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INTRODUCTION

This handbook has been prepared for the guidance of members of the Graduate Council, a standing committee of the Academic Senate of the Riverside Division. This handbook is a compilation of relevant bylaws of the Academic Senate, various documents and policies prepared by the Graduate Council, and descriptions of common practice. The handbook is intended both to provide new members with an overview of Graduate Council responsibilities and procedures and to assist every member in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Council.

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.

STRUCTURE

A. Composition

The Council is composed of at least 15 members, including the Dean of the Graduate Division. The Council has three officers, a CCGA Representative, and four 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 four standing subcommittees: Review A (covering CHASS, Management, and Education), Review B (covering CNAS, the Biomedical Division, and Engineering), Courses and Programs, and Fellowships.

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

B. Roles

The Chair of the Council is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Chair’s responsibilities include conducting the meetings, writing correspondence on behalf of the Council, and representing the Council on the Academic Senate Executive Council.

The Vice Chair of the Council is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Vice Chair serves as Chair in the Chair’s absence. The CCGA Representative is also appointed by the Committee on Committees.

The Secretary of the Council is appointed by the Chair of the Council in consultation with the Dean’s office. The Secretary is responsible for proofing and finalizing the draft of the minutes produced by the staff.

The subcommittee chairs are also appointed by the Chair.

Separate sections below describe the CCGA Representative duties, and subcommittees and chairs’ roles.
C. Meeting Schedules

The Council normally meets on the third Thursday of every month. 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, and meets the week prior to the full council meeting, to prepare business for presentation to the full Council. The Review subcommittees meet as needed, determined by the schedule of reviews. The Fellowship Committee meets once during Fall & Winter, and twice in Spring. 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.
RIVERSIDE DIVISION REPRESENTATIVE TO THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is the system wide 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 handbook on the activities of the CCGA is available from the UCOP for each member. 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 9-11 times during the year on the first Tuesday of each month and are held at UCOP.

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 sent out 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
GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES
University of California, Riverside
2012-2013

I. Overview

Reviews of graduate programs are conducted by the Graduate Council, usually 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, six to eight programs are scheduled for review each year. This pattern typically yields a 7-9 year cycle between reviews.

II. Preparation for Council Review

The graduate program is notified approximately 6-12 months prior to the scheduled review. At the time of this notification the program is asked to prepare the following information regarding its program for submission to the Graduate Council and to outside reviewers.

1. A concise report based on self-study of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since 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. We also strongly urge you to start the report with a short vision statement that briefly and concisely lays out the immediate goals and direction of the program. [guidelines attached]

2. List of faculty members by rank including department affiliation and participation in other graduate programs.

3. Brief biographies for faculty members. [guidelines attached]

4. A page listing links to website materials available to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).

5. Placement data for all Ph.D. degrees awarded since the last review, arranged by date of award of degree, listing dissertation director, first position and current position. [guidelines attached]

6. The WASC learning outcomes for graduate study that has already been prepared recently by your department/program.
The Graduate Council gathers statistical information from sources around the campus. The Office of Institutional Planning provides:

1. Departmental expenditures.
2. Faculty (ladder and budgeted) as of Fall (current year).
3. All courses taught per year (ladder FTE and headcount) for past three years.
4. Graduate courses offered during past three years and enrollment in each.
5. Non-faculty instructional personnel for (current year).
6. Staff personnel for (current year).
7. All course enrollments for last three years.
8. Student workload FTE and faculty FTE justified for last two years.
9. Headcount majors for last two years.
10. Courses taught by faculty from other departments for last three years.
11. Summary of degrees for last three years.
12. Summary of financial support provided all graduate students for last two years.

The Graduate Division provides:

13. Admissions profiles, enrollment data, degrees awarded (and time to degree), dropout rate.

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. Items 1-15 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 (masters awardees in the case of a masters only program). Statistical summaries are provided where appropriate, and a compilation of all comments, copied verbatim, is included in the review materials.

