AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday, March 21, 2013
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

Action
9:00-9:05  1. Approval of Minutes of February 21, 2013 meeting Attached

Information
9:05 – 9:10  2. Announcements
          a. Chair of the Graduate Council
          b. CCGA Representative
          c. Graduate Student Council Representative(s)
          d. Dean of the Graduate Division

Action
9:30 – 9:35  3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee
             Attendance Sheet

          3. Approval of Courses – the following courses are to be approved:

             1. BIEN 271 - Video Bioinformatics: Multi-scale Analysis of Biological Systems – CHANGE
             2. BIEN 272 - Special Topics in Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering – CHANGE
             3. CS 210 - Scientific Computing – CHANGE
             4. CS 230 - Computer Graphics – CHANGE
             5. EE 235 - Linear System Theory – CHANGE
             6. EE 270 - Introduction to Video Bioinformatics – CHANGE
             7. EE 271 - Video Bioinformatics: Multi-scale Analysis of Biological Systems – CHANGE
             8. EE 272 - Introduction to Imaging Bioinstrumentation and Analysis – CHANGE
             9. EE 273 - Live Imaging and Analysis of Cellular and Molecular Behaviors – CHANGE
             10. EE 274 - Introduction to Medical Imaging and Analysis – CHANGE
             11. GEN 270 - Introduction to Video Bioinformatics – NEW
             12. GEN 271 - Video Bioinformatics: Multi-scale Analysis of Biological Systems – NEW
             13. GEN 272 - Introduction to Imaging Bioinstrumentation and Analysis – NEW
             14. GEN 273 - Live Imaging and Analysis of Cellular and Molecular Behaviors – NEW
             15. GEN 274 - Introduction to Medical Imaging and Analysis – NEW
             16. HIST 238A - Research Seminar in Oral History - CHANGE
             17. HIST 238B - Research Seminar in Oral History – CHANGE
             18. HIST 276A - Research Seminar in Native American History – CHANGE
             19. HIST 276B - Research Seminar in Native American History – CHANGE
             20. HIST 287A - Research Seminar in Nature, Place, and Space: Environmental and Spatial Approaches to History – CHANGE
             21. HIST 287B - Research Seminar in Nature, Place, and Space: Environmental and Spatial Approaches to History – CHANGE
             22. MGT 256 - Business Analytics for Management - NEW
             23. MSE 280 - Special Topics in Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering – NEW
             24. CS 287 – Colloquium in Computer Science (Professional Development) – CHANGE
             25. EEOB 210 – Organismal Biology – NEW

Include program change below:
26. ENSC 401 – Professional Development in Environmental Sciences – NEW

9:35 – 9:45

Program Changes and Proposals

1. Computer Science (CS 287 course above) catalog updates with professional development.  
2. EEOB (EEOB 210 course above) program change with justification as requested by C&P.  
3. Environmental Sciences (ENSC 401 course above) program change with professional development.

Information

Discussion/Action

9:45 – 10:45

4. New Business

a. Professional Development requirements – clarify intention of requirement  
b. Double Ph.D. policy – Mike Vanderwood report from CCGA  
c. Allowing committee members (for oral exams, thesis defense, etc.) to participate via teleconference - discussion  
d. Exam appeals policy – Kevin Esterling, Assoc. Dean attending  
e. Sociology student grade appeal

10:45 – 11:00

5. Graduate Program Reviews

a. CMDB F&R – approve to send to program for response  
b. Creative Writing review – approve program’s response and close out review  
c. Plant Pathology review – approve program’s response and close out review
Present:
Connie Nugent, Chair
Lynda Bell, Vice Chair
Chris Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El Hafsi, Area of Management Science
David. A. Johnson, School of Medicine
Rene Lysloff, Music
Rollanda O’Connor, Graduate School of Education
Richard A. Redak, Entomology
Daniel Schlenk, Environmental Sciences
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, Graduate School of Education
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Aaron Jones, GSA Student

Absent:
James S. Tobias, English
Roland K. Kawakami, Physics and Astronomy
Jianzhong Wu, Chemical/Environmental Engineering
Henry Huang, GSA Student

Guests:
Linda Scott, Graduate Division

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the January 17, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved as written.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Nugent thanked the members who volunteered to be on the Online Task Force. Vice Chair Bell mentioned that online education was discussed at the February 19th Senate Division meeting.

Announcements
Mike Vanderwood (CCGA Representative) – Prof. Vanderwood informed the Graduate Council that UC Provost Aimee Dorr has to give the Regents an update about online education at every other Regents meeting. The Governor appears to be very involved with the Regents, and is pushing them to look at academic efficiencies. The search for the new UC President is currently underway, in which the Regents will make the final decision, even though there are 13 faculty members on the search committee. The Open Access policy that the Graduate Council reviewed in November was not approved and will be rewritten. The CPAC form, previously used to
submit programs to CCGA for approval, has officially been eliminated. The five year plan is still required but they are going to work on making it more efficient. UCR’s Art History Ph.D. proposal was approved by CCGA. Prof. Vanderwood had to defend and advocate for the proposal when it was discussed. The debate was whether or not another Art History Ph.D. program was needed at the UC. UCR’s Masters of Finance was also approved by CCGA.

**Graduate Student(s)** – Aaron Jones informed the Graduate Council that the Student Regent did express concerns about the implementation of online education and how it will affect the daily lives of students. He feels that there needs to be more student input. In regards to the President’s search, there are many committees involved unlike the Chancellor’s search. In regards to the Chancellor’s search, there will be three meetings at UCOP, the first being March 4th. There is also a Town Hall meeting on February 22nd regarding the Chancellor’s search. The GSA recently lost their Executive Vice President and is searching for a replacement. Graduate students are still concerned about funding for travel, and increased services and support for graduate students. Graduate students are concerned about the future of the student services fee as units are trying to be supported by this fee.

Vice Chair Bell commented that big courses with TA’s should not be online courses. She asked that GSA make this point clear.

**Graduate Dean Joe Childers** – Graduate Dean Childers reported to the Graduate Council that Graduate Division received 5,000 applications, which is a ten percent increase from last year. Dean Childers credits Hobsons for this increase especially for Engineering. GRE scores and GPA’s are up from last year as well. As for processing, Graduate Division is 100% ahead for admits and SIR’s. This proves his point that if departments get their offers out early, students will take them.

Dean Childers would like the Graduate Council to clarify the professional training requirement and the fact that programs are assuming it is required for all degrees. The intention was for it to be for Ph.D. students; it was not intended for those who are in Masters or professional Masters Programs. This clarification needs to be made to all programs and departments.

Dean Childers informed the Graduate Council that occasionally Graduate Division will receive a request from a student seeking a second Ph.D. There is an unwritten rule that students are not allowed to obtain a second Ph.D. This policy is written in the Graduate handbook but no one knows where it came from. Some campuses make exceptions if the second Ph.D. is in a different field than their first. Most other institutions allow students to get a second Ph.D. but some do not. Dean Childers would like for the Graduate Council to discuss this issue and decide if they like the policy as is or would like to make some revisions. Prof. Vanderwood agreed to raise the issue at the next CCGA meeting.

Dean Childers discussed UC Ship, the student health insurance policy, which is now at a $57 million deficit. This program was poorly managed and now all campuses are looking for other health care providers. There is a 27% projected increase next year. While the program was managed at UCR, the increases were only about 6% per year.
The Graduate Division is receiving good feedback on their newsletter. Alumni seem to really like it.

**Courses and Programs to be approved**
Graduate Council voted to approve the following courses:

1. BCH 264 - Seminar-Tutorial in Physical Biochemistry – DELETE
2. BPSC 236 - Principles of Light Microscopy – DELETE
3. CHEM 207 - Chemical Group Theory – DELETE
5. CHEM 215B - Organic Synthesis – DELETE
6. CHEM 217 - Polymers: Synthesis and Characterization – DELETE
7. CHEM 239 (E-Z) - Advanced Topics in Inorganic Chemistry – DELETE
8. CHEM 239O - Advanced Topics in Inorganic Chemistry – DELETE
9. CHEM 239S - Advanced Topics in Inorganic Chemistry – DELETE
10. CHEM 239T - Advanced Topics in Inorganic Chemistry – DELETE
11. CHEM 239X - Advanced Topics in Inorganic Chemistry – DELETE
12. CHEM 276 - The Nanocrystal-ligand Interface – NEW
13. CS 242 - Information Retrieval and Web Search – NEW
14. ENSC 202 - Principles and Applications of Environmental Modeling – DELETE
15. ENSC 217 - Vadose Zone Processes – CHANGE
16. ENTM 255 - Seminar in Medical and Veterinary Entomology – CHANGE
17. GEO 226 - Soil Geomorphology – CHANGE
18. GEO 239 - Advanced Topics in Resource Geology – DELETE
19. GEO 245 - Principles and Applications of Geochronology – DELETE
20. GEO 247 - Electrical Exploration Methods – DELETE
22. GEO 257 - Current Issues in Seismology – DELETE
23. HIST 220 - Reading Seminar in Women's History – CHANGE
24. HIST 237 - Reading Seminar in Native American Historical Theory – CHANGE
25. HIST 251A - Research Seminar in European History – CHANGE
26. HIST 251B - Research Seminar in European History – CHANGE
27. HIST 253A - Research Seminar in Renaissance and Reformation History – CHANGE
28. HIST 253B - Research Seminar in Renaissance and Reformation History – CHANGE
29. HIST 254 - Reading Seminar in Historical Theory and Methods – CHANGE
30. HIST 277 - Reading Seminar in Early Modern World History – CHANGE
31. MGT 229 – Accounting Ethics and Professional Responsibilities – CHANGE
32. MUS 200 - Music Bibliography – CHANGE
33. MUS 206 - Proseminar in Musicology – CHANGE
34. MUS 266 - Seminar in Improvisational Studies – NEW
35. MUS 400 - Research and Professional Development Workshop – NEW
36. SWSC 203 - Surface Chemistry of Soils – CHANGE
37. SWSC 204 - Environmental Organic Chemistry – CHANGE
38. SWSC 206 - Principles and Theories Relating to Arid Zone Soils – CHANGE
39. SWSC 213 - Soil Mineralogy – CHANGE
40. SWSC 217 - Vadose Zone Processes – CHANGE
41. SWSC 226 - Soil Geomorphology – CHANGE
42. SWSC 262 - Wetlands Biogeochemistry Seminar – CHANGE
Graduate Council discussed the following programs:

1. **Proposal for a new Designated Emphasis in Science Fiction and Technoculture Studies** – Graduate Council approved this proposal as written.
2. **Application to BIG program be limited to Fall quarter – Bioengineering** – Graduate Council approved this proposal as written.
3. **Sociology program changes** – Graduate Council discussed and voted to table further discussion and approval of the program changes set forth in the curricular revision until a complete response is received.
4. **Professional Development requirement – Anthropology** – Graduate Council approved this proposal as written.
5. **Program changes and Professional Development requirement – Music** – Graduate Council approved this proposal as written with one abstention.

**Request for credit approval for BS/MS Mechanical Engineering student, John Reaver**

Prof. Guillermo Aguilar from Mechanical Engineering came to discuss Graduate Council making an exception for BS/MS Mechanical Engineering student, John Reaver, to be allowed to receive graduate course credit for ME 200 and ME 240A. While working toward his BS, he completed two upper division courses, ME 133 and ME 153, which were counted toward both his BS and MS degrees. The dual use of two courses in this fashion is allowed by the BS/MS program. In addition, while working toward his BS, he completed four graduate courses: ME 200, ME 240A, ME 267, and CS 205. These four courses did not contribute to the units required for his BS. He has been allowed to back transfer credit for two of these courses (ME 267 and CS 205) toward his MS, but has not been allowed to back transfer credit for the other two (ME 200 and ME 240A). Graduate Council voted to approve the request from Mechanical Engineering.

**Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R6.3 and R6.4 – Campus Graduation Requirements**

Graduate Council discussed and unanimously approved the proposed changes to R6.3 and R6.4 – campus graduation requirements.

**English F&R**

Lynda Bell and Rene Lysloff revised the language and tone of this previously written F&R. Graduate Council will provide English with updated attrition data in the new format from the Graduate Division to send with the F&R. Graduate Council voted to approve the F&R as written.

**Environmental Sciences task force charges**

Graduate Council approved the charges written for the Environmental Sciences task force as written.

**Bioengineering F&R**

Graduate Council approved the Bioengineering F&R as written with the addition of the program’s external review date of 2014/15.

**Biomedical Sciences F&R**

Graduate Council discussed the need for Biomedical Sciences to submit a strategic plan – plans for the future, where they want to be in ten years, etc. Faculty and student funding issues should also be addressed. Chair Nugent will add the acknowledgement of the program’s preliminary
response to the external reviewers report. Graduate Council would also like the program to be aware that they are going to be the model for how programs interact with other CNAS programs. Graduate Council approved this F&R pending the revisions that were discussed.

**Current reviewers receiving previous reviewers’ report**
Graduate Council discussed and agreed that it is fine to transmit the previous reviewers’ report of a program to the current reviewers by request only. Vice Chair Bell suggested asking programs at the review planning retreat in April if they would like reviewers to receive previous reports.
# 2012-2013 Courses & Programs Subcommittee

**Meeting Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHASE-DUNN, CHAIR</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHSEN EL HAFSI</td>
<td>SOBA</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLAND KAWAKAMI</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN KIM</td>
<td>COMP. LIT. &amp; FOREIGN LANG.</td>
<td>ABSENT; STARTING 4/11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENE LYSLOFF</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL SCHLENK</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERTEM TUNCEL</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE VANDERWOOD</td>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
February 5, 2013

TO: Dr. Connie Nugent
Chair, Graduate Council

FR: Dr. Laxmi Bhuyan
Computer Science & Engineering

RE: Requested Catalog Updates for 2013-14

Dear Dr. Nugent:
The attached requested catalog changes were voted on and approved by the Computer Science faculty.

The revised text adds a statement regarding the Professional Development Requirement to satisfy the new campus/Graduate Division requirement; it is satisfied via the colloquium in Computer Science.

Thank you.
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

Program: Computer Science & Engineering
Department/Academic Unit/School: BCOE
Date: 4/30/13
Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2013

Faculty Contact: Vangelis Tosotas Email: tosotas@as.ucr.edu Phone: x2888
Prepared by: Amy Raine Email: amy@as.ucr.edu Phone: x2903

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

☐ Admission requirements
☐ Unit requirements
☒ Professional Development Plan
☐ Other (please describe):
☐ Course requirements
☐ Examination requirements
☐ Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions and strike the deletions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

☐ Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
☐ Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
☐ Revised and Dated Program Summary
☐ Revised Catalogue Copy
☑ Revised Website Copy
PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER SCIENCE GRADUATE REQUIREMENTS

PRESENT:

Graduate Program
The Department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Computer Science. General requirements are listed in the Graduate Studies section of this catalog. Specific requirements for each degree are described below. Students enrolled prior to Fall 2008 can still follow the old Graduate Program.

Admission All applicants must supply GRE General Test scores. The GRE subject test in Computer Science is recommended but not required. Applicants should have at least an undergraduate degree in computer science or a closely related field, but applicants who fail to meet this criterion may sometimes be admitted with deficiencies.

Prerequisite Material Competence in the areas defined by the following UCR courses is essential to graduate study in computer science:
CS 141, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153, CS 161/CS 161L
A student who is deficient in any of these competency areas may be asked to complete the corresponding UCR course with a letter grade of at least B+, or to pass a challenge examination based on that course’s final exam with a grade of at least B+. All such remedial work should be completed within the first year of graduate study, and in all cases the deficiency must be corrected before a student can enroll in any graduate course from the same specialty area.

Core Areas Students have considerable flexibility in selecting specialty area(s) within the program. However, the following core areas introduce fundamental concepts and tools of general interest to all students.

PROPOSED:

Graduate Program
The Department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Computer Science. General requirements are listed in the Graduate Studies section of this catalog. Specific requirements for each degree are described below. Students enrolled prior to Fall 2008 can still follow the old Graduate Program.

Admission All applicants must supply GRE General Test scores. The GRE subject test in Computer Science is recommended but not required. Applicants should have at least an undergraduate degree in computer science or a closely related field, but applicants who fail to meet this criterion may sometimes be admitted with deficiencies.

