Dean's letter from each participating school.
- ☑ Faculty vote
- ☑ Revised or new Course Action Forms (if applicable)
- ☑ Additional letter(s) of support (if applicable)
- ☑ P&EVC's letter (if applicable)
- ☑ Plan for funding for self-supporting or professional degree programs (if applicable)

Contact Information:
Sarah Miller
sarah.miller@ucr.edu
951-827-5538

New Graduate Program Proposals & New Degree Title Proposals

Proposing Faculty in consultation with College Dean, Graduate Division and related departments

↓

College Executive Committee *

↓

Chair, Academic Senate

↓

Senate Committee review:
- Graduate Council
- Library Information Technology and Scholarly Communication (LITSC)
- Planning & Budget

↓

Divisional Academic Senate
(Fall, Winter, or Spring meeting)

↓

CHANCELLOR/PROVOST & EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

↓

UC PROVOST

↓

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)

↓

NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

NEW DEGREE TITLE PROPOSAL →

Assembly of the Academic Senate (or Academic Council if Assembly is not meeting within 60 days of CCGA's approval)

↓

President (final approval)

↓

Notification to Home campus

The completed graduate degree program proposal submission packet consists of:
- Graduate degree program proposal
- Letter of support from campus administration
- Letter of approval from divisional Graduate Council
- Faculty curriculum vitae
- Response to CPEC questionnaire
- Lead faculty member's name, address, contact numbers
- Department Chair's name, address, contact numbers
- Administrative staff contact person's name, address, contact numbers
- Suggested names for external reviewers

* Refer to College Bylaws