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 me with a list of at least 15 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other UC campuses and the rest from other places throughout the U.S. This list will be vetted by chairs of comparable programs at other UC campuses prior to inviting a three-member review panel. The panel will consist of at least one, but no more than two, reviewers from different UC campuses. Accordingly, please divide the list of names into three sections corresponding to your program's most important sub-disciplines or fields so that selecting one name from each section would yield an acceptable review team. 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. 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 obtains published biographies from standard sources, communicates with related programs elsewhere to ask about scholarly reputation and probable utility in the review process. Other names may arise from these queries; they are sent to the program for comment. The combined lists are examined by the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee, and (typically) a list of three names is selected by the subcommittee, along with a list of alternate names for each area of expertise selected. The Graduate Council typically contacts and assembles the review team and coordinates their travel arrangements. Team members receive travel expenses and an honorarium.

The Graduate Council formulates 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 and a current catalog are sent to each member of the Extramural team (contents of package follow below). An identical information package is provided the members of the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. The Program, College Dean, and 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 Grad Council review subcommittee responsible for the review.

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

1. Tentative schedule/campus map.
2. Questions for reviewers and Table of organization.
3. Program review statement.
4. Graduate program handbook and other publications related to the graduate program.
5. A list of faculty members with digested biographies (abbreviated version of full biography).
6. Faculty grant activity.
7. Graduate Council admission data/program history.
8. Graduate student support for last year.
9. Graduate student placement data.
11. Questionnaires.

IV. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

A typical team visit begins Monday morning with a briefing by the Graduate Council Chair and the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. The 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. 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 30 days of their visit.

Following the morning meetings, the Team meets to organize itself and select a chair, and then meets the program chair and graduate advisor, after which the Team begins to meet with faculty and students in the program. At noon the Team usually meets with chairs of closely related programs. These chairs are chosen by the Associate Dean in consultation with the Chair of the program being reviewed. After lunch, the team meets with faculty/students and examines the physical facilities. 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 Tuesday, the Team meets together with the College or School Dean, Graduate Dean, Associate Dean, Graduate Council Chair and Graduate Council Review Subcommittee 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 chairs this exit interview.

When the Team report is received, the honoraria are sent. The Team report is reviewed by the Graduate Council for matters of confidentiality, and the report (redacted if necessary) is sent to the Program with a three week response deadline for preliminary comment about factual inaccuracies and misperceptions.

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 writer of the first draft is usually the Graduate Council Subcommittee Chair or designate, with revisions or redrafting by the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. If the draft Findings and Recommendations appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee usually meets 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* that meets with its approval, the document is sent to 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 *Findings and Recommendations* are a policy document, and failure to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on graduate admissions or other actions.

When the Graduate Council is satisfied that changes are being implemented by the program as provided 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, Executive Vice Chancellor, College or School Dean and Academic Senate office. 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 follow 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.

Below is a summary of who has access to the external report and findings and recommendations at what stage of the review process:

- *External report*: GC subcommittee, Department/program
-  **Dept. Preliminary Response plus external report**: GC subcommittee, Department/program, Chancellor, EVC & Provost, College Dean, and Graduate Dean

-  **Findings and Recommendations plus external report plus Dept. Response**: Grad. Council, Department/program, Chancellor, EVC & Provost, College Dean, and Graduate Dean

-  **The closed file including all of the above plus correspondence between GC and Dept./Program leading to the conclusion of the process**: All parties listed above, closed review no longer confidential.

The internal review documents (item detailed in Section II of this document) remain confidential, except for the department self-summary, which will be attached to the external report.
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, to prepare recommendations on courses and programs for the Council.

C. Business

1. Graduate Course Forms

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 Academic Senate will be distributed to subcommittee members. Guidelines that pertain in particular to *graduate* course forms have been extracted from these guidelines.

Graduate course forms are routed (electronically) from the department to:

- Courses office
- Dean of the College (or Division)
- Graduate Council
- Committee on Courses

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).

- 200-285 Lecture and Seminar courses
- 286-289 Interdisciplinary courses
- 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 most accurately reflect hours of training.)
• 302 “Apprentice Teaching” or “Teaching Practicum,” variable (1-4 units). Open to TAs with units assigned to accurately reflect individual teaching activity time 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 change in “catalog copy style” which lists the current requirement on the left side of the page, and the proposed changes on the right side of the page; and include the Coversheet for Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements found on the Academic Senate web site. 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. It is the subcommittee’s responsibility to review the requested change to insure that the change is appropriate.