Prerequisite Material Competence in the areas defined by the following UCR courses is essential to graduate study in computer science:
CS 141, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153, CS 161/CS 161L
A student who is deficient in any of these competency areas may be asked to complete the corresponding UCR course with a letter grade of at least B+, or to pass a challenge examination based on that course’s final exam with a grade of at least B+. All such remedial work should be completed within the first year of graduate study, and in all cases the deficiency must be corrected before a student can enroll in any graduate course from the same specialty area.

Core Areas Students have considerable flexibility in selecting specialty area(s) within the program. However, the following core areas introduce fundamental concepts and tools of general interest to all students.
Major Specialty Areas
The department has active research programs in the following major specialty areas. A list of related graduate courses is provided for each area. Courses that qualify for the M.S. Breadth Requirement are marked with an asterisk (*).

C. Databases, Data Mining, and Machine Learning: CS 205*, CS 235*, CS 229, CS 236*, CS 272
E. Computer Networks: CS 204*, CS 237, CS 239*, CS 240, CS 257, CS 255*
F. Programming Languages, Compilers, and Software Engineering: CS 201*, CS 206*, CS 207*, CS 245*, CS 246*

Master’s Degree
The Department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the M.S. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Requirements
48 quarter units of graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses are required. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course. For students interested in interdisciplinary research, individual study programs can be approved.
1. Core Requirement (8 units). Choose one course from two of the three Core Areas listed above, with no grade lower than B-.

2. Breadth Requirement (8 units). Two approved breadth courses chosen in such a way that together the core and breadth courses cover four different Major Specialty Areas (A to G).

3. Electives (32 units)
   a. Project Option. A student pursuing the M.S. degree, non-thesis option, may include up to 4 units of Directed Research (CS 297) towards the elective requirement. Of the remaining 28 units, at least 12 units must be approved graduate lecture courses. The remaining 16 units may include additional approved graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260–269, and up to 12 units of approved undergraduate technical electives.
   
   b. Thesis Option. A student pursuing the M.S. degree, thesis option, may include up to 12 units of graduate research (CS 297 or CS 299) towards the elective unit requirement. Of the remaining 20 units, at least 4 units must be approved graduate lecture courses. The remaining 16 units may include additional approved graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260–269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives.

Capstone Experience All students must complete a capstone experience that synthesizes and integrates the knowledge and skills obtained throughout the master’s program, according to one of the following options. It is the responsibility of the student to find a faculty member willing to supervise the master’s project or thesis, to form the faculty examining committee, and to schedule the oral examination.

   a. Project Option Students must complete a research project under the guidance of a faculty member. This project will require a written report and will be presented to a committee of at least two faculty members in an oral examination.

   b. Thesis Option Students must complete a research project under the guidance of a faculty member. This project will require a written report and will be presented to a committee of at least two faculty members in an oral examination.
**b. Thesis Option** Students must submit a master’s thesis in accordance with the general requirements of the university. The thesis is original research work, and it should demonstrate the student’s ability to study a research area, identify an open problem and make a research contribution. The thesis must be presented to and approved by a committee of at least three faculty members.

**Normative Time to Degree** 2 years.

**Combined B.S. + M.S. Five-Year Program** The department offers a combined five-year B.S. + M.S. program, designed to allow successful UCR Computer Science B.S. graduates to complete the Master of Science degree in Computer Science in one year, by allowing up to 12 credits of coursework taken as a UCR undergraduate to be counted towards the 32-unit elective requirements of the M.S. (The courses that can be double-counted are those that are eligible to be counted as technical electives in the B.S. requirements.) A student may apply at the start of their senior year by submitting an application to the Computer Science M.S. program, provided that at the end of junior year, the student was a UCR CS B.S. student with cumulative GPA at least 3.4 and had completed the following courses with no grade less than a B- and average grade at least 3.2: CS 100, CS 120A, CS 120B, CS 161. The application to the M.S. program must include at least two recommendation letters from UCR Academic Senate faculty members (at least one, and preferably both, CSE faculty). Submission of GRE scores with the application is recommended but not required. Matriculation into the combined program occurs in the Fall term following senior year, provided: (a) the M.S. application is accepted, (b) throughout senior year, the student is a CS B.S. major with cumulative GPA 3.4 or higher, (c) by the end of senior year, the student completes the Computer Science B.S. degree requirements.
Incoming students who are applying to the CS B.S. program may simultaneously apply for preliminary admission into the combined program provided their high-school GPA is at least 3.6, their SAT-I combined score is at least 1950, they satisfy the Entry-Level Writing requirement before matriculation, and they have sufficient math preparation to enroll in calculus upon arrival. Preliminary admission status is maintained as long as the student is a CS B.S. student in good standing with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.4. Preliminarily admitted students still need to apply for full admission in their senior year as described above.

For Computer Engineering undergraduates seeking the B.S. + M.S. program leading to an M.S. in Computer Science, please see catalog entry under Computer Engineering.

Doctoral Degree
The Department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry, or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view of the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category.

Incoming students who are applying to the CS B.S. program may simultaneously apply for preliminary admission into the combined program provided their high-school GPA is at least 3.6, their SAT-I combined score is at least 1950, they satisfy the Entry-Level Writing requirement before matriculation, and they have sufficient math preparation to enroll in calculus upon arrival. Preliminary admission status is maintained as long as the student is a CS B.S. student in good standing with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.4. Preliminarily admitted students still need to apply for full admission in their senior year as described above.

For Computer Engineering undergraduates seeking the B.S. + M.S. program leading to an M.S. in Computer Science, please see catalog entry under Computer Engineering.

Doctoral Degree
The Department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry, or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view of the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category.
Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course. Units obtained in CS 270, CS 287, CS 290, CS 297, CS 298, CS 299, CS 301, and CS 302 cannot be counted in any course work category.

1. **Core Requirement (12 units)**. Choose three courses from at least two of the three Core Areas described above, with no grade lower than B- and an overall core course GPA of at least 3.2.

2. **Depth Requirement (8 units)**. Choose two courses listed above under the same Major Area (A to G). This requirement ensures that Ph.D. students, early on in their careers, acquire some depth of knowledge in a particular research area.

3. **Breadth Requirement (12 units)**. Choose three courses from at least two different Major Areas (A to G) outside the student’s depth area. No course that is listed in the student’s depth area can be used to fulfill the breadth requirement, even if it is cross-listed in another area. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted towards the breadth requirement.

4. **Electives (12 units)**. The remaining courses can be selected from additional CS graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted as an elective.

**Milestones**
The Department has established three milestones to mark progress towards the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science: advancement to candidacy, presentation of the dissertation proposal, and final oral examination. A Ph.D. student must also satisfy all applicable Graduate Division requirements for each milestone.
Milestone I: Advancement to Candidacy. A student advances to candidacy after he/she has completed all of the Ph.D. course requirements described above, and passed the combined written and oral qualifying examinations, as described below. These two exams are intended to verify three components of the student's preparation for Ph.D. research: (1) breadth of comprehension sufficient to enable Computer Science research in areas beyond the topic(s) of the research exam and dissertation; (2) ability to perform critical study, analysis and writing in a focused area; and (3) demonstrated research experience or ability to do research.

Written Qualifying Examination The written qualifying examination consists of a written report summarizing the oral presentation to be given at the oral qualifying examination. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication, and must be submitted to the Qualifying Committee for approval at least one week prior to the oral qualifying examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination The student is expected to demonstrate research aptitude by undertaking a research study on some topic (typically a problem from student’s chosen research specialty that may be a promising area in which to conduct the dissertation research), under the guidance of his or her faculty major professor. The research must be presented orally to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department. The committee will consist of at least four Senate faculty members, with at least three members whose home department is CSE. The committee evaluates the merits of the work and the student’s aptitude for research. The work must represent significant progress towards original and publishable research. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication. The student must complete this requirement in no more than two attempts. The normative time for taking the Oral Qualifying Exam is by the end of the fifth quarter.
Dissertation Committee After advancing to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Examination Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least four senate faculty members with at least three members belonging to the CSE department (their home department is CSE).

Milestone II: Dissertation Proposal Examination
After advancement to candidacy, the student prepares a dissertation proposal that describes the dissertation topic, summarizes the relevant background literature, and presents a comprehensive research plan for the doctoral dissertation. The Dissertation Proposal Examination evaluates appropriateness of the research topic and the feasibility of the research plan. It also establishes a realistic timeline for the completion of the Dissertation. The Dissertation Committee administers this exam. The normative time for the Dissertation Proposal Exam is by the end of the third year. The Dissertation Proposal exam must be taken at least six months prior to the Final Doctoral Examination.

Milestone III: Final Doctoral Examination
The student is required to write a dissertation in accordance with the Graduate Division requirements and may be required to defend it in a public oral final doctoral examination to the Dissertation Committee. After a satisfactory performance on the final doctoral examination, the Dissertation Committee recommends granting the PhD degree. The student’s research and the dissertation must both meet the highest standards of originality and scholarship. The normative time for the completion of a Ph.D. in Computer Science is five years.

Professional Development Requirement
All incoming M.S. and Ph.D. students must enroll in the Fall, Winter, and Spring offerings of CS 287, Colloquium in Computer Science.

JUSTIFICATION:
The revised text includes adding the Professional Development Requirement to satisfy the new campus/Graduate Division requirement; it is satisfied via the colloquium.

APPROVALS:
Computer Science and Engineering Department: 1/30/13
DATE: February 1, 2013

TO: J. Daniel Hare
FROM: J. Daniel Hare
       Director, Graduate Program in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

SUBJECT: Program changes and catalog copy

The faculty of the Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology recently voted to consolidate the three disciplinary "tracks" in the program into one unified program. The attached document outlines the changes to the program and provides updated catalog copy. Additional details appear in the "Justification" section.
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>2/5/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Contact: Dan Hare  
Email: daniel.hare@ucr.edu  
Phone: 2-3858

Prepared by: Melissa Gomez  
Email: melissag@ucr.edu  
Phone: 2-5913

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Course requirements
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree
- Other (please describe):

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. <strong>Underline</strong> the additions and <strong>strike</strong> the deletions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate  
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate  
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
- Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
- Revised and Dated Program Summary
- Revised Catalogue Copy
- Revised Website Copy
### Existing

**Doctoral Degree**

The Department of Biology offers the Ph.D. degree in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, with specializations in Evolutionary Biology, Ecology, and Physiology & Biophysics. In addition to the general requirements of the Graduate Division, students intending to become candidates for the Ph.D. degree in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology must complete the following.

**Course Work**

Course requirements are determined in consideration of the requirements of the student’s area of specialization. Selection of specific courses is done by the guidance committee in consultation with the student. Each track requires EEOB 400, two 200-level disciplinary courses, a core course (or core course series) and two current research topics courses: EEOB 265 and a disciplinary colloquium series seminar (BIOL 252 or equivalent).

**A. Evolutionary Biology**

1. Disciplinary core course in Evolutionary Theory (EEOB 216 or the equivalent)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (EEOB 211, BIOL 212/ENTM 212/GEOL 212, EEOB 213, EEOB 214 EEOB 217, BIOL 219)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.

**B. Ecology**

1. Disciplinary core course in Ecology (EEOB 211)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (BIOL 212/ENTM 212/GEOL 212, EEOB 213, EEOB 217, BPSC 246, BPSC 247, BPSC 243, ENSC 232, SWSC 211/MCBL 211)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.

**C. Physiology and Biophysics**

1. Disciplinary core course in Physiology (EEOB 297; two units each in the first four quarters of residence for a total of 8 quarters)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (CMD 200 or CBNS 200A, CMD 201, CBNS 200B, CMD 202, CBNS 200C, BIOL 203, EEOB 216, ENTM 201, ENTM 243)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.

### Proposed

**Doctoral Degree**

The Department of Biology offers the Ph.D. degree in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, with specializations in Evolutionary Biology, Ecology, and Physiology & Biophysics. In addition to the general requirements of the Graduate Division, students intending to become candidates for the Ph.D. degree in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology must complete the following.

**Course Work**

Course requirements are determined in consideration of the requirements of the student’s area of specialization. Selection of specific courses is done by the guidance committee in consultation with the student. Each track requires EEOB 400, two 200-level disciplinary courses, a core course (or core course series) and two current research topics courses: EEOB 265 and a disciplinary colloquium series seminar (BIOL 252 or equivalent).

**A. Evolutionary Biology**

1. Disciplinary core course in Evolutionary Theory (EEOB 216 or the equivalent)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (EEOB 211, BIOL 212/ENTM 212/GEOL 212, EEOB 213, EEOB 214 EEOB 217, BIOL 219)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.

**B. Ecology**

1. Disciplinary core course in Ecology (EEOB 211)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (BIOL 212/ENTM 212/GEOL 212, EEOB 213, EEOB 217, BPSC 246, BPSC 247, BPSC 243, ENSC 232, SWSC 211/MCBL 211)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.

**C. Physiology and Biophysics**

1. Disciplinary core course in Physiology (EEOB 297; two units each in the first four quarters of residence for a total of 8 quarters)
2. At least two disciplinary courses (CMD 200 or CBNS 200A, CMD 201, CBNS 200B, CMD 202, CBNS 200C, BIOL 203, EEOB 216, ENTM 201, ENTM 243)
3. Two current research topics courses (BIOL 252 or another disciplinary colloquium and EEOB 265) for a minimum of 5 quarters prior to advancement to candidacy and 12 quarters prior to completion of the doctoral degree.
Justification: The EEOB program carefully considered recommendations made during its most recent Graduate Program review and has eliminated its three tracks in favor of a single consolidated program. The 'Core' and Disciplinary courses for the tracks are eliminated and replaced by a list of three foundation classes, EEOB 210, Organismal Biology, EEOB 216, Theory of Evolution, and EEOB 217, Advanced Population and Community Ecology. All students are required to take at least one of these three courses. Additionally, students, in consultation with their Guidance Committees will require at least one other four-unit graduate-level course from an approved list maintained by the program. The list of classes will be determined by the program and updated as needed. Classes will be selected that provide students with additional foundational training in the areas of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology. It is anticipated that the approved list will include many of the other existing EEOB classes, but, recognizing the interdisciplinary nature of the program, four-unit graduate classes from other departments and graduate programs also will be considered. Prior requirements for EEOB 400 and two seminars remain in effect.

This change was approved by vote of the EEOB faculty on November 19, 2012.

Submitted by J. Daniel Hare, EEOB program director
Sarah,  

Our requested justification appears below, and from last week’s correspondence, you should be aware that the program corrected and resubmitted the new proposed course weeks ago.

Best,

Dan

The EEOB program expects students to specialize within one of the three research areas of the program: evolution, ecology, or organismal biology. The proposed required courses each are necessarily broad-based and relevant for students with diverse interests and backgrounds. Requiring only two of these (a core plus one chosen from an approved set) gives the students more flexibility to take additional courses tailored to their dissertation specialty. Such courses would include (but not be restricted to) courses in quantitative methods such as statistics or simulation modeling, courses focusing on technical methodologies, conceptually-based courses on more specialized topics, and less formal seminar courses discussing current literature in their field of interest. The students will select these optional courses in consultation with their advisory committees and it is expected that each student will take courses appropriate for their areas of specialization and background preparation.

---

Hi Dan,

The committee will meet again on March 14th. In order to make that agenda, I will need the justification from you and the course returned to me in CRAMS with corrections made by March 6th. You can submit everything to me via email.

Thanks,

Sarah
Graduate Program
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The Environmental Sciences Graduate Program offers the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Environmental Sciences.

Advanced training in Environmental Sciences is becoming increasingly necessary to address complex problems involving natural resources and environmental quality. Although this task frequently requires specialized knowledge in various fields of science, it also requires understanding and integration of a wide variety of interacting physical, chemical, biological, and societal influences. This interaction makes graduate study in environmental sciences distinct from many other scientific fields.

We have designed our program to offer advanced training in a number of specialized field areas within environmental sciences, operating within a single graduate degree program administered by the Department of Environmental Sciences. Students trained in the Environmental Sciences Graduate Program can fill many areas of expertise needed in the state and nation. Potential career opportunities exist at regulatory agencies, consulting firms, government and academic research institutions, and industrial research facilities.
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The Environmental Sciences Graduate Program offers the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Environmental Sciences.

