AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday January 19, 2012
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of December 8, 2011

2. Update of Graduate Support Task Force – Robert Clare

3. Announcements
   a. Chair of the Graduate Council
   b. CCGA Representative
   c. Graduate Student Council Representative
   d. Dean of the Graduate Division

4. Courses and Programs Subcommittee

   1. Approval of Courses - The following Courses have to be approved:
      1. BIEN 273 - Special Topics in Regenerative Engineering and Biomechanics - New
      2. CHEM 260 - Organic and Organometallic Methodology and Synthesis - New
      3. CHEM 263 - Analysis and Synthesis at the Chemistry-Biology Interface - New
      4. CPLT 212 - Introduction to Graduate Studies in Comparative Literature - Delete
      5. CPLT 216 - Semiotics: Literature and Culture - Delete
      6. CPLT 218 - Narrative Universals - Delete
      7. CPLT 271 - Narratology and Comparative Stylistics - Delete
      8. CPLT 274 - Representation of Science in Literature - Delete
      9. CPLT 286 - Interdisciplinary Studies - Delete
      10. CS 210 – Scientific Computing - New
      11. CS 301 – Teaching Computer Science at the College Level - Delete
      12. CS 302 – Apprentice Teaching – Change
      13. CWLR 200 – Professional Fundamentals - New
      14. CWPA 254 – The Novel and 9/11 - New
      15. CWPA 297 – Directed Research - New
      16. DNCE 269 – Laban Movement Analysis - Delete
      17. ECON 209 Nonmarket Valuation and Environmental Policy - Change
      18. EE 215 – Stochastic Processes - Change
      19. ENSC 209 – Nonmarket Valuation and Environmental Policy – New
      20. ETST 243E – Special Topics in Ethnic Studies - New
      21. ETST 243F – Special Topics in Ethnic Studies – New
      22. HIST 241 – Readings in Asian History - New
      23. MCBL 297 – Directed Research – Change
      24. ME 274 – Plasma-aided Manufacturing and Materials Processing – New
      25. MGT 285 – Field Colloquium – New
      27. PHYS 250 – Special Topics Seminar in Physics & Astronomy - New
      28. PHYS 251 – Techniques of Observational Astronomy - Delete
      29. PHYS 252 – Topological Phases in Condensed Matter and Their Application to Quantum Computing – Delete
      30. PHYS 254 Statistical Physics in Biology
31. PHYS 255 Spin Dependent Phenomena in Solids – Delete
32. PHYS 257 – Topics in Interacting Many Body Systems – Delete
33. PHYS 259 – Techniques of Observational Cosmology – Delete
34. PHYS 260 – Selected Topics in Theoretical High-Energy Physics – Delete
35. PHYS 261 – Theory of Strongly Correlated Low-Temperature Systems – Delete
36. PHYS 262 – Electron Spin and Magnetism Nanostructures – Delete
37. PHYS 263 – The Yukawa Sector Beyond the Standard Model – Delete
38. PHYS 264 – Strongly Correlated and Nanoscale Systems – Delete
39. PHYS 265 – DNA Computation - Delete
40. PHYS 266 – Theoretical Aspects of Fundamental Particle Interactions - Delete
41. PHYS 267 – Hadron Physics at Electron-Positron Colliders - Delete
42. PHYS 268 – Electroweak Physics at Electron-Positron Colliders - Delete
43. PHYS 269 – Physics and Electronics in Nanoscale Systems - Delete
44. PHYS 270 – Magnetic Resonance Techniques in Condensed Matter Physics - Delete
45. PHYS 271 – Heavy Ion Physics - Delete
46. PHYS 272 – High Transverse Momentum Physics at Hadron Colliders - Delete
47. PHYS 274 – Experimental Relativistic Nucleon-Nucleon Collisions - Delete
48. PHYS 276 – Experimental Aspects of Electroweak Symmetry Breaking - Delete
49. PHYS 277 – Special Topics in the Theory of Condensed Matter - Delete
50. PHYS 278 – Surface Sciences - Delete
51. PHYS 279 – Astrophysics - Delete
52. PHYS 280 – Space Physics and Astrophysics - Delete
53. PHYS 281 – Charge-Parity (CP) Symmetry Violation - Delete
54. PHYS 282 – Experimental Investigations of Strongly Correlated Materials - Delete
55. PHYS 283 – Techniques of Microscopy - Delete
56. PHYS 284 – Optical Techniques for Measurements in Physics - Delete
57. PHYS 285 – Experimental Technique in Particle Physics - Delete
58. RLST 231 – Ethnographic Methodology – New
59. SOC 206 – Proseminar in Quantitative Sociology – New
60. SOC 208 – Proseminar in Qualitative Sociology – New