3. New Program Proposals

The format for new program proposals follows that specified by CCGA (see documentation on web site at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/ccgahandbook.pdf). The campus review process is as follows.
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 by the Chancellor.

The proposing faculty are advised to meet early on with the Associate Graduate Dean and Council Chair and to consult 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. In addition, the final proposal should also include the proposing faculty's responses to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) questionnaire (found in Appendix D of CCGA guidelines).

During the preparation of this proposal, various drafts of the document should be reviewed with the College Dean or his/her designee, and if desired, with the Graduate Dean and/or Associate Graduate Dean. These consultation sessions should provide constructive criticism and advice that would 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** - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement endorsing the proposal and committing appropriate resources to ensure the success of this proposal once approved and initiated

- **The College Executive Committee** (where applicable) - who should render their review and endorsement of this proposal before being submitted to the campus for formal review

- **Related Campus Department Chairs** - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement concerning the proposal and delineating whether this new program positively or negatively impacts on his/her own programs and what level of interaction between the 2 programs are likely to occur

- **(Optional step)** The Graduate Council Courses and Programs Subcommittee - who will 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].
Submission of the Proposal to the Campus for Review

Once these additional documents are secured and added to the proposal, and any modifications to the proposal suggested by these individuals/groups completed, the final proposal should be forwarded electronically in a pdf format to the Graduate Council to initiate the formal review process. The attached flowsheet (Appendix 2) demonstrates the progression of the proposal through the campus and off-campus administrative channels.

Suggested Timelines for New Program Review

Various stages of proposal preparation = indeterminate [depends on the proposing faculty] – between 6 – 12 months is probably typical.

Graduate Council approval process = 2-3 months if the proposal is well-prepared and strongly supported by the College Dean and Academic Senate Committees; longer if the proposing faculty need to address serious concerns raised by the Graduate Council.

Campus approval process = the proposal is first directed to the Graduate Division who iterates with the program. Once that is done, it is forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee, Committee on Educational Policy, and the Library Committee for review at its next meeting. After the proposal is reviewed by these committees, it goes to the Courses and Programs Subcommittee of the Graduate Council for review, before being forwarded to the Graduate Council for review and final approval.

Off-Campus approval process = usually 6 months to 1 year.

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 allocating Dissertation Research Grants and Masters Thesis Research Grants. 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.

In Spring quarter, the Fellowship Subcommittee also reviews and ranks Diversity Fellowships (DYP and GRMP). In addition, they review and select awardee(s) for the Advisor/Mentoring award.

B. Schedule

The Fellowship Subcommittee meets once in Fall & Winter quarters and twice in Spring quarter.

C. Business

Committee members are primarily responsible for evaluating proposals from students in their college/school and related colleges/schools. Normally, 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.

D. Guidelines

1. Dissertation Research Grants

Awards for graduate student expenses directly related to dissertation research are funded for a maximum of $1,000. (A copy of the Application Form is included in Appendix 3.)

Deadlines are quarterly, on the first working day after the third week of classes. Applicants are notified in writing about their competition results.
Only registered graduate students who have advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D. may be in the competition for Dissertation Research Grants and utilize grants.

A recap of the dissertation is not needed, but the applicant must describe the research questions to be answered, the data to be collected and the method(s) employed. They must also explain how the research will contribute to the academic discipline. The applicant should include or append a list of references or a bibliography of research work that relates to the topic. The committee will evaluate all proposals primarily on the merit of the proposal.

Research proposals using Recombinant DNA, humans or animals require special approval by designated campus committees. If it is appropriate to the research, it is the applicant's responsibility to provide protocol numbers and approval dates or indicate this is pending. If approvals are pending, this may increase the time required for the release of funds.

Requests for general assistance, such as lab helpers, are routinely denied when the work can be done by the applicant.

Permanent equipment is rarely funded. Reusable supplies, books, etc. remain the property of the university.

Limited per diem expenses are allowed during travel. All travel expenses are processed through the student’s department. Funding is not likely granted for travel in southern California. Foreign travel requests must include documentation from a host institution, facility, or individual that the student has the access needed to do the research. Travel to professional society conventions is not funded.