Advanced training in Environmental Sciences is becoming increasingly necessary to address complex problems involving natural resources and environmental quality. Although this task frequently requires specialized knowledge in various fields of science, it also requires understanding and integration of a wide variety of interacting physical, chemical, biological, and societal influences. This interaction makes graduate study in environmental sciences distinct from many other scientific fields.

We have designed our program to offer advanced training in a number of specialized field areas within environmental sciences, operating within a single graduate degree program administered by the Department of Environmental Sciences. Students trained in the Environmental Sciences Graduate Program can fill many areas of expertise needed in the state and nation. Potential career opportunities exist at regulatory agencies, consulting firms, government and academic research institutions, and industrial research facilities.
**Admission** Entry to the program requires completion of a baccalaureate degree in a field appropriate as preparation for graduate study in environmental sciences. Students normally will come to the program from an environmental sciences related discipline such as atmospheric science, aquatic science, earth science, environmental chemistry, hydrology, or soil science; a basic science such as biology, chemistry, or physics; or in a social science discipline such as economics, political science, geography, or sociology. Students may conduct research under the supervision of a sponsoring faculty member in any of the following field areas. Students must specify a field area for entry into the program.

In addition to the following requirements, all applicants must meet the general requirements as set forth in this catalog under the Graduate Studies section.

**Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology**
The Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology field area focuses on the sources, physical and chemical transformations, and removal processes of chemicals in soil, water, and air, and their impacts on ecological systems.

**Entrance requirements** There are no entrance requirements for the Environmental Chemistry area beyond the general requirements for admission to the ESGP. For Ecotoxicology, prospective students would be expected to have had courses in General Biology/Zoology and Organic Chemistry. Students who do not have sufficient background to take the core course or specific elective courses may, however, need to first take prerequisite courses.

**Environmental Microbiology**
The Environmental Microbiology field area encompasses the study of microbial processes in natural and agricultural ecosystems and the effects of microorganisms on environmental processes and environmental quality. Research topics include fundamental research on microbial physiology, genetics, and ecology as related to the environment, applied research on microbial effects on the fate and transport of pollutants, anthropogenic effects on microbial communities, fate and transport of human pathogenic microorganisms in the environment, and the application of microorganisms and microbial assays as indicators of soil and water quality.
**Entrance requirements** Students admitted to the Environmental Microbiology field area are expected to have a baccalaureate degree in biology, microbiology, or closely related field or demonstration of extensive background in biology and microbiology. Recommended prior course work includes chemistry (general, organic, and biochemistry), biology (general and advanced course work), microbiology (general), and statistics (general). Deficiencies in these areas must be remedied during the first year of graduate school.

**Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy** The economics and policy field area focuses on the human aspects of environmental problems. Coursework emphasizes training in the traditional areas of environmental and natural resource economics, including welfare theory, externalities, pollution control, resource extraction, and non-market valuation, but also in sustainability, environmental management, and environmental policy. Research topics could include the environmental impacts of agriculture, transportation and urbanization, land use in poor and industrialized countries, international trade and the environment, climate change, and methodological advances in non-market valuation, to name just a few. Training in this field enables a student to analyze and address a wide variety of environmental policy issues.

**Entrance requirements** Students admitted to the Environmental Microbiology field area are expected to have a baccalaureate degree in biology, microbiology, or closely related field or demonstration of extensive background in biology and microbiology. Recommended prior course work includes chemistry (general, organic, and biochemistry), biology (general and advanced course work), microbiology (general), and statistics (general). Deficiencies in these areas must be remedied during the first year of graduate school.

**Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy** The economics and policy field area focuses on the human aspects of environmental problems. Coursework emphasizes training in the traditional areas of environmental and natural resource economics, including welfare theory, externalities, pollution control, resource extraction, and non-market valuation, but also in sustainability, environmental management, and environmental policy. Research topics could include the environmental impacts of agriculture, transportation and urbanization, land use in poor and industrialized countries, international trade and the environment, climate change, and methodological advances in non-market valuation, to name just a few. Training in this field enables a student to analyze and address a wide variety of environmental policy issues.

**Entrance requirements** Students admitted to the Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy field area normally will have completed a baccalaureate degree in the natural sciences, social sciences, or engineering. At least two undergraduate courses in economics and statistics are recommended. Students who do not have sufficient background to take the core courses or field courses may need to first take prerequisite courses.

**Soil and Water Sciences** The Soil and Water Science field area offers comprehensive training in the chemistry, physics, biology, and ecology of soils, surface waters and wetlands. Students can specialize in a variety of areas, including soil and aquatic chemistry, hydrology, limnology, soil-plant relations, biogeochemistry, bioremediation, geomicrobiology, contaminant fate and transport, water resources management, hill slope processes, soil genesis, soil mineralogy and geomorphology, and related areas.

**Entrance requirements** Students admitted to the Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy field area normally will have completed a baccalaureate degree in the natural sciences, social sciences, or engineering. At least two undergraduate courses in economics and statistics are recommended. Students who do not have sufficient background to take the core courses or field courses may need to first take prerequisite courses.

**Soil and Water Sciences** The Soil and Water Science field area offers comprehensive training in the chemistry, physics, biology, and ecology of soils, surface waters and wetlands. Students can specialize in a variety of areas, including soil and aquatic chemistry, hydrology, limnology, soil-plant relations, biogeochemistry, bioremediation, geomicrobiology, contaminant fate and transport, water resources management, hill slope processes, soil genesis, soil mineralogy and geomorphology, and related areas.
**Entrance requirements** Admission to the Soil and Water Sciences field area requires a baccalaureate degree with preparation in both physical and life sciences. It is recommended that students have completed one year of general chemistry, as well as courses in general physics, organic chemistry, calculus through integrals, general biology, statistics, and physical geology or physical geography.

**Environmental Sciences and Management**
The Environmental Sciences and Management field area is designed to serve students seeking interdisciplinary training in environmental research. Students enrolled in this field area will be expected to pursue a rigorous research plan that involves research in one or more of the following areas: science, management, or policy. Students will have the opportunity to select study committees from a spectrum of environmental disciplines.

**Entrance requirements**
There are no additional entrance requirements for this field area beyond those to enter the graduate program.

**Course Work**
The Ph.D. and M.S. degree programs both require completion of the courses given below, which are specific to each field area. Students with a M.S. objective may need to take additional courses to fulfill the requirements of the Plan I (Thesis) or Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) options. Upon acceptance to the program, the student will select an Advisory Committee made up of three members of the participating faculty in the ESGP to assist in the planning of the individualized curriculum. Electives are chosen in consultation with the Advisory committee. Students also must attend a seminar each quarter (to be chosen in consultation with the major advisor). There is no foreign language requirement for the program.

**Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology**
All students must complete one core course: ENSC 200/ENTX 200/CHEM 246.

- Students focusing on **Environmental Chemistry** must complete 4 electives from the following list, of which at least 2 must be at the graduate level:
  - ENSC 104, ENSC 127/SWSC 127, ENSC 133/SWSC 133/MCBL 133, ENSC 135/ENTX 135/CHEM 135/CHEM 136/ENTX 136

**Environmental Sciences and Management**
The Environmental Sciences and Management field area is designed to serve students seeking interdisciplinary training in environmental research. Students enrolled in this field area will be expected to pursue a rigorous research plan that involves research in one or more of the following areas: science, management, or policy. Students will have the opportunity to select study committees from a spectrum of environmental disciplines.

**Entrance requirements**
There are no additional entrance requirements for this field area beyond those to enter the graduate program.

**Course Work**
The Ph.D. and M.S. degree programs both require completion of the courses given below, which are specific to each field area. Students with a M.S. objective may need to take additional courses to fulfill the requirements of the Plan I (Thesis) or Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) options. Upon acceptance to the program, the student will select an Advisory Committee made up of three members of the participating faculty in the ESGP to assist in the planning of the individualized curriculum. Electives are chosen in consultation with the Advisory committee. Students are encouraged to attend a seminar each quarter (to be chosen in consultation with the major advisor). Students must complete 2 units of ENSC 401 (Professional Development in Environmental Sciences) within their first year of entering the ESGP. There is no foreign language requirement for the program.

**Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology**
All students must complete one core course: ENSC 200/ENTX 200/CHEM 246.

- Students focusing on **Environmental Chemistry** must complete 4 electives from the following list, of which at least 2 must be at the graduate level:
  - ENSC 104, ENSC 127, ENSC 133/MCBL 133, ENSC 135/ENTX 135/CHEM 135, ENSC 136/ENTX 136
### 135/CHEM 135, ENSC 136/ENTX 136/SWSC 136, ENSC 214/SWSC 214, ENSC 217/SWSC 217, ENSC 224/SWSC 224, ENSC 225/SWSC 225, ENSC 232/SWSC 232, ENTX 200L, ENTX 244/CHEM 244, ENTX 245/CHEM 245, SWSC 203, SWSC 204

Students focusing on Ecotoxicology must complete: ENTX 201 and ENTX 208 and take at least two electives from the following list, one of which must be at the graduate level: ENSC 214/SWSC 214, ENSC 217/SWSC 217, ENSC 224/SWSC 224, ENSC 225/SWSC 225, ENSC 232/SWSC 232, ENTX 200L, ENTX 244/CHEM 244, ENTX 245/CHEM 245, ENTX 154, ENTX 205

### Environmental Microbiology

Students must complete the following core courses: MCBL 201, MCBL 221, MCBL 211, and at least 4 elective courses (or 12 credit hours), three of which must be at the graduate level.

### Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy

Course requirements include: core course sequences consisting of ECON 200A, ECON 200B, ECON 200C and ECON 205A, ECON 205B, ECON 205C; field course sequence consisting of ECON 207, ECON208, ECON 209; and three elective courses comprised of upper division undergraduate courses and/or graduate courses approved by their advisor. Students must earn a satisfactory score on the doctoral cumulative examination in microeconomic theory, attain a “B” average in each of the core and field course sequences, and pass the doctoral qualifying examination with written and oral components.

No student will be given more than three attempts to achieve a satisfactory grade on the microeconomic theory cumulative examination. Any unexcused absences from the required examinations will be regarded as a failure.

### Soil and Water Sciences

Students must complete one course in each of the following core course groups.

#### Chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENSC 104</th>
<th>SWSC 104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 136/ENSC 136/ENTX 136/SWSC 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Physics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEM 136/ENSC 136/ENTX 136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ENSC 107/SWSC 107  
ENSC 163

Biology

ENSC/MCBL/SWSC 133  
BPSC 134/ENSC 134/SWSC 134  
ENSC 141/MCBL 141/SWSC 141

Natural Structure and Diversity

ENSC 138/GEO 138/SWSC 138  
ENSC 140/SWSC 140

Students may have completed these prior to admission or they may take them early in their graduate program. Students must present a departmental seminar summarizing results of their thesis or dissertation or internship during the final quarter of matriculation.

Environmental Sciences and Management
Because students enrolled in this field area may carry out interdisciplinary research for their advanced degree, the graduate course plan will be individualized. It is expected that the student and his/her Advisory Committee will design a course plan that includes graduate environmental science, management, and/or policy courses. The student will be required to take 6 courses (24 units), 3 of which must be at the graduate level.

Master's Degree
The Department of Environmental Sciences offers the M.S. degree in Environmental Sciences under the Plan I (Thesis) and Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) options. The general requirements for the M.S. degree are found in the Graduate Studies section of the General Catalog. All students are required to give a presentation annually at the Environmental Sciences Graduate Program Student Symposium.

Plan I (Thesis) Plan I (Thesis) Students must complete a minimum of 36 quarter units of graduate and upper-division undergraduate courses in, or significantly related to, Environmental Sciences. These must include the course requirements given above for the specific field area. At least 24 of the 36 units must be in graduate courses. A maximum of 12 of these units may be in graduate research for the thesis. No more than 4 units of ENSC 290 and 2 units of graduate seminar courses may be applied toward the degree. A thesis must be written and
the degree. A thesis must be written and accepted by the M.S. thesis committee members, and a final oral defense of the thesis must be passed.

**Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)** Students must complete a minimum of 36 quarter units of graduate and upper-division undergraduate courses in, or significantly related to, Environmental Sciences. These must include the course requirements given above for the specific field area. At least 18 units must be in graduate courses. Students may count no more than 2 units of graduate seminar courses and 6 units of graduate internship courses toward the required 18 units and no units from graduate research for thesis or dissertation.

Students must take a comprehensive written examination that covers fundamental topics in environmental sciences. The written examination, which is three to four hours long, is prepared and evaluated by a committee appointed by the field director. The examination is taken during the latter part of the final quarter in the M.S. program. Students must wait at least eight weeks before retaking a failed examination. Students failing the examination twice are dismissed from the program.

**Normative Time to Degree** 2 years

**Doctoral Degree**

The Department of Environmental Sciences offers the Ph.D. degree in Environmental Sciences. The general requirements for the Ph.D. degree are found in the Graduate Studies section of the General Catalog.

**Course Work** Students must complete the course requirements given above for the specific field area. All students are required to give a presentation annually at the Environmental Sciences Graduate Program Student Symposium.

**Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination** Following completion of all course work prescribed by the student’s Advisory Committee, a Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination will be prepared and administered to the student by a Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination Committee. The Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination Committee will consist of at least three faculty members with interests in the student’s line of research. The purpose of this examination is to determine that the student has gained sufficient knowledge in the

accepted by the M.S. thesis committee members, and a final oral defense of the thesis must be passed.

**Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)** Students must complete a minimum of 36 quarter units of graduate and upper-division undergraduate courses in, or significantly related to, Environmental Sciences. These must include the course requirements given above for the specific field area. At least 18 units must be in graduate courses. Students may count no more than 2 units of graduate seminar courses and 6 units of graduate internship courses toward the required 18 units and no units from graduate research for thesis or dissertation.

Students must take a comprehensive written examination that covers fundamental topics in environmental sciences. The written examination, which is three to four hours long, is prepared and evaluated by a committee appointed by the field director. The examination is taken during the latter part of the final quarter in the M.S. program. Students must wait at least eight weeks before retaking a failed examination. Students failing the examination twice are dismissed from the program.

**Normative Time to Degree** 2 years

**Doctoral Degree**

The Department of Environmental Sciences offers the Ph.D. degree in Environmental Sciences. The general requirements for the Ph.D. degree are found in the Graduate Studies section of the General Catalog.

**Course Work** Students must complete the course requirements given above for the specific field area. All students are required to give a presentation annually at the Environmental Sciences Graduate Program Student Symposium.

**Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination** Following completion of all course work prescribed by the student’s Advisory Committee, a Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination will be prepared and administered to the student by a Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination Committee. The Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination Committee will consist of at least three faculty members with interests in the student’s line of research. The purpose of this examination is to determine that the student has gained sufficient knowledge in the
chosen field to perform professionally and competently. This exam may be attempted only twice. If this exam is failed twice, the student may be redirected to the M.S. degree if the student does not already hold an M.S. in Environmental Sciences or terminated from the program.

**Ph.D. Oral Qualifying Examination**
A student who satisfactorily passes the Ph.D. Written Qualifying Examination may proceed with the Ph.D. Oral Qualifying Examination, which will focus on the dissertation proposal. This examination is conducted before the Oral Qualifying Examination Committee, consisting of five faculty members, one of whom must be from outside the ESGP. This examination maybe attempted only twice. If this exam is failed twice, the student will be redirected to the M.S. degree if the student does not already hold an M.S. in Environmental Sciences or terminated from the program. The Ph.D. Written and Oral Qualifying Examinations will normally be taken at the end of the second year of graduate study and before the start of the third year.

**Dissertation**
All Ph.D. students must write a doctoral dissertation, which must be read and accepted by all members of the Doctoral Dissertation Committee, comprised of at least three faculty members from the ESGP. A final oral dissertation defense in front of at least three Doctoral Dissertation Committee members may be required.

**Relationship between Master’s and Doctoral Programs**
The M.S. and Ph.D. programs are separate. Students who enter the Ph.D. program do not need to acquire a M.S. degree first, although students may elect to take both.

**Normative Time to Degree**

- 5 years
Justification for Proposed Changes to Graduate ENSC Curriculum
Since the Soil and Water Science Graduate Program is in moratorium, the Environmental Sciences Department voted to remove all upper division SWSC courses from the catalog to reduce catalog clutter and avoid student confusion. All of the upper division courses listed under SWSC are crosslisted with courses in ENSC and most students enroll in these courses using the ENSC listing. There was simply no reason to keep upper division SWSC courses in the catalog. Because the upper division SWSC courses are being removed from the catalog, all mentions of these courses in the catalog must be removed.