Program Changes and Proposals - None

5. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee:
   a. Status Report Page 7 - 9
   b. Update on Entomology Review

6. Fellowship Subcommittee Report:

7. Old Business:

8. New Business:
   Cooperative Extension Specialists as Sole Graduate Advisors Page 23 - 36
   Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs and UCLA’s draft guidelines on Self-Supporting proposals
   Items from Dean Childers
Present:

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)

Absent:
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Deborah Wong, Music
Gary Coyne, (Graduate Student Representative)
Jennifer Wright (Graduate Student Representative)

Guests:
Susan Allen Ortega
Ken Baerenklau

Approval of Minutes
The agenda and the minutes were approved as written.

Announcements:
Chair of the Graduate Council:
Chair Barish indicated that Prof. Bob Clare, the UCORP representative will attend the Graduate Council meeting scheduled for January to discuss the Joint Administration/Senate Workgroup on Graduate Student Issues report.

CCGA Representative: Prof. Mike Vanderwood indicated that CCGA spent some time discussing the report from Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support. This report will be forwarded to the Regents. CCGA also discussed the new standards of accreditation and what that will mean to the campuses. The committee also discussed at length the issue of online courses and the need to ensure that the proposals submitted to OP are fully reviewed by the campuses. The length of time it takes to review a proposal is about six months.
Prof. Vanderwood suggested that it might help departments and graduate programs to know these deadlines so that they could plan accordingly.

**Graduate Student Council Representatives:** The graduate student representatives were not present so there was no report.

**Dean of the Graduate Division:** The Dean was absent due to a prior commitment and thus there was no report.

**Courses and Programs Subcommittee:** The following courses and programs were unanimously approved:

**Courses approved:**
1. CS 217 (GPU Architecture and Parallel Programming) New
2. DNCE 280 (Colloquium in Current Topics in Dance Research)
3. BIEN 235 (Vascular Biomechanics and Engineering)
4. EE 217 (GPU Architecture and Parallel Programming) New
5. ME 255 (Transport Processes in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer)
6. ME 273 (Principles and Designs of Micro Transducers)
7. CS 213 (Multiprocessor Architecture and Programming)
8. CS 203B (Advanced Computer Architecture)
9. MCBL 262 (Seminar in Molecular Biology and Genomics of Disease Vectors)
10. ENTM 262 (Seminar in Molecular Biology and Genomics of Disease Vectors)
11. BPSC 290 (Directed Studies)

**Program Changes and Proposals approved:**
1. Revision to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. Degree - GSOE
2. Revision to the Autism M.Ed. Degree – GSOE
3. Proposed addition to graduate program requirements – normative time to degree - Biochemistry.

**Graduate Program Review Update:**

**Environmental Sciences:**
Vice Chair Maduro indicated that the review will take place on March 5 and 6, 2012.

**Biomedical Sciences:**
Chair Barish indicated that the review will take place on March 12 - 13, 2012

**Economic Program Review**
The Committee reviewed the draft Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations and approved them for further distribution to the department after corrections and review by Dean Childers.

**Fellowship Subcommittee Report:** There was nothing to report.

**Old Business:** There was no old Business.
**New Business:** Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy at UCR. Graduate Council discussed the newly revised Academic Integrity policy and the following changes were agreed upon:

- **Allegations of Misconduct in Research:** All allegations of research misconduct should be immediately reported to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. The Associate Dean will then inform the Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer and who, in furtherance of the University’s obligations and responsibilities, has been delegated the administrative authority by the Chancellor with respect to the oversight, implementation, maintenance and updating of the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside.

- All complainants should consult the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside prior to bringing an allegation of research misconduct to the Associate Dean, Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer.

- In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause with respect