School district research must have written permission from the proper authorities submitted with the application.

Research grants are not for stipends nor for the actual preparation of thesis copy such as typing, charts or photos.

Budgets that exceed $1,000 will not be considered. Funds are available during a specified award period. Extensions of grant periods should be requested in writing. Awards terminate upon leaves of absence or filing fee status. Expenditure reports are due two weeks after the termination of award period.

Expenditures must be within the categories budgeted in the application. Written permission is required for adjustments prior to spending funds.


Awards for graduate student expenses directly related to thesis research are funded for a maximum of $500.

Deadlines are quarterly, on the first working day after the third week of classes. Applicants will be notified in writing about their competition results.
Only registered graduate students enrolled in Anthropology (M.S. degree), Art History, Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts, Experimental Choreography, and Visual Art may receive and utilize grants.

Research proposals using humans or animals are reviewed and approved by designated committees. Funds are released after such approvals are obtained.

Requests for general assistance, such as lab helpers, are routinely denied when the work can be done by the applicant.

Permanent equipment is rarely funded.

Reusable supplies, books, etc. remain the property of the university.

Limited per diem expenses are allowed during travel. All travel expenses are processed through the student’s department. Funding is not granted for travel in southern California. Foreign travel requests must include documentation from a host institution, facility, or individual that the student has the access needed to do the research. Travel to professional society conventions is not funded.

School district research must have written permission from the proper authorities submitted with the application.

Research grants are not for stipends nor for the actual preparation of thesis copy such as typing, charts or photos.

Funds are available during a specified award period. Extensions of grant periods should be requested in writing. Awards terminate upon leaves of absence or filing fee status. Expenditure reports are due two weeks after the termination of award period. Expenditures must be within the categories budgeted in the application. Written permission is required for adjustments prior to spending funds.

3. Diversity Awards (forthcoming)

4. Advisor/Mentor Awards (forthcoming)
The Graduate Division

The Graduate Division provides administrative leadership on graduate affairs and acts as the executive branch to the Council as legislature. It supports the EVC, colleges and school Deans, senior administrators, and departments/programs in managing graduate education. The Dean, Associate Deans, and staff of the Graduate Division implement the policies and guidelines established by the Council.

The Graduate Division is currently organized into the following units:

- Administration
- Financial Support
- Academic Preparation and Outreach
- Admissions
- Graduate Academic Affairs & Employment
- Graduate Success
- Office of Postdoctoral Studies

Administration: Deans and Associate Deans
Joseph W. Childers, Dean
As Dean he 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. He represents the Graduate Division on campus, system-wide, and nationally. He has final approval on graduate admissions and works with colleges and schools to construct fellowship and financial aid packages for all new graduate students. He 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.

Leah Haimo, Associate Dean
Handles all matters related to graduate recruitment and outreach. Oversees the supervision of UCLEADS and AGEP programs. Special focus is on diversity issues including grant support.

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

Shelley Hsu, Hobson's Coordinator

Andrea Gonzales, Assistant to the Dean

Financial Support
Yung Phung, Graduate Student Cohort Funding Analyst
Monitors cohort funding for the various colleges and schools and supervises Sherry Gonzalez and Andrea Gonzales.

Sherry Gonzalez, 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.

**Andrea Gonzales, Analyst**
Works with Fellowship Subcommittee to process the Dissertation Year Fellowship and GRMPS from submission to transfer of awards and is the liaison between the committee and students.

**Academic Preparation and Outreach**

**Maria Franco-Aguilar, 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.

**Admissions**

**Victoria Long, Director**
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.

**Patti Fagan, Manager**

**Amanda Wong**, SAO responsible for applicants whose last name begins with A-L

**Elisa Gutierrez**, SAO responsible for applicants whose last name begins with M-Z

**Graduate Academic Affairs and Employment**

**Linda Scott, 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, monitors student employment and fellowships for matriculated students. 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. Produces written support documents such as the Graduate Division Calendar, the Graduate Student Handbook, the Graduate Adviser’s Manual, and the Graduate Student Employment Handbook. Provides statistical information and surveys concerning graduate students to programs, the campus, the Office of the President, system-wide committees, and outside agencies. Also oversees TA evaluations.