Graduate students in environmental sciences need a formalized professional development course, ENSC 401, in order to develop skills necessary to excel in graduate school and their careers. While many of these skills can be picked up during the course of graduate education, a professional development course will provide enhanced opportunities for peer interactions and faster acquisition of practical written and oral presentation skills.

The ENSC Department evaluated the seminar requirement for graduate students and felt it was overly prescriptive and decided that decisions on the number and type of seminars to be attended should be left up to the student and major advisor. Currently, the ENSC Department offers 2 quarters of seminar each year and encourages student participation.

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Environmental Sciences: February 14, 2013.
**Catalog Description**

ENSC 401. **Professional Development** in Environmental Sciences (2 units)

Lecture 1 hour: discussion 1 hour.

Prerequisite(s): graduate standing; consent of instructor.

Provides skills needed for professional development in environmental sciences. Introduces strategies for successful graduate study and early career development. Consists of lectures, discussions/presentations covering research and professional ethics, grant/fellowship writing, and preparation of manuscripts. Addresses effective job search skills, including preparation of curriculum vitae, networking, oral presentations, and job interviews.

Graded S/NC
Syllabus ENSC 401

Professional Development in Environmental Sciences

Description: Course satisfies professional development requirement for graduate students in Environmental Sciences. Introduces students to strategies for successful graduate study and early career development. Course will cover material appropriate for students at all stages of their graduate school experience. Addresses career skills: research and professional ethics, grantsmanship, preparation of thesis, dissertation and technical journal articles. Activities will include preparation of a curriculum vitae, making an effective 15 minute conference presentation, making an effective poster presentation and a mock interview. Mock interviews will be conducted for students nearing graduation.

Objective: Prepare students for the responsibilities of graduate school, post doctoral research positions and their early careers in environmental sciences.

Units: 2

Activities: Lecture, 1 hour per week
Discussion, 1 hour per week (group activity)

Syllabus

Instructor in Charge – Michael Anderson (Chair)
Instructor - Staff

Week 1 Introduction - Overview of Career Skills

Week 2 Science Ethics

Week 3 Scientific Method and Good Research Practices

Week 4 Theses, Dissertation and Technical Journal Articles

Week 5 Making Effective Oral and Poster Presentations

Week 6 Job Searches and Networking
   Postdoctoral positions - finding and making the most of opportunities
   Applying for faculty positions

Week 7 Curriculum Vitae
   Cover letters
   Preparing for an interview

Week 8 The Interview
   Mock interviews
Week 9 Time Management Skills for Grad Students, Post Docs and Assistant Professors

Week 10 Course Summary - Tomorrow's Environmental Scientist

Grading S/NC
Grade will be based on participation, and student presentations.

Course in repeatable.
Graduate Appeal Procedure Form

Instructions: Please read the Graduate Appeal Procedure, dated _____, before completing this form. Be sure to observe the time limits specified in the procedure. If the action being appealed occurred in your department, program, or school, you must complete the formal appeal process at program level before requesting consideration under this appeal procedure.

Name: __________________________________________ Student I.D. number: ______________
Last First M.I.

Mailing Address: __________________________________________________________________________

Phone Number: ( ) ____________________ Academic Department: ____________________________

The decision being appealed was rendered by:
Name of individual(s): ___________________________ Department: __________________________

The date you received the decision you are appealing: _________________________________

What was the result of the program-level appeal? __________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

The date you received the result of the program-level appeal: _____________________________

Please provide a short description of the decision you are appealing under the Graduate Appeal Procedure:
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
Please provide the names of the individual or individuals whose actions you are appealing:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please state the grounds upon which the appeal is based (see Graduate Appeal Procedure, section II.C):

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please state the relief you are requesting:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Do you wish to make a formal appearance at the time your appeal will be considered?  
___ Yes ___ No

At any stage during this process, will you be assisted by counsel or other representative? If so, please list the name, title, and contact information for that person.

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Attach the written record produced by the formal appeal under the Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedure.

Signature: ____________________________________________ Date: ______________
PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this procedure is to afford UCR graduate students an opportunity to resolve complaints involving academic or administrative decisions that interfere with the graduate student’s academic progress, such as adverse outcomes on qualifying exams, dismissal from graduate standing, placement on probationary status, denial of readmission to the same program (if the student was previously in good standing), disputes over joint authorship of research in accordance with joint authorship policies of campus departments or units, revocation of campus fellowships, and other administrative or academic decisions that terminate or otherwise impede progress toward academic or professional degree goals (see section II.F of this procedure). This procedure is not available to appeal denial of admission to any program.

This procedure also governs the Graduate Division review of decisions made at the program level regarding appeals of actions originating in a program. A student must exhaust program level review procedures when a complaint centers on departmental actions. When a complaint centers on actions originating in the Graduate Division, a student must submit the appeal to the Graduate Council of the UCR Academic Senate, as described below. In this procedure, “program” refers to degree granting programs at UCR, including academic departments, that are subject to Graduate Division oversight, and only to those programs.

The scope of this procedure is limited to the matters listed above, and excludes complaints regarding student records, grades in courses of instruction, student employment, student discipline, and auxiliary student services (such as housing, child care, etc.). This procedure may not be used for complaints regarding actions based on faculty evaluation of the academic quality of a student’s performance in cases such as those enumerated in section II.F, or decanal evaluations of a student’s appropriate academic progress, unless the complaint alleges that the actions may have been influenced by non-academic criteria as identified in section II.B.2 of this procedure.

This procedure is provided for continuing, former and returning graduate students in the Graduate Division on the UCR campus who file an appeal within the given timelines. This procedure may not be used by applicants for admission. This procedure also may not be used to appeal any alleged action or inaction by the School of Medicine or University Extension. A student may bring a complaint individually or may file a complaint jointly with other students when each claims injury as a result of the same alleged action(s).

Graduate students may contact the Office of the Ombuds for informal and confidential assistance with complaint resolution. The Associate Deans of the Graduate Division also may be consulted for
informal resolution at any stage of the process. Civil law remedies, including injunctions, restraining or other court orders, and monetary damages also may be available to complainants.

THE APPEAL PROCESS

I. DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A. Department Level Complaints

For complaints regarding actions originating within the student’s graduate department or program, the student must first attempt resolution at the program level by following the Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedures. The Program level procedures may include informal and formal complaint resolution processes. Copies of the unit Program level complaint resolution procedures may be obtained from the Chair or Graduate Adviser(s) in each unit. If a mutually satisfactory resolution cannot be reached at the Program level, the complaint may be brought to the Graduate Division under the Formal Appeal Procedures outlined below, provided the student has exhausted the remedies afforded under the Program complaint resolution procedures.

Note that most actions related to a student’s academic progress originate in his or her department or program, not in the Graduate Division. For example, if a student is dismissed by the Graduate Division this is done at the request of the department or program and hence is not an action originating in the Graduate Division.

B. Division Level Complaints—Informal Resolution

For complaints regarding actions originating within the Graduate Division or with the Graduate Council, the student may first initiate informal resolution with the Dean or an Associate Dean of the Graduate Division. If a mutually satisfactory resolution cannot be reached through informal resolution, the complaint may be brought under the Formal Appeal Procedures outlined below.

Time Limits: Attempts at program level resolution or informal resolution with the Graduate Division must be initiated within thirty days from the time at which the student knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the action being appealed. The program level or Graduate Division informal procedures should normally be concluded within 60 days of the date resolution was initiated.

C. Complaints Involving Sex Discrimination or Sexual Harassment

Students with complaints involving allegations of sex discrimination or sexual harassment which would otherwise fall under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Appeals Procedure should attempt resolution under the UCR campus office for Title IX sex discrimination or sexual harassment complaints [http://www.titleix.ucr.edu/] prior to bringing their complaint under the Graduate Appeals Procedure.

If the complainant is not satisfied with the resolution provided by the sexual harassment complaint resolution procedures, the complainant may proceed directly to the Formal Appeal
Procedure outlined below. In such cases, any allegations of sexual harassment investigated under the Title IX procedure will not be reinvestigated in the Formal Appeal. The individual or committee in charge of the investigation pursuant to a Formal Appeal will rely on the fact-finding report made pursuant to the Title IX sexual harassment complaint resolution procedure. All matters involving academic or administrative decisions that interfere with the graduate student’s academic progress (such as those in II.F) are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Graduate Appeals Procedure.

Complaints involving sexual harassment that are brought pursuant to the sexual harassment complaint resolution procedures must be brought within the time frames indicated in those procedures.

II. FORMAL APPEAL PROCEDURE

A. Time Frames for Formal Appeal

A student may appeal a decision rendered under the Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedure or the lack of a timely decision, provided the formal written appeal is received in the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division within 21 days of the notification of the result of the Departmental Academic Appeal Decision, or within 21 days of the expiration of the deadline for rendering a decision (in which case the Graduate Program Academic Appeal is deemed denied).

If the action being appealed originated with the Graduate Division or the Graduate Council or under paragraph II.C.1.-3. herein, the formal written appeal must be received in the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division within 30 days from the time the student knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the action being appealed, or within 21 days of the notification of the result of the informal resolution process if the student attempted informal resolution through the Graduate Division.

If the action being appealed was investigated pursuant to the campus sex discrimination or sexual harassment complaint resolution procedures (see section 1.C), the formal written appeal must be received in the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division within 21 days of the notification of the result of the sexual harassment complaint resolution process.

The formal written appeal should generally be concluded within sixty days of the date it was received by the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division.

For purposes of this section, all days are measured as calendar days, excluding campus holidays, inter-session periods, and summer session.

B. Content of the Formal Appeal

Complaints under the Formal Appeals Procedure must be initiated by a written statement indicating the action(s) being appealed and the date(s) the action(s) occurred, the grounds upon which the appeal is based, and the relief requested. The written statement may include a request
for a personal appearance before the investigative officer, if desired, and notice to the Graduate
Division if the student bringing the appeal will be represented by counsel or other representative.
The written statement should also include a description of the results of the program level
resolution process, and any background information that the student deems pertinent to the case.
*All written material must be submitted prior to the deadlines stated in section II.A.* Material
submitted after that date might not be considered in the investigation, unless new material or
information emerges that was not available prior to the deadline.

**C. Grounds for Formal Appeal**

A formal appeal may be brought if based upon one or more of the following grounds which had
material impact on the student’s academic standing or credit for research:

1. Procedural error or violation of official policy by academic or administrative personnel;

2. Judgments improperly based upon non-academic criteria including, but not limited to,
discrimination or harassment on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex,
disability, age, medical condition (cancer related), ancestry, marital status, citizenship,
sexual orientation, or status as a Vietnam-era veteran or special disabled veteran;

3. Special mitigating circumstances beyond the student’s control not properly taken into
account in a decision affecting the student’s academic progress.

**D. Procedure for Processing Formal Appeals**

For complaints regarding actions originating within the student’s major department, school,
college, or graduate group, the Dean of the Graduate Division may:

1. conduct the investigation and make a decision for final action; or,

2. assign an Associate Dean, an ad hoc committee or another campus official to conduct the
investigation and make a recommendation to the Dean for final action.

For complaints regarding actions originating with the Graduate Division, or the Dean of the
Graduate Division, the appeal will be referred to the Graduate Council for final action in all
matters. The Chair of the Graduate Council, or another member of the Council he or she
designates, will be in charge of the Council’s investigation and final action.

The Graduate Division will notify the student regarding which individual or committee will be in
charge of processing the Formal Appeal within 15 days of the receipt of the written statement
initiating the Formal Appeal.
E. Investigation of Formal Appeals

All Formal Appeals will be investigated according to the following procedures. Nothing in these procedures shall be interpreted as precluding further attempts at informal resolution before a final decision is made.

The individual or committee in charge of the investigation will:

1. consult with the appropriate campus compliance officer regarding all complaints that include allegations of discrimination or harassment on the basis of sex, race, national origin, color, age, religion, sexual orientation, or disability (see section IV.C.);
2. forward a copy of the complaint to the individual(s) complained of and ask them to provide written responses within twenty days of receipt (the written responses should include notice to the University if the respondents wish to be represented by counsel or other representative);
3. forward a copy of the responses to the student bringing the complaint;
4. arrange for a personal appearance by the student if the student requested a personal appearance in the written statement initiating the complaint;
5. obtain any other relevant information from other individuals or sources available, including arranging for personal appearances of witnesses as necessary;
6. prepare a written report setting forth the factual findings of the investigation, and either the final decision made, or the recommendation for the final decision to be made.

The Dean of the Graduate Division or the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall notify the student of the final decision on the Formal Appeal within sixty days of the receipt of the written statement initiating the complaint.

F. Final Decision

1. Decisions by the Graduate Dean.

The decision of the Dean of the Graduate Division is final in all complaints pertaining to the following where the complaint originated within the student’s major department, school, college, or graduate group:

- Readmission to graduate standing
- Petition for change of major
- Changes in program
- Academic probation
- Academic dismissal
- Composition of committees for higher degrees
- Results of examinations for higher degrees (including special departmental examinations and Master’s projects submitted in lieu of the comprehensive examination)
- Acceptability of dissertations and theses
- Actions to lapse or terminate candidacy
- Revocation of campus fellowship
2. Decisions by the Graduate Council

The decision of the Graduate Council is final in all complaints concerning the following:

- Complaints under this procedure regarding actions originating with the Graduate Division
- All other matters pertaining to the formal requirements for advancement to candidacy and the award of higher degrees except those enumerated above as falling under the Dean’s jurisdiction.

Decisions by the Graduate Council are not, however, meant to limit the Dean of the Graduate Division’s ability to take additional appropriate action within decanal authority (except in cases regarding actions originating with the Dean). For example, the Dean could readmit or allow a change of major to a student whose failure on a qualifying examination had been upheld by the Graduate Council.

G. Standards of Review:

1. Actions originating within the Graduate Division/Graduate Council and Under Paragraph II.C.1.-3.: The standard of review to be employed for actions originating within the Graduate Division or with the Graduate Council and Under Paragraph II.C.1.-3, shall be the "clearly erroneous" standard. Under the clearly erroneous standard, outcomes will not be disturbed unless the deciding official/body is left with a "definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed" by the Graduate Division/Graduate Council.

2. Graduate Division level Review of Departmental Appeal Decision: The standard of review to be employed by the Graduate Dean (or Graduate Council in the event the Graduate Dean has recused himself/herself) shall be under an "arbitrary and capricious" standard as to decisions on the merits rendered under the Departmental Academic Appeals Procedure and under the “abuse of discretion” standard as to determinations regarding validity of an appeal rendered under the Departmental Academic Appeals Procedure. Under the arbitrary and capricious standard, outcomes of comprehensive and qualifying exams will not be disturbed unless the Graduate Dean (or Graduate Council in the event the Graduate Dean has recused himself/herself) determines that a previous determination is invalid because it was made on unreasonable grounds or without any proper consideration of circumstances. As to determinations of appeal validity where a lower body has made a discretionary ruling (such as whether to allow a party claiming a hardship to file an appeal after the deadline), that decision will be reviewed for abuse of discretion. It will not be reversed unless based upon improper criteria or incorrect assumptions. Any valid pertinent reason stated will be sufficient to uphold the validity determination.
III. RECONSIDERATION

A. Grounds

Students may request reconsideration of a decision made by the Dean of the Graduate Division or the Graduate Council on the following grounds only:

1. New evidence is discovered which was not available by duly diligent effort at the time the decision was made and which materially affects the outcome of the case; or,

2. There is evidence that the Graduate Appeal Procedures described herein were not followed and the failure to follow the procedures resulted in a decision adverse to the student.

B. Procedure and Time Frame for Reconsideration

Students must submit their request for reconsideration in writing to the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division. The request must be received within thirty days following the date of the notification to the student of the final decision on the Formal Appeal. The Dean or Administrative Committee will notify the student of the final decision concerning the request for reconsideration within thirty days after the request is received.

IV. OTHER INFORMATION

A. Personal Appearance

1. Scope.

Students bringing complaints under the Formal Appeal process have the right to a personal appearance before the individual or committee in charge of the investigation. The scope of the personal appearance shall be limited to matters that were raised by the written complaint or the responses that are within the jurisdiction of this procedure.

2. Notice.

The Graduate Division shall provide the student with fifteen days’ notice of the time and place of the personal appearance. If the student wishes to be represented by counsel or other representative, the student must notify the Graduate Division in writing at least ten days prior to the date of the personal appearance. The notice should include the name, title of, and contact information for the counsel or representative. This notice will constitute an authorization for the Graduate Division to send the representative copies of relevant student records.
B. Time Frames

All time frames referred to in this procedure refer to calendar days. Summer and inter-session recesses are not included within these time frames. The Graduate Dean may extend time limits for good cause upon notice to all parties involved in the appeal.

C. Campus Compliance Officers

The campus compliance officers to be consulted pursuant to section II.C.2 are listed below. The names, phone numbers, and campus addresses of these individuals are listed in various campus publications and may be obtained from the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Division or the campus Office of the Ombuds.

° Academic Compliance Affairs Officer - should be consulted for complaints alleging discrimination or harassment on the basis of race and sexual orientation. http://affirmativeaction.ucr.edu/
° Title IX Compliance Officer - should be consulted for complaints alleging sexual harassment or discrimination on the basis of sex. http://www.titleix.ucr.edu/
° ADA/504 Compliance Officer - should be consulted for complaints alleging discrimination or harassment on the basis of disability, or cases involving reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities. http://www.specialservices.ucr.edu/Pages/default.aspx
° Age Discrimination Act Coordinator - should be consulted for complaints alleging discrimination on the basis of age. http://hr.ucr.edu/

V. OTHER COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

A. Informal Resolution

The Office of the Ombuds (http://ombudsperson.ucr.edu/resources/resources.html) may be able to provide confidential, informal assistance, as a neutral party, toward the resolution of the problem. The Associate Deans of the Graduate Division also may be consulted for non-confidential, informal resolution at any stage of the process.

B. Articulation with Other Campus Procedures

1. Guidelines.

All graduate student complaints that include allegations of interference with academic progress must be brought under the Graduate Appeals Procedure. Once a graduate student has brought a complaint under the Graduate Appeals Procedure, he or she may not bring the same complaint under any other campus appeal or grievance procedure, unless there has been a determination on the Graduate Appeal that the complaint is outside the scope of the Graduate Appeals Procedure. The only exception to this guideline is for complaints including allegations of sex discrimination or sexual harassment, which may be pursued through the Title IX office (http://www.titleix.ucr.edu/) prior to initiating the Graduate Appeals Procedure.
Graduate students may have complaints regarding University actions that do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Graduate Appeals Procedure. The list below indicates other complaint procedures available to graduate students for issues that are outside the scope of this procedure.

If a graduate student brings a complaint under a procedure other than the Graduate Appeals Procedure, and the complaint is investigated and a decision is made, a complaint regarding the same facts may not be brought again under the Graduate Appeals Procedure unless there are subsequent events that give rise to allegations of interference with academic progress, or unless the complaint was pursued through the Title IX office.

For these limited situations where a complaint may be brought under the Graduate Appeals Procedure after it was brought under another campus complaint procedure, the issues investigated in the first procedure will not be reinvestigated pursuant to the Graduate Appeals Procedure. Rather, the Graduate Appeals Procedure will provide a decision with regard to the allegations of interference with academic progress based on the factual findings of the prior procedure.

2. Other Campus Complaint Procedures.

This procedure excludes complaints regarding grades, academic integrity and discipline, employment, benefits, and auxiliary student services (such as housing and child care). In some circumstances, this procedure may be used to address complaints regarding violations of campus non-discrimination policies, to the extent that a documented discriminatory act has affected a student’s academic progress (for details, see http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html).

1. Grade disputes must be appealed under the Academic Senate Bylaw R5, Procedures for the Appeal of Grades (http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=r&section=05).
2. For academic integrity disputes involving graduate students, see the Academic Senate Bylaw 6 (http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=app&section=06)
3. For disputes involving graduate student academic employment, see the Employment Issues section of http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html
4. For disputes regarding disability accommodations, inquire with the Services for Student with Disabilities (SSD) Administrative Office (http://www.specialservices.ucr.edu/disabilities/Pages/permanentDisabilities.aspx)
5. For disputes regarding whistleblower complaints, including complaints for retaliation, see the University of California Whistleblower policy (http://www.ucop.edu/uc-whistleblower/)
6. For other non-academic issues, the student may refer to the campus Ombuds (http://ombudsperson.ucr.edu/) and/or the Office of Administrative Resolution (http://conflictresolution.ucr.edu/) and/or the Office of Labor Relations (http://hr.ucr.edu/supervisor/labor.html)

Complaints brought under the Graduate Appeals Procedure may include allegations of serious misconduct by University students, staff, or faculty. Neither the Dean of the Graduate Division nor
the Graduate Council has jurisdiction under these procedures to impose discipline in cases of alleged misconduct. In such cases, the aspects of the case that fall within this procedure will be resolved. Any allegations of student, staff, or faculty misconduct will be referred to the appropriate disciplinary procedure for investigation and action where warranted.

VI. OTHER CAMPUS POLICIES

A. **UCR Campus Policy on Sex Discrimination and Sexual Harassment:** the Title IX office should be used for graduate student complaints of sex discrimination or sexual harassment where the complaint does not allege interference with academic progress. This office may attempt informal resolution of sex discrimination or sexual harassment complaints prior to bringing the complaint under the Graduate Appeals Procedure in cases where the complaint does include allegations of interference with academic progress. (http://www.titleix.ucr.edu/).

B. **UCR Campus Policy Governing Disclosure of Information from Student Records:** Complaints regarding access to student records and for complaints alleging that student records are inaccurate, misleading, inappropriate or otherwise maintained in violation of student rights to privacy should be referred to the registrar’s office (http://www.registrar.ucr.edu/Pages/default.aspx).

C. **UCR Campus Policy Governing Faculty Conduct:** For disputes regarding faculty conduct, students may contact the Office of Administrative Resolution (http://conflictresolution.ucr.edu/).
Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedures
(Adopted by a vote of the Graduate Council on ___________ )

1. **Purpose and Scope**: This procedure enables current and former graduate students to appeal academic decisions including outcomes of comprehensive and qualifying exams. Applicants denied admission to the Program may not use this procedure and instead will be referred to the admissions office of the Graduate Division. This procedure excludes complaints regarding grades, academic integrity and discipline, accommodations for disabilities, employment, benefits, auxiliary student services (such as housing and child care) and whistleblower complaints. This procedure may be used to address complaints regarding violations of campus non-discrimination policies, pursuant to 4.e.2 below, to the extent that a documented discriminatory act has affected a student's academic progress (for details, see [http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html](http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html)).
   a. Grade disputes must be appealed under the Academic Senate Bylaw R5, Procedures for the Appeal of Grades ([http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=r&section=05](http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=r&section=05)).
   b. For academic integrity disputes involving graduate students, see the Academic Senate Bylaw 6 ([http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=app&section=06](http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=app&section=06))
   c. For disputes involving graduate student academic employment, see the Employment Issues section of [http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html](http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html)
   d. For disputes regarding disability accommodations, inquire with the [Services for Student with Disabilities (SSD) Administrative Office](http://www.specialservices.ucr.edu/disabilities/Pages/permanentDisabilities.aspx)
   e. For disputes regarding whistleblower complaints, including complaints for retaliation, see the University of California Whistleblower policy ([http://www.ucop.edu/uc-whistleblower/](http://www.ucop.edu/uc-whistleblower/))
   f. For all other non-academic issues, the student may be referred to the campus Ombuds ([http://ombudsperson.ucr.edu/](http://ombudsperson.ucr.edu/)) and/or the Office of Administrative Resolution ([http://conflictresolution.ucr.edu/](http://conflictresolution.ucr.edu/)).

2. **Access to Academic Records**: Pursuant to FERPA requirements, students are entitled to timely access to academic records stored in his or her academic file. Students also are entitled to a review of faculty evaluations of their work, such as faculty comments on qualifying exams, and to have those actions explained to them by the relevant faculty.

3. **Informal and Formal Resolution**: As a first step in an appeals procedure, students are strongly encouraged to pursue informal resolution of disputes over academic decisions before resorting to a formal appeal. Informal resolution involves further oral communication among the affected parties (e.g., a student and the chair of his/her exam committee), perhaps in the presence of a third party if desired. Absent an informal resolution, a formal complaint must be initiated in writing.

4. **Formal Appeal Initiation**: The formal appeals procedure defines what constitutes a valid appeal.
   a. Only current, returning and former graduate students and faculty members in the Program may use this procedure.
   b. The formal appeal must be addressed to in writing to the Graduate Advisor. If the student perceives a conflict of interest with the Graduate Advisor or in the case where the Graduate Advisor is absent or the position not filled, the appeal may be addressed instead to the Department Chair or Program Director. The appeal must be addressed to one or the other of these Program officers.
c. The appeal must include a written statement that lays out the grounds for the appeal, and any supporting documentation.

d. The appeal must be initiated within 30 calendar days from the day the student knew or reasonably should have known about the action generating the complaint, excluding campus holidays, intersession periods, and summer session.

e. The valid grounds on which a student may base an appeal are confined to three areas: (1) evidence of procedural error committed intentionally or inadvertently by the Program faculty or staff and/or (2) evidence of non-academic criteria being used to evaluate academic work, including personal bias and violations of the campus nondiscrimination policy and/or (3) special mitigating circumstances beyond the student’s control (such as documented severe illness to self or immediate family, or death in the family) not properly taken into account in a decision affecting the student’s academic progress. In order to seek relief under 4.e(3), “special mitigating circumstances,” the student must have raised the issue with the program contemporaneous with the mitigating event. For example, if a documented medical condition impairs the student’s ability to pass an exam, the student must notify the exam committee prior to the exam’s administration.

5. Investigation and Record Keeping:
   a. The Graduate Advisor shall determine the validity of an appeal with respect to whether it meets the criteria set out in 4.a.-e. or whether additional material should be provided by appellant in order to make that determination under 4.c. Should the Graduate Advisor have a conflict of interest, the determination of validity shall be made by the Department Chair or his/her designate in the case that the Department Chair also has a conflict of interest. The appellant shall be notified as to the determination as to validity within 30 days of the submission of an appeal. Failure of the Graduate Advisor or Department Chair or his/her designate to identify to appellant the outcome as to the validity of the appeal within 30 days shall result in referral of the appeal directly to the Graduate Division.

   b. The Graduate Division will be notified as to who determines the validity of appeals both as a matter of course and in instances where substitutions are necessary to avoid conflicts of interest.

   c. Appeals procedures will be published in the Graduate Student Handbook and on the Program’s website.

   d. A panel of faculty appointed by the Graduate Advisor (such as the program’s graduate committee) will serve as the Faculty Hearing Panel (the “Panel”). Only faculty who were not involved in making the decision under appeal may sit on this panel. The Panel will make a decision on the merits of the appeal as well as a remedy, if any.

   e. The Panel will review the written complaint and submitted materials; afford the opportunity for the affected parties to meet separately with the Panel; and make any appropriate efforts to interview witnesses or other parties and discover information relevant to the decisions.

   f. The Panel may not change an exam result, though it may be allowed to deem the result invalid.

   g. The Panel will make a decision and notify the appellant of the outcome within 60 days of the initiation of the formal complaint. If determination is not made within the 60-day timeframe, the appeal is deemed denied. Further, if determination by the Panel is not made within the 60 day timeframe, the matter is automatically referred to Graduate Division.
h. When a determination as to validity has not been determined within the 30-day timeframe or where a determination as to the merits/remedy have not been determined within the 60-day timeframe, or if the appellant is notified after the 30-day or 60-day timeframes identified above, the outcome will be forwarded to Graduate Division as part of the file.

i. A written summary of the appeal and the conclusions reached will be kept in the student’s academic file. If the appeal is supported, Graduate Division will ensure that prompt corrective action is taken.

6. Notice to Parties: The appellant and any parties complained of will be promptly informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal and any corrective action taken.

7. Appeal Procedure: All affected parties have the opportunity to appeal determinations by the Graduate Advisor/Department Chair or his/her designee as to validity of an appeal or determinations by the Panel as to the merits of the appeal and any remedy to the Graduate Dean (http://graduate.ucr.edu/dispute_resolution.html).

8. Timeframes: All timeframes are defined in terms of calendar days, excluding campus holidays, inter-session, and summer session, starting on the day the student either knew or reasonably should have known of the actions leading to the complaint.

9. Standards of Review:
   a. Program level: The standard of review to be employed by the Panel shall be the “clearly erroneous” standard. Under the clearly erroneous standard, academic outcomes will not be disturbed unless the Panel is left with a “definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed" by the instructor(s).
   b. Graduate Division level: The standard of review to be employed by the Graduate Dean shall be under an “arbitrary and capricious" standard as to determinations of the Panel and under the “abuse of discretion” standard as to determinations regarding validity of an appeal. Under the arbitrary and capricious standard, academic outcomes will not be disturbed unless the Graduate Dean determines that a previous determination is invalid because it was made on unreasonable grounds or without any proper consideration of circumstances. Determinations regarding appeal validity will not be reversed unless The Graduate Dean determines that there was no reasonable basis at all for the decision. Any valid pertinent reason stated will be sufficient to uphold the validity determination.
Comments from the Graduate Council Ad Hoc Subcommittee For Review of Proposed Graduate Appeals Procedures

[3/9/13/jt]

In this document I provide comments on 1. the proposed “Graduate Appeal Procedure Form”; 2. on the proposed “Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedures” and 3. on the proposed “Graduate Appeal Procedure”

Comments range from minor to more significant. The number of asterisks after an item indicates my sense of how serious the concern raised is (* = minor or typographical, *** = more serious procedural concern). Initials indicate comments received by email from sub-committee members other than myself.

I. Comments on the proposed “Graduate Appeal Procedure Form”:

1. The proposed appeal form’s requirements (naming individuals whose decision is being appealed) may not correspond to the way appeals are evaluated. For example, it’s possible an appeal decision may be rendered by two unit-level administrators (say, both graduate program director and department chair) not simply a single individual. Easy fix: add “(s)” to “individual”. *

Done

2. Documentation: The proposed appeals form allows “additional background material” to be appended. Is the documentation allowed too open-ended? On one hand, the form doesn’t require the petitioner to include relevant documents that would help establish the grounds for the appeal; on the other hand, it does not require the petitioner to verify that all statements and documents submitted by the petitioner are truthful or legitimate. ***

This was a great catch. The form has now been revised to instruct the student to attach the written record produced under the program-level appeal. Students can only appeal to graduate division based on the written record produced at this level.

3. The proposed appeals form does not require the petitioner to disclose any conflicts of interest, failure to observe program procedures, etc., on his or her own part. We probably want to be careful not to invite nuisance or gratuitous appeals aimed at salvaging what may otherwise be, in many cases, the end of an academic career. **

In an adversarial process it is normally not required for the appellant to provide evidence of his or her guilt or culpability. Instead, it is the department’s responsibility to respond to the allegations. Requiring documentation in a written record should limit the nuisance cases. Berkeley assures us that these appeals are very rare on their campus, and they have nearly identical procedures.
II. Comments on the proposed “Graduate Program Academic Appeals Procedures”

Section 1, item f: The word “other” is repeated unnecessarily. *

Done.

Section 4, item b: how is a conflict of interest “perceived”? Could a term indicating somewhat more weight be used? **

I think it’s important to give the student the opportunity at this stage to express perceptions of conflict of interest, and to give the benefit of the doubt to the student in order to minimize the chance that he or she can raise a conflict claim later in the process. It should not matter whether the chair or the grad advisor is the point person.

Section 4, item e: what constitutes “evidence” and how is that evidence to be provided (only in written form? Would cell phone logs, for instance, qualify?)? **

I don’t think we should specify this in advance. The procedure requires documentation in order to create a written record, and then the standards of review give considerable weight to the department’s judgment regarding what counts as evidence within that record.

Section 4, item e: “the student must have raised the issue with the program contemporaneous with the mitigating event”: I am wondering whether this sentence actually expresses what it should. Shouldn’t what is referred to here as the “mitigating event” be the “event whose outcome is being appealed”? Similarly, wouldn’t the “mitigating event” be the illness, etc., that needs to be taken into account? ***

Bergquist wrote this phrase in this way specifically that the issue is raised at the same time as the mitigating event, not after the outcome is known. The idea is to prevent students from ex post raising objections, such as after they found out they failed an exam. To clarify this, I have inserted, “For example, if a documented medical condition impaired a student’s ability to pass an exam, the student must notify the committee prior to the exam’s administration.”

Also: what about procedural “violations” that are inadvertent or otherwise not the fault of the program or its administrators? The assumption here seems to be that the program is at fault for any procedural irregularities that may be grounds for an appeal. But that may not necessarily be the case. Conceivably, irregularities might qualifying as procedural violations might occur inadvertently (or conceivably may occur intentionally by a student who wants to have an exam thrown out). **
If there is a procedural error it does not matter if it was intentional or inadvertent. I have revised the text to clarify this. I also have clarified that the error must originate from department faculty or staff to address your second point (which is a great point) that the student can not appeal procedural errors of his or her own making.

Section 5, item i: how soon is “prompt”? Certainly different cases will require different timelines for redress, but is there some way in which the timeline requirement might be made more specific? **

Because of the wide variety of outcomes that can be appealed, and the fact that we can’t envision what they all will be. To address this, I have changed the wording to indicate it is graduate division’s responsibility to ensure that the correction is prompt.

III. Comments on the proposed “Graduate Appeal Procedure”

1. Part I, Section A, “Purpose and Scope” section, paragraph 1: to the partial list, might we want to include “qualifying examinations” or other instances to which these appeal procedures apply? That is, can scope be more explicitly enumerated? **

I have added qualifying exams, along with revocation of campus fellowships to the list. I have also included here and where ever else it is relevant a reference to section II.F which provides a fuller enumerated list.

2. Part I, Section A, “Purpose and Scope” section, paragraph 2: the word “to” is missing at the end of line 5: “refers” should read “refers to”. *

Done.

3. Part I, Section A, “Purpose and Scope” section, paragraph 3: where we read “of a student’s performance” inserting “in cases such as those enumerated above” may help clarify when these procedures apply. Then again, this sentence would be less vague if we add in a more explicit list of the cases in which these rules apply in paragraph 1 of this section (immediately above). I feel that being as clear as possible throughout the document about those instances in which appeals may or may not be raised is important – it’ll help students have a clear sense of an issue needing to be addressed. **

Again, I refer now to section II.F explicitly here.

Also, in this paragraph, line 4, might we delete the word “solely”? DJ notes: “One reading of this would be that a student could file a complaint that includes faculty evaluation of his/her academic quality. Including "solely" adds
ambiguity to the possible scope of complaints, and I suggest that it be deleted.”

***

Great catch – done.

4. Part I, Section C, “Complaints Involving Sex Discrimination or Harassment,” note that “Harassment” is not spelled correctly; it should have only one “r”. Also, in paragraph 2, regarding the sentence that begins “All matters involving …”: as suggested in items #1 and #3 above in this section, a non-exclusive but nonetheless substantive enumeration of cases where appeals may be lodged would be useful for both administrators and students. The document might add, after this sentence, “Such instances may include but not be limited to the following: ....” Or perhaps an enumeration could be given in Section A, where a short list of such instances now appears. In any case, this section seems to repeat language relevant to scope that appears in Section A – is this section repetitive, or should it break out some of the decisions that may be appealed? Etc. **

I did not see an instance of harassment with more than one “r.” Bergquist wrote this section and even if it is redundant I think it’s best to leave as is. I also have included a reference to section II.F here.

5. Part II, Section A, paragraph 1: a period is repeated at the end of the paragraph. *

Fixed.

6. Part II, Section A, paragraph 5: why should summer session not count in the appeals processing period? Does this mean that an appeal filed in the last week of spring quarter, say, in early June, could be processed until approximately the end of November of the same year? That’s a long response time. If some action was required resulting in a faculty member or student being barred from participating in certain activities, etc., such a long review period may prolong unnecessarily the conditions that need to be changed. **

This is campus policy and there is no way around this. The same is true for academic integrity procedures. The reason is that faculty are actually on 9 month appointments and we are not allowed to compel faculty to be on campus during summer or days when the campus is closed in order to be involved with student matters.

7. Part II, Section C, section 2: does “medical condition (cancer related)” mean that only cancer-related medical conditions would provide grounds for considering an appeal (apart from disability)? ***

This is an interesting question and I have sent an email to Bergquist to clarify this.
7. Part III, Section F, section 1, paragraph 1, comma missing between “college” and “or”. *

Fixed.

8. Part II, Section F, section 2: do appealable decisions include decisions by Graduate Division regarding, say, part-time status requests or requests for maternity or other leave of absence? (See the points above about whether we might provide a list of representative decisions that might be appealed.) **

This is an important point because the procedure indicates that unenumerated decisions get appealed straight to grad council. The problem is that it is impossible to enumerate the full list of decisions that should stay at the grad division level, since it does not make sense for grad council to hear appeals on mundane things that happened not to be enumerated. To address this, I have listed a final item that grad division has jurisdiction over items that ordinarily or routinely fall under its purview. That should address the problem that we can’t enumerate everything, but also leaves open the exceptional things that really should go straight to grad council.

9. Section IV, section A, part 2: grammar: the phrase should read: “fifteen days’ notice” (that is, add apostrophe to “days”). *

Fixed.

10. Section IV, Section C: “Ombudsman” should be “Ombudsperson”? See also the reference to “Ombudsman” in the introduction of this document. **

Fixed throughout.

11. Section V, B2: formatting issues with the list of links; no period needed at the end of item 6; comma needed after “staff” in line 2 of the last paragraph of this section: “staff, or faculty” (since a comma appears in this phrase later on). *

Fixed.

(I haven’t necessarily noted all formatting inconsistencies in the document.)
To recap: Graduate Council received Creative Writing’s response to the Findings & Recommendations (F&R) in May, 2010. A response from Graduate Council was sent to the program on June 9, 2010 via Virginia Bustamante. That memo indicated that the program responded adequately to some, but not all of the Recommendations. The goal of this memo is to respond to the remaining, inadequately-answered recommendations and effectively, if belatedly, close the graduate program review of Creative Writing & Writing for the Performing Arts.

Recommendation 4: The sentence fragment surely was the beginning of a statement about Professor Krieger’s wish to move over to main campus (from Palm Desert). He has since done so, and is presently Chair of Theatre.

Recommendations 5 & 6: Please see attached Bylaws for both the Main Campus CWPA MFA Program and the Palm Desert Low Residency MFA Program.
Recommendation 8: We now enjoy regular, faculty-sponsored but student-organized MFA readings, both on campus and at bookstores and libraries throughout Southern California, including Riverside, Pasadena and Los Angeles. Furthermore, students now have opportunities to have their dramatic work produced within the curriculum, in the Playworks and New Play festivals, the new departmental short film, as well as the department-supported but student-run extracurricular Golden Mean Players ensemble.

Recommendation 10: The culture of the department has changed for the better in this respect, and more faculty involvement continues to be part of our conversation. In 2014, for example, we are moving to a model whereby the 2nd Year MFA Readings will be incorporated into Writers Week, which is always well attended by faculty, thus ensuring that graduating 2nd Years will have a significant faculty audience for their final readings. Theatre faculty regularly make appearances at play productions, and the CRWT Chair is encouraging CRWT faculty to also attend Theatre productions. We are also contemplating taking a cue from the way Palm Desert’s residency works: a couple of days when all the faculty and students are able to get together and share ideas, critical and constructive suggestions, and general community feelings; such a possibility will require resources that may not be available in our present budget climate, but it nevertheless remains a part of our conversation and has generated much interest on the part of faculty and students. The present CRWT Chair has also made it a habit to consistently stress to CRWT faculty the importance of their on-campus presence—particularly those faculty (a majority of the department) who live in Los Angeles. This is obviously an ongoing issue, but, again, one that is very much a part of our regular conversation. That is to say that it is never not on our radar. To be sure, the current Chairs, Grad Advisors, and the Graduate Director are all regular presences on campus, and very involved in the weekly culture of the program.
Date: June 9, 2010

From: Paul Green, Chair
Graduate Council Review Subcommittee A

To: Chris Abani, Director
Graduate Program in Creative Writing & Writing for the Performing Arts

Re: Graduate Program Response on May 19, 2010 to Findings & Recommendations

The Graduate Council’s Review Subcommittee A met on June 1, 2010 to consider the Program’s response to the Findings & Recommendations. The Subcommittee feels that the Program has responded adequately to some but not all of the Recommendations. The Subcommittee’s specific responses to the Program, numbered according to the original findings and recommendations, are below.

1. Accepted.

2. Accepted.

3. Accepted.

4. Please clarify the apparent sentence fragment in your response: “The adjunct faculty and Stu Krieger from that program who desire it will be transferred”

5. Your response mentions your efforts to revise the handbooks for both the Riverside and Palm Desert programs. The Subcommittee interprets a “handbook” as a document used primarily by students and their major professors as a reference for guiding students through the program. Rather than a handbook, the Subcommittee expects the program to develop bylaws to address the issues raised in this recommendation. Bylaws are distinctly different from a handbook and are used primarily to define how the participating faculty should administer the program. Bylaws for interdepartmental programs are reviewed by the Graduate Council; handbooks are not. Attached is a copy of the guidelines for developing bylaws for Interdepartmental Graduate Programs as well as a sample set of bylaws for the Program to reference. Sample handbooks can typically be found on the websites of other graduate programs (e.g., http://envisci.ucr.edu/downloads/ESGPhandbook.pdf).

6. See #5 above.
7. Accepted. Please notify the Graduate Division when the handbooks are complete.

8. The Subcommittee notes that the external team report emphasizes the importance of readings and production opportunities for students. The report states bluntly (p.17): “Opportunities for production in all programs is not an option, but an essential.” In light of this, the Subcommittee requests additional information from the Program regarding its plans to enhance these opportunities, including potential sources of funding. At the very least, the program should convey to the CHASS Dean the importance of such opportunities and request additional funding from the college for this “essential” activity.

9. Accepted.

10. The Subcommittee is encouraged that the faculty has recommitted itself to a greater on-campus presence, but remains concerned that this may not materialize given the nature of the discipline and the current culture in the Program. Faculty availability, presence, and engagement are crucial elements of program quality in the short-term, and also for building and maintaining a nationally competitive program in the long-term. The Subcommittee therefore requests more information from the Program regarding what else it specifically will do, beyond the student performance committee, to promote faculty engagement with students. Regarding class time and office hours, the Subcommittee suggests that the Program consider utilizing teaching evaluations and perhaps an annual survey of students to determine whether faculty are meeting these obligations. Classroom instruction is the province of department chairs. The Subcommittee urges the Chairs of Creative Writing and Theatre, in the strongest terms, to discharge this important responsibility.

11. The Graduate Division does not provide such compensation to programs.
MEMORANDUM

TO: MORRIS MADURO, ACTING CHAIR
    GRADUATE COUNCIL

FROM: CHRIS ABANI, DIRECTOR
    MFA PROGRAM IN CREATIVE WRITING AND WRITING FOR THE
    PERFORMING ARTS

SUBJECT: SECOND RESPONSE TO GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

DATE: 05/19/10

Please find attached our program response to the action memo from the Graduate Council following our program review. This represents both sides of the program and faculty.

Sincerely

Chris Abani
Following the external review report of the MFA in Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts in Riverside and the satellite program in Palm Desert, and the recommendations of the graduate council, the two departments that host the joint program (Creative Writing and Theater) and the program staff (the Director and MFA Coordinator) have met and begun to take action on the points listed below extracted from the report.

This response is to inform the graduate council not just on the areas where we have achieved compliance, but also to respond to areas where we have begun to comply but need more time to achieve the stated objectives.

1. Work with the Graduate Dean to establish a new Director for TPR and ensure that the position rotates between the departments of Creative writing and Theatre.

When the directorship was set up two years ago, in 2008, it was agreed that it would reside with an appointee for two years and would rotate between the two departments that co-host the program.

After consultation, discussion and a joint faculty meeting for the Program and a unanimous vote, Professor Robin Russin was selected as the candidate for the position. The current director, Prof. Abani has sent Professor Russin’s nomination up to the Graduate Dean, J. Childers, who has accepted it and passed it on to the graduate council for final approval.

2. Work with the Dean of CHASS to clarify the responsibilities of the Administrative Assistant—with particular attention to how this position can better link the departments together—and to restrict the role of the MSO to administrative matters.

It is important here to point out that the AA position was created after consultation with the current director and staff, to take the extra workload of program administration off the MSO, who is currently responsible for the CRWT program as a whole. The MSO graciously undertook many of the tasks that this position (that of the AA) should have been undertaking in the difficult transition time it took to train and clarify the roles. The MSO has gladly passed those tasks onto the AA.

The important linking of the two departments can only be partially facilitated by the AA, but this will be achieved best through the programmatic approaches that she facilitates. The point of the appointment is to create a unified program, and then have the program form the link, rather than that individual staff or faculty of appointees such as the directors. We have already implemented some programs prior to the review like joint admissions committees and joint program administration committees.

Post report and recommendations, we have taken further steps along these lines. One of them is to develop a monthly newsletter, prepared by the AA, with announcements of
upcoming deadlines, news of faculty and student publication and readings, statements by
the chairs and advisors of the two departments, local literary and theatrical events, and
other news. A first trial publication of this new venture was emailed on April 22, 2010,
with new issues to follow on the third Friday of each month, overseen by the Program
Director and produced by the Administrative Assistant, with contributions from both
departments and from both the main campus and Palm Desert programs.

The newsletter is one way to better link the two departments and, at the same time, to
increase transparency through regular publication of all Program activities.

With the help of the chairs of both theatre and creative writing, the faculty have also
agreed to regular quarterly meetings of the full faculty (the first two—and the first two in
the history of the program—have already occurred), and the faculty committed itself by
acclamation to the institution of regular events involving graduate students and faculty
from both departments.

The new graduate admissions process instituted this year (SIS), and the internal program
online system using Blackboard, initiated in 2008, that allows public online evaluation of
all prospective students, with visible comments by faculty from both programs, have also
added a level of mutual involvement that didn’t exist in the past, and added to a sense of
transparency and community.

The joint production of a revised Handbook for the program has done the same. The said
handbook is now ready and undergoing final edits.

We are bringing all of TAs from both programs into a common space (or at least onto one
floor) and hope this will ease some of the anxieties in this area. We are also reviewing
our current TA selection process (using the CNAS model) to create more transparency.

3. Work with the Dean of CHASS to determine if there is viable neutral space for
housing the CWWPA Program administration.

Finding neutral space was not seen as viable or advisable by the majority of the faculty or
by the Administrative Assistant (AA). The faculty feels whatever perceived need existed
for a neutral administrative space has already diminished (many doubted it was ever very
widespread) and will continue to diminish. If the question arises again we will of course
revisit it.

Most of the TA offices are on the fourth floor of INTS, next door to the AA’s office, and
arrangements are being made to house the remaining TAs on the same floor. One faculty
member suggested housing the AA in the Arts building, but this would isolate the AA
from the majority of students; would not appear to be neutral space either, but to favor
Theatre; and would not foster a greater sense of community. The only practical neutral
space, one that would encourage rather than discourage a greater sense of community,
might be the third floor of INTS, halfway between the two departmental homes, but such a move seemed to have very little value, to incur expense, and to require an extra office (presumably the Director would not relinquish their faculty office). In the faculty meetings held in response to this report with the full faculty from both departments, there was very little interest in any such move. The AA reports that she has not heard a single complaint from students about the location of her office.

4. Engage the CWWPA Program faculty and relevant UCR administrators in a discussion of the future of the Traditional Program at Palm Desert. Consider the option of closing this program and report your deliberations to the Council by June 2010.

The faculty on the main campus has agreed through vote to close the Traditional Program at Palm Desert. This was brought to discussion with the CHASS Dean and it was agreed that it is no longer a viable program and that the low residency would be the way forward. This, it was felt, would also help with the branding and identity issues raised by the conferring of a degree with the same name.

Palm Desert Associate Director Tod Goldberg has discussed the various options with all students remaining in that program and all but two have opted, without demur, for finishing their degrees in the Low Residency Program. The other two students would prefer to finish their degree programs on the main campus, and the faculty by unanimous vote on its meeting of April 19 agreed to accept those students into the main campus MFA. The understanding is that these students would not be eligible for any main campus funding sources that were not available to them in Palm Desert. The program will thus be shut down at the end of Spring quarter 2010.

The graduate dean was included in the conversation and has agreed to this.

The adjunct faculty and Stu Krieger from that program who desire it will be transferred.

5. Engage the CWWPA Program faculty and relevant UCR administrators in a discussion of the relationships between the Riverside and Palm Desert campus programs. Address the inherent problems with multiple programs awarding the same degree. Establish, document, disseminate, and enforce how these programs function in concert with and independently of each other.

In meetings on March and April 19, the faculty committed by acclamation to forging a better relationship between the two programs.

The original idea, when the program was founded, was that sharing fulltime faculty by splitting their appointments between the two campuses would provide the social and academic glue between programs, but the Palm Desert program, caught between the necessity to become self-supporting and the beginning of serious budget cuts, was forced
to hire non-ladder faculty for the majority of its courses, and faculty on strenuous (if for no other reason than because of the commute) overloads. Two of the three faculty with joint appointments resigned their Palm Desert appointments and became full time Riverside faculty. The fact that these three professors taught on both campuses, and the fact that some ladder faculty from Riverside taught a course in Palm Desert on overload did little to bind the two programs together. In the beginning there were great hopes that the communications technologies built into the Palm Desert facility would allow for joint classes, readings and other group activities, but those technologies never became operational. Faculty and students on both campuses were invited to joint events, but very few ever made the trip in either direction.

In the past, the lack of MFA meetings left each department to develop its own, separate relation to the Palm Desert programs, and the hectic pace of Palm Desert program development left little time on that end for worrying about the relationship.

Regular full-program faculty meetings, with Palm Desert participation, will provide the basis for future collaborations. Fruitful areas of cooperation include more thorough discussions of future hires, sharing of visiting writers, joint publication ventures, and communication through the newsletter.

Palm Desert academic personnel procedures are handled by the Creative Writing MSO, and with the growth of that program to a size considerably larger than the Riverside program, this has required significant increased work. We would like to see a more thorough dissemination of search materials for the Palm Desert program on the Riverside campus; the MSO properly compensated for this increased workload, and full program faculty meetings for votes on new hires.

The faculty is circulating and revising the Handbooks for each program, with the idea of establishing or re-establishing, documenting, and disseminating the practices and procedures of each program, including policies for admissions, curricular requirements, course scheduling, advising, TA selection, student grievances, and other important aspects of program administration and functioning.

6. Establish, document, disseminate, and enforce bylaws for each program including policies for admissions, curricular requirements, course scheduling, advising, TA selection, student grievances, and other important aspects of program administration. Work to ensure transparency.

Handbooks are being completed for each program. They will contain all the relevant information, and the Director will translate these practices into bylaws, which the faculty will then ratify.

7. Publish a handbook for each program, and ensure these are updated at least annually.

See above. The Director will ensure annual updates.
8. Provide more opportunities for student readings and productions; ensure adequate faculty involvement with these.

To the extent these have no cost, the departments are dedicated to make them happen. The sad fact is that reductions in our discretionary budgets will ensure fewer rather than more extracurricular activities.

It also bears stating here that faculty such as Prof. Russin and Abani have both assisted students with setting up on-going readings with bookstores in LA such as Skylight Books. The Arts Block has also helped where they can. Professor Jayme has through Writers Week over the years, helped with this same issue. We also have a bi-monthly on campus reading for students that has been in place for five years.

9. Develop and implement specific strategies to improve communication and interaction among faculty, students, and staff. Ensure an equitable sharing of the programmatic administrative responsibilities across the departments of Creative Writing and Theatre.

We believe the concerns of the first sentence are addressed above; the rotating Directorship ensures some equity in administrative responsibilities, and the Director has been charged to ensure an equitable sharing of the programmatic administrative responsibilities across the departments.

10. A physical on-campus presence by faculty is important to students. Ensure adequate contact time with students, including class time, office hours, and faculty presence at student readings and productions.

At the most basic level—standard class time, office hours—procedures are already in place, and faculty have expressed their commitment to these. Faculty presence at extracurricular activities is by its very nature voluntary, and the balkanized nature of the faculty ensures that TV writing faculty will be unlikely to show up for the poetry readings, and the novelists unlikely to attend light opera. That being said, we have recommitted ourselves as a group to a more visible presence of the faculty, and have assigned faculty (as a service activity) to a student performance committee, chaired by the director and staffed by the person in charge of student readings in Creative Writing (this coming year Juan Felipe Herrera) and Rickerby Hinds & Erith Jaffe-Berg in Theatre.

11. Prepare for an internal review of the CWWPA Program in two years.

We ask that the Graduate College ensures adequate compensation for any staff time required for such a review.
March 23, 2010

Christopher Abani, Director
Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts

The Findings and Recommendations Report of the Graduate Council resulting from the review of the Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts graduate program is enclosed. A formal response is due from your program by June 24, 2010. This response, developed in consultation with program faculty, should include appropriate program changes, descriptions of changed procedures, course proposals, etc., or other materials, as necessary. Should program faculty determine that a particular recommendation not be pursued, a rationale should be provided. Acceptance of your response package by the Graduate Council will conclude the present review of the program.

Alan E. Williams, Chair
Graduate Council

AEW/vb

Cc: Chancellor White
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Rabenstein
Dean Cullenberg, CHASS
Academic Senate
*Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts faculty

*Aslan  *Hoffman  *Russin
Barr    Hornby    Simon
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Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations
Graduate Program in Creative Writing & Writing for the Performing Arts

March 19, 2010

Introduction

The Graduate Program in Creative Writing & Writing for the Performing Arts (CWWPA) offers the M.F.A. degree (initiated at the main campus in 2002 and at the Palm Desert campus in 2005). From inception through Summer 2009, the Program has enrolled 170 students (101 at the main campus and 69 at Palm Desert) and granted 86 degrees (72 at the main campus and 14 at Palm Desert). Twelve students left with no degree (7 at the main campus and 5 at Palm Desert), 72 students are currently enrolled (22 at the main campus and 50 at Palm Desert), and 86 earned a degree, for an attrition rate of 12% (12/98 overall; 7/79 (9%) at the main campus and 5/19 (26%) at Palm Desert). The median time to degree for students completing degrees is 2 years. At the time of the review, there were 22 ladder-rank faculty participating in the Program (all from the departments of Creative Writing and Theatre), two visiting assistant professors, and one assistant adjunct professor.

This is the first review of any kind for the CWWPA Program. The review was conducted from October 19-20, 2009. Reviewers were Professor David Bradley (University of Oregon), Professor Camille Dungy (San Francisco State University), and Professor Emeritus Jorge Huerta (UC San Diego).

Review Team Report Summary

There are five main sections of the review team report: (1) Introduction and Overview, (2) Low Residency Program at Palm Desert, (3) Traditional Program at Palm Desert, (4) Traditional Program at the Riverside campus, and (5) General Recommendations.¹

1. Introduction and Overview

The review team found the Traditional Program at the Riverside campus (TPR) and the Low Residency Program at the Palm Desert campus (LRPD) to be “vibrant, viable, and potentially competitive with top programs.” However the team found the Traditional Program at Palm Desert (TPPD) to be “anemic, derivative, dependent, pedagogically inferior, and a potential liability.” Despite the fact that each of these programs awards the same degree, the team found the only shared aspect among them to be the cross-genre concept. In terms of how the programs function, the team identified common problems related to “an ongoing and persistent lack of communication, spirit of negotiation, and conceptual agreement among all involved entities.” The team found there to be a “lagging sense of community,” an insufficient amount of mutual respect, and a “certain disdain for the expectations and concerns of the students” in each

¹ Throughout this document, the MFA degree program is referred to as the “CWWPA Program” or “the Program,” while the Riverside and Palm Desert operations are referred to as “programs.”
program. Therefore the team recommends that the top priority for CWWPA should be to foster a greater sense of community and mutual respect, mainly through better communication and institutionalized procedures including a process for student suggestions and grievances.

2. Low Residency Program at Palm Desert (LRPD)

The review team believes that LRPD is based on an established, viable, and potentially profitable pedagogical model that continues to grow in popularity. The team finds that LRPD is generally similar to other programs that have adopted this model, in terms of its functioning. LRPD is “well-equipped, in terms of faculty” in the area of writing for the performing arts, but “allows little opportunity for actual performance.” The team sees this as a weakness rather than a critical problem. Because LRPD is so new and because the team spent most of their time on the Riverside campus engaged with the Riverside program, it recommends only that LRPD be “reevaluated in three years by a [team] with specific experience in low residency programs.”

3. Traditional Program at Palm Desert (TPPD)

Although TPPD is supposed to be no different from TPR, it has no resident ladder-rank faculty, “inadequate consultation with the full faculty of either the Creative Writing Department or Theatre Department,” and differing standards of instruction. There is also a “lack of production opportunities for the playwrights and screenwriters at TPPD” which effectively undercuts the primary purpose of such a program. The team is “greatly concerned” about the faculty staffing situation, primarily because the TPPD Director has the authority to hire adjunct faculty “without the advice and consent of any personnel committee staffed by ladder faculty,” and wonders if such an ad hoc process is permitted anywhere else in UC. The team worries that this practice is not sustainable for a program that desires to be first rate. The team is also concerned about the admission process at TPPD, which seems “arbitrary, ambiguous as to standards, and commercially-driven to a troubling degree.”

Generally the review team feels that by purporting but failing to be the same as TPR, TPPD creates a liability for the reputation of TPR and the credibility of UCR. The team believes that TPPD is “inferior” to TPR and largely serves a perceived need by the UCR administration to utilize the Palm Desert Campus. Therefore the team wonders “whether TPPD should have a future,” and urges that this question be answered soon.

4. Traditional Program at the Riverside Campus (TPR)

---

2 During the exit interview, the team stated that community, connections, and networking are very important in this field, but the students are “not getting any help” in these respects. The team also stated that there are insufficient amounts of academic advising and student-faculty interaction. They noted that there is no programmatic orientation offered for incoming students.

3 The team believes that the UCR administration could do more than it has in the past to help the programs solve these problems.

4 The team acknowledges that students seem “engaged, contented and committed” and that the class scheduling and part-time enrollment option make the program appealing to a different cohort of students relative to TPR. During the exit interview, the team also stated that the Palm Desert program director is doing a “wonderful job” considering the challenges he faces.
The team writes that TPR has “an impressive faculty, good student financial support, and ample and enviable housing.” The cross-genre philosophy is perceived by the team to be “venerable and demonstrably viable” and a distinguishing characteristic that makes TPR different from and potentially superior to many top programs.

However the team states that TPR has “problems of development and identity” which appear to stem from the relationship between the two departments (Creative Writing and Theatre) that are effectively the exclusive participants in this interdepartmental graduate program. The development problems are related to the unequal growth rates the departments have experienced, with Creative Writing now having a dominating presence in the program. The team finds that there are both real and perceived academic and administrative tilts toward the creative writing component, which has led to a sense of disjunction within the program. The team says that “students and some faculty perceive the program as being made up of two distinct cohorts.” Cohesion, community, and cooperation are lacking, with the team going so far as to say that the departmental faculties “appear to have at times behaved irresponsibly with respect to the joint MFA program.” For example, although the team acknowledges that an off-campus public presence by the faculty is necessary to maintain and enhance the reputation of the program, students have sometimes paid an unfair price including canceled and shortened classes. The team states that faculty must fulfill their teaching commitments to the program and provide adequate contact hours for students.

The problems of identity are reflected in the team’s comment that TPR must “state clearly, as a result of a serious internal conversation, what it is, what it intends to be; to cease to try to be all things to all people, and to decide what it will be and for which people.” The team feels that the program’s “promise of interdisciplinarity is unsupported by what students seem to be taking, and required to take, and is not coherently integrated into the requirements of graduate-level study.” Some students apparently have had difficulty meeting the cross-genre requirements because individual faculty will not admit them into workshops outside their area of concentration. The team provides several specific suggestions to address this problem.

The team report also identifies specific structural and administrative issues in the program that could be improved. The team is pleased with the establishment of a rotating Director and the allocation of an administrative assistant to the program. However, the team believes that the “functions and responsibilities of the administrative assistant need to be clarified” and rearranged, and believes that the current reporting structure (to the Creative Writing MSO) is potentially problematic. The team writes that “establishment of the MFA program in neutral space would encourage both students and others to view the administrative assistant as the link between departments, rather than as part of any.”

One of the team’s “most serious concerns is the lack of documentation and standard published protocols governing the operations of TPR.” The team finds that “information about the specific mechanics of the program seem to be at best unofficial and certainly non-binding.” The result is

---

5 During the exit interview, the team stated that the program focuses too much on publishing at the expense of student placements.
6 During the exit interview, the team stated that the cross-genre concept is attractive but found the implementation of it to be unclear and confusing.
the appearance of arbitrariness and favoritism, which has led to “vehement and persistent objections of some students to some administrative decisions and the manner in which these decisions were made, published, and enforced.” The team states that at times the program seems to run as an “apparent dictatorship,” whereas “good administration depends on consistent, published, and binding policies and procedures.” The team finds the absence of these to be an “intolerable liability” and recommends that the program be required to produce a handbook immediately. The team also recommends that the program leadership “be required to document their decisions and actions, and the supporting rationales, and that these practical actions be regularized, codified and published no later than the end of academic year 2010-11.” The team specifically states that “it is crucial that the MFA program establish consistent, written protocols for student selection, curriculum, advising, TA selection, and grievances.” The team also recommends precisely defining, promulgating, and vigorously enforcing the roles, responsibilities, and limitations of all programmatic positions.

Other specific recommendations for TPR include:

- Redouble efforts to make this program work.
- Establish participation requirements for program faculty, including attendance at student readings and performances and at least biannual meetings of the full faculty.
- Work to concentrate teaching (but not advising) responsibilities for each faculty into two quarters so that most off-campus requirements can be satisfied during the third.
- Develop an admissions protocol in which faculty from multiple genres review admissions applications; undertake better assessment of student abilities before they arrive on campus; make this a joint process involving faculty from both departments.
- Establish clearer communication with students, particularly regarding TAships; utilize a TA selection committee with applications and interviews.
- Provide more opportunities for production; direct funding and resources into this area.
- Establish a student-run reading series with rotating faculty attendance.

5. General Recommendations

The team is very concerned that all three programs confer the same degree even though they are substantially different programs. Therefore the team strongly recommends establishing separate degrees for the traditional and low residency formats. The team also believes that a “linguistically neutral” name would be beneficial for the CWWPA Program, though it does not provide any specific suggestions. The team emphasizes that the problems of documentation that are made prominent in the TPR section of the report are common to all programs and need to be addressed; to the extent the programs remain unified in the future, documentation and guidelines must be made consistent across programs. Finally, although the team believes that in the long-run the program should transition from two years to three, they recommend that it remain a two-year program in the near-term while the other issues identified in the report are addressed.

---

7 During the exit interview, the team stated that in some cases verbal commitments to students have not been kept and the current director has made “ad hoc decisions,” both of which have contributed to the problem.
8 With regard to TAships, and in light of the success the program has had with its students serving as TAs in a variety of departments, the team states that “it seems a shame that the TAships appeared to be a contentious and anxiety-inducing issue for so many of the MFA graduate students.”
Program Response Summary

Professor Chris Abani, Director of the Riverside program, and Professor Tod Goldberg, Director of the Palm Desert programs, provided the response on behalf of the CWWPA Program.

Professor Abani’s letter, on behalf of TPR, states that TPR is “not connected” to the Palm Desert programs, and that the main campus faculty “unanimously distances themselves” from the Palm Desert programs; however TPR disagrees that there are differing standards of instruction across programs. The letter states that the Administrative Assistant reports directly to the Associate Dean of CHASS, not the Creative Writing MSO. TPR disagrees that classes were cancelled due to external activities by faculty members, and believes that the team overlooked efforts by the faculty to support student readings. TPR believes that both faculty cohesion and implementation of the cross-genre concept are better than the team has reported. Professor Abani’s letter states that a faculty-authored handbook exists, and that policies and procedures—particularly with regard to admissions and TAships—are clearer and more transparent than the team suggests.

Professor Goldberg’s letter, on behalf of TPPD and LRPD, states that these programs afford students greater opportunities for performance than suggested by the team. The Palm Desert programs also agree with TPR that the instructional standards do not differ across campuses, and add that neither do the academic and admissions standards. Professor Goldberg’s letter cites many ladder faculty who have taught at Palm Desert, and states that the Palm Desert faculty hiring process has included input from UCR ladder faculty and the Associate Dean of CHASS.

Findings and Recommendations

The Graduate Council acknowledges the unique and, in many ways, challenging situation faced by the CWWPA Program, particularly with regard to its presence at both the Riverside and Palm Desert campuses. Although this review has reaffirmed that the faculty associated with the Program are impressive scholars, it also has identified several crucial issues that must be addressed if the Program is to remain viable.

The Council is concerned about TPR’s response that the “UCR main campus joint program is not connected to the Palm Desert program” and that the “faculty of the main program unanimously distances themselves from the Palm Desert program.” There is only one MFA in Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts that is conferred by all three programs (TPR, TPPD, and LRPD), and therefore the programs are intimately connected even if their financial and operational structures are distinct. Furthermore TPR’s statement about the lack of any connection between programs strikes us as inconsistent with its statement that standards of instruction do not differ across programs, and inconsistent with what Professor Goldberg wrote about the involvement of ladder rank faculty from the Riverside Campus in both instruction and hiring at the Palm Desert campus. The Council concludes from this that the relationship between the programs is unclear even to the faculty in the programs, and believes that this contributes to an ad hoc approach to administering the CWWPA Program that is detrimental, risky, and unsustainable.
The Council also echoes the team's concern that administration is a problem within each of the three programs, as well. The Administrative Assistant for TPR may, in fact, report to the Associate Dean of CHASS and not the Creative Writing MSO, but even the appearance of the latter reporting structure is problematic. The Council feels similarly about policies and procedures in general: clarity, transparency, fairness, and effectiveness should be judged not by the program leadership but by the students and faculty at large. The Council notes a litany of troubling comments by this group, expressed in the anonymous questionnaires: the program leadership is aloof; the program is run by the MSO who determines when and if classes are taught; the program leadership is unresponsive and hostile to student suggestions and concerns; the class scheduling process is opaque; the program specifics are never adequately explained to students; disorganization and miscommunication; lack of information flow and structure; seemingly uncoordinated academic advising; lack of communication about course offerings, degree requirements, TAships, and scholarships; lack of transparency; program requirements are unclear; program is run by administrative fiat; faculty have little say in many academic matters. One respondent writes: "The greatest weakness is in the administration of the program, where there are major problems with efficiency, scheduling of classes, interactions with graduate students and faculty by particular staff members, and sometimes unfair favoritism shown to certain grad students and faculty by administrators and staff. This is reflected in TA awards, in course scheduling, and several other areas, and has led to a sad lack of morale among students and faculty."

The Council draws the same conclusion: poor administration has been a main contributor to low morale. However the Council also believes that the overall level of faculty engagement in the CWWPA Program has contributed, as well. Although TPR states that classes were not cancelled due to external activities by faculty members and believes that support for student readings and productions is adequate, the Council finds compelling evidence to the contrary provided by the team and by the anonymous questionnaires. Although some students seem satisfied with the level of engagement in teaching and mentoring, many make it clear that they are not -- to the extent that the Council is concerned about the ramifications for the reputation of the CWWPA Program and its ability to recruit good students in the future. The Council is concerned that the faculty has, in some cases, shied away from its responsibility to own its curriculum and ensure that instruction and mentoring are delivered to students responsibly.
In light of these findings, the Council has the following recommendations:

1. Work with the Graduate Dean to establish a new Director for TPR and ensure that the position rotates between the departments of Creative Writing and Theatre.

2. Work with the Dean of CHASS to clarify the responsibilities of the Administrative Assistant -- with particular attention to how this position can better link the departments together -- and to restrict the role of the MSO to administrative matters.

3. Work with the Dean of CHASS to determine if there is viable neutral space for housing the CWWPA Program administration.

4. Engage the CWWPA Program faculty and relevant UCR administrators in a discussion of the future of the Traditional Program at Palm Desert. Consider the option of closing this program and report your deliberations to the Council by June 2010.

5. Engage the CWWPA Program faculty and relevant UCR administrators in a discussion of the relationships between the Riverside and Palm Desert campus programs. Address the inherent problems with multiple programs awarding the same degree. Establish, document, disseminate, and enforce how these programs function in concert with and independently of each other.

6. Establish, document, disseminate, and enforce bylaws for each program including policies and procedures for admissions, curricular requirements, course scheduling, advising, TA selection, student grievances, and other important aspects of program administration. Work to ensure transparency.

7. Publish a handbook for each program, and ensure these are updated at least annually.

8. Provide more opportunities for student readings and productions; ensure adequate faculty involvement in these.

9. Develop and implement specific strategies to improve communication and interaction among faculty, students, and staff. Ensure an equitable sharing of the programmatic administrative responsibilities across the departments of Creative Writing and Theatre.

10. A physical on-campus presence by faculty is important to students. Ensure adequate contact time with students, including class time, office hours, and faculty presence at student readings and productions.

11. Prepare for an internal review of the CWWPA Program in two years.

APPROVED BY GRADUATE COUNCIL ON 3/19/2010.
Plant Pathology Graduate Program Response

We thank the review team and the graduate Council for their evaluations and recommendations. As we have been in a leadership transition, we have focused on making adjustments to our graduate program. We respond to the Graduate Council findings and recommendations for each point below, understanding that these specifically derive from the recommendations of the excellent review team.

Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

1. The program must work to establish a clear and compelling vision of its future goals and develop a coherent strategy for accomplishing its goals. The program faculty and students should work together to develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

We have worked diligently to redesign our vision as our faculty has changed. The new vision is defined as a suite of new goals. “Our departmental goals are to conduct research on the basic biology of plant pathogens and microbes, to develop methods for the management of microbial diseases of plants and other organisms, to provide a quality education to our students; and be a repository of expert advice on plant diseases and microbiology to the citizens of California and the world.”

Building upon this, “The Graduate Program of Plant Pathology at the University of California, Riverside aims at conducting research on the basic biology of plant pathogens; developing methods for the management of plant diseases; providing a quality education to its students; and, providing expert advice on plant diseases to the citizens of California and the world.”

Both goals are stated in our two new websites; for the Department at http://plantpathmicro.ucr.edu, and for the Plant Pathology Graduate Program at http://plantpath.ucr.edu

One output of achieving our goals has been the reinstatement of the interdepartmental Microbiology Graduate program and reinvigoration of the Plant Pathology Graduate Program (see below). Our department is the administrative home for the two programs and most faculty are members of both. This is reflected in our new departmental website, with prominent links to both programs.

2. Work with the CNAS Dean and the Graduate Dean in identifying a faculty member to serve as Department Chair, who has the leadership and interpersonal skills to work successfully with all members of the faculty to build a common vision and strategy.

Professor Katherine Borkovich has accepted the Chairmanship, bringing the breadth of perspective in Plant Pathology and Microbiology broadly to build a new common vision and strategy.

3. Re-evaluate recruitment efforts in hiring some mid-career faculty potentially with focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology.
While we continue to request new positions for the Department, we point out that our faculty have matured and we have been successful in hiring new faculty. We currently have a good distribution of junior and senior faculty. We have 10 full Professors (including several step I to IV), 3 Associate Professors, and 3 Assistant Professors, plus 3 Cooperative Extension Specialists.

4. **Undertake a concerted effort to work with the administration and the department in determining a strategy for renovation and/or replacement of the plant growth facilities so that faculty can undertake research of the highest quality.**

We continue to work to improve the ancient, decrepit, and unreliable plant growth facilities. All facilities are under the management of Agricultural Operations directly under the Dean’s office, who are also committed to improving facilities. Efforts are underway to generate funding for a new facility.

5. **Assess the curriculum to reduce redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses, to allow students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization and to introduce new courses that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.**

Efforts to revise the 4-course base currently in existence (Mycology, Virology, Bacteriology, and Nematology) are underway. Professor Jim Adaskaveg recently redesigned his undergraduate Mycology lecture and laboratory courses so that they could be taken by both undergraduate and graduate students. This will expose our graduate students to real-world fungal diseases and their management.

6. **Discuss mechanisms that can increase the number of domestic graduate students in the program by giving serious consideration to reviving the MS degree program and consider the development of Professional Science Master’s program.**

We are making extensive efforts to increase the number of graduate students, especially domestic students. These include direct calling and aggressive recruitment efforts. We also believe that as our faculty mature, we will continue to increase our student recruitment. These efforts are already paying off, as we had 6 new domestic PhD students last year, and 6 offers out this year, with one acceptance already received. Our primary limitation now to expanding the graduate program is support from the College for GSR funding for new graduate students, and TA positions for 2-5 year students.

We are continuing discussions for the Masters and a Professional Science Master’s degree.

7. **Develop the professional training requirements and cultivate an appreciation of the importance of teaching experience for graduate students and view TA-ships as an essential learning experience for graduate students.**

We redesigned our PLPA265 course to offer a review of the Principles of Plant Pathology and also provide education in professional development to our students. This course was well-received by the graduate students and will be offered again in Spring 2013.
We do agree that teaching experience is a critical part of our training. Many of our students now receive some TA experience. However, the allocation of TAs is ultimately determined by the Dean’s office through the TAAC, and funding cutbacks have curtailed the number of available TA positions.

8. **Address the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives.**

We will be asking for student input while we revise our curriculum over the next few years. We are also planning more activities for students in order to increase the *esprit de corps* of the group. Current students are essential and effective contributors to our recruitment of new students.
July 11, 2011

Michael Allen, Chair
Department of Plant Pathology

Dear Dr. Allen:

The Findings and Recommendations of the Graduate Council resulting from the review of the Plant Pathology program are enclosed. A formal response is due from your program by October 11, 2011. Your response package should include appropriate program changes, statements of changed procedures, course proposals, etc., or statements of why the points in the Recommendations are not to be carried out. Acceptance of your response package by the Graduate Council will conclude the present review of the program.

Yours truly,

Morris Maduro, Chair
Graduate Council

Cc: Chancellor White
EVC and Provost Rabenstein
Dean T. Baldwin, CNAS
A. Introduction

The Graduate Program in Plant Pathology has a strong and well-deserved reputation in plant pathology. The program was established in 1961-1962, but remains relatively small, consisting of 15 PhD students at the present time. Currently, the Program does not have Master’s students. In total, the Program has conferred 232 PhD degrees, with 23 of these awarded since the prior extramural review in 2002. The overall attrition rate for students who leave without a PhD is 32%. The mean time to completion of the degree for students who earned their doctorate during the period from fall 2002 to winter 2010 is 5 years.

The Program underwent an extramural review on February 7-8, 2011. The extramural review team consisted of Professors Andrew O. Jackson, University of California Berkeley; James D. MacDonald, University of California Davis; Leland S. Pierson III, Texas A&M University. The review team submitted its report on March 30, 2011. Graduate Division received the Program’s response to errors of fact, misperceptions and interpretations in the extramural report on May 2, 2011.

B. Summary of the Extramural Report

The extramural review team positively notes high national ranking of the Plant Pathology Program and recognizes its strengths in subtropical and semi-arid crop production that sets it apart from many other plant pathology programs and provides UCR with a competitive advantage in this area of research. The program is well positioned to build new focus on Microbiology that can interact synergistically with Plant Pathology addressing more fundamental questions of host-pathogen interactions. The team finds the faculty to be strong, internationally recognized and to attract a substantial level of extramural funding. The program recruited a number of outstanding new faculty members in recent years. There was an approximately 50% increase in grants, including federal grant support, and 30% increase in faculty hires during the review period.

The review team found a number of areas in which the Program could be strengthened.

Leadership and Faculty

The review team expressed concerns related to leadership. The team recommends identifying a new chair, someone committed to the future success of the program and equipped with the social networking skills to reach across all
members of the faculty to move the program forward. The team views as essential to the long term success of the program a new leader who can develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

The team comments that the department has few mid-career faculty members to fill important leadership roles. The team recommends new mid-career faculty hires in microbiology to meet anticipated instructional needs and to provide a balance between the microbiology and plant pathology.

**Graduate Students**

The review team raises a number of issues with respect to the graduate students. The graduate program is composed of a diverse group of mostly international students and a smaller number of domestic students. The team finds that program’s research focus on subtropical and semi-arid crop production is one of the factors making the program highly attractive to students from developing countries. The team also finds that the difficulty in attracting domestic graduate students to both Plant Biology and Plant Pathology is seen broadly as a national problem. Nonetheless the MS program could provide a mechanism for attracting domestic students to the program that become interested in research and choose to advance to PhD studies. The team raises concerns that there is no effort in recruiting or admitting students to the MS program, even though it is listed as an active option for students. The team also indicates that there are many career opportunities for graduates with the MS degree and there is a strong demand for MS level graduates in private industry and many other agricultural outlets. The team recommends giving serious consideration to the mechanisms for reviving the MS degree program. The team also suggests that undergraduate microbiology interactions with faculty in the plant pathology track might enhance domestic graduate student recruitment efforts.

Although a student group was active in the past, the review team found that the students, in general, appear to be unaware as to how decisions that affect their lives are made. The team recommends addressing the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives. The team finds the Program’s track record for placing its graduates into faculty positions to have been strong but does question whether this record may have fallen off in recent years.

The team points out that the program should recognize the importance of teaching experience for graduate students (via TAships) as an essential learning experience. The team also recommends that student experiences should be broadened to consider professional opportunities outside academia by inviting industry representatives to speak in the departmental seminar series.
Curriculum

The most significant finding of the team with respect to the structure of the graduate program itself is that there are too many core courses offered to support them. The four core courses currently required of all students are organized around the primary plant pathogen groups, fungi, bacteria, viruses, and nematodes, and the curriculum has been in place for many years without revision. The team recommends reducing the redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses and allowing students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization.

The team also suggests additions to the curriculum. Noting that undergraduate students do not get involved in plant pathology research, the team suggests converting some of the core courses to cross-listings at both the undergraduate and graduate levels to increase undergraduate student exposure to this area of research that will potentially enhance pool of domestic applicants. The team also suggests separating lecture and lab components of classes, offering them as two related, but independent courses and adding new classes that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.

The team recommends additional mid-career faculty hires with the focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology tracks of the program.

The team also indicates the lack of student awareness of career options outside academia. The team recommends the program to invite industry representatives for seminars to educate students about professional opportunities outside academia.

C. Departmental Response

The Department was appreciative of the external review recommendations and considers their assessment to be helpful. The Preliminary Response of the Department of Plant Pathology to the Extramural Report identifies three minor errors as follows:

1. The student group exists and was active in the past. However the strength of student organization has reduced due to lack of programmatic cohesion and the dispersal of students across labs in many buildings.

2. Professor Baldwin has expressed concern about a possible perception that he served as interim chair of the Department of Plant Pathology to facilitate a merger between the Department of Plant Pathology and Nematology, where only a minority of faculty consider themselves to
be programmatically compatible with the Department of Plant Pathology versus with some other department.

3. A college-wide TAAC committee assigns TAships taking into consideration student teaching requirements of the program, their experience and language skills, instead of financial needs.

D. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

1. The program must work to establish a clear and compelling vision of its future goals and develop a coherent strategy for accomplishing its goals. The program faculty and students should work together to develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

2. Work with the CNAS Dean and the Graduate Dean in identifying a faculty member to serve as Department Chair, who has the leadership and interpersonal skills to work successfully with all members of the faculty to build a common vision and strategy.

3. Re-evaluate recruitment efforts in hiring some mid-career faculty potentially with focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology.

4. Undertake a concerted effort to work with the administration and the department in determining a strategy for renovation and/or replacement of the plant growth facilities so that faculty can undertake research of the highest quality.

5. Assess the curriculum to reduce redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses, to allow students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization and to introduce new courses that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.

6. Discuss mechanisms that can increase the number of domestic graduate students in the program by giving serious consideration to reviving the MS degree program and consider the development of Professional Science Master’s program.

7. Develop the professional training requirements and cultivate an appreciation of the importance of teaching experience for graduate students and view TA-ships as an essential learning experience for graduate students.
8. Address the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives.

APPROVED BY GRADUATE COUNCIL ON JUNE 7, 2011