**Kara Oswood, Academic Affairs** – handles all degree requirements related to PhD students
Karen Smith, Fellowship Administration – oversees all fellowship revisions to matriculated student packages and all graduate student employment for compliance with UCR and UCOP regulations.
Amanda Wong, Academic Affairs – handles all issues related to masters degrees.

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.

Office of Postdoctoral Studies
Linda Scott, Director – Oversees the regulations of postdoctoral scholars on campus and provides the campus and UCOP with data and statistics on postdoctoral scholars.
APPENDIX 1

Academic Senate By-Laws Relating to the Graduate Council

Chapter 8. Committees of the Division

8.14 GRADUATE COUNCIL

8.14.1 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 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)

8.14.2 The Graduate Council exercises regulative and coordinating functions in the Graduate Division of the Riverside campus except for the final approval of new programs leading to established graduate degrees and the final recommendation to the Assembly of the Academic Senate on new graduate degrees. It is the duty of the Graduate Council to:

8.14.2.1 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;

8.14.2.2 Coordinate the procedures in the Division relating to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor’s Degree;

8.14.2.3 Set policies and standards for admission to graduate status; (En 20 Mar 75)

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

8.14.2.5 Admit qualified students to candidacy for graduate degrees;

8.14.2.6 Recommend the award of fellowships and graduate scholarships, including honorary traveling fellowships, according to the terms of the various foundations;

8.14.2.7 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)

8.14.2.8 Supervise the conduct of public and other examinations for higher degrees;

8.14.2.9 Make final report to the Division on the conferring of graduate degrees;

8.14.2.10 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)
8.14.2.11 Report and make recommendations to the Division on matters pertaining to graduate work;

8.14.2.12 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)

8.14.2.13 Make rules governing the form of presentation and the disposal of dissertations;

8.14.2.14 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)

8.14.2.15 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)
APPENDIX 2

NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

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 to acquire 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. In addition, the final proposal should also include the proposing faculty's responses to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) questionnaire (found in Appendix D of CCGA guidelines).

During the preparation of this proposal, various drafts of this document should be reviewed with the College Dean or his/her designee, and if desired, with the Graduate Dean and/or Associate Graduate Dean. These consultation sessions should provide constructive criticism and advice that would 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 - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement endorsing the proposal and committing appropriate resources to ensure the success of this proposal once approved and initiated
- The College Executive Committee - who should render their review and endorsement of this proposal before being submitted to the campus for formal review
- Related Campus Department Chairs - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement concerning the proposal and delineating whether this new program positively or negatively impacts on his/her own programs and what level of interaction between the 2 programs are likely to occur
- (optional step) The Graduate Council Courses and Programs Subcommittee - who will 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 probably typical
- Graduate Council approval process = 2-3 months if the proposal is well-prepared and strongly supported by the College Dean and Academic Senate Committees; longer if the proposing faculty need to address serious concerns raised by the Graduate Council
- Campus approval process = after approval by the Graduate Council, 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
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. New programs should be listed in the 5-year prospectus, so the Chancellor should be notified as soon as a decision is reached on the new graduate degree proposal. Preparation should include initial proposal guidance and consultation with Graduate Division Dean.

2. Prepare proposal using the CCGA Format for Proposal for Graduate Degree Programs.

3. Send proposal to each participating school Dean for a letter on the academic merit, resource requirement and funding priority of the proposal.

4. Conduct a faculty vote in each participating school. Include date of vote.

5. 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.

6. If a self-supporting or professional degree programs, include a plan for funding.

7. A draft proposal needs to be submitted to the Academic Senate who will forward the same to the Graduate Division (Dean and Staff) to review for policy and procedures.

8. Graduate Division will reply directly to the program with comments and recommendations.

9. The Program will respond back to the Graduate Division.

10. The Graduate Division will ensure that the issues have been addressed and then forward the final proposal to the Academic Senate via the Graduate Council Support Staff.

11. The proposal will be submitted to the Planning and Budget and Library for review prior to submission to Courses and Programs Subcommittee of the Graduate Council.

12. If Courses and Programs is satisfied with responses from P&B and Library, the proposal is submitted for full Graduate Council review and then sent to the Division for Divisional vote.

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)
- EVC&P'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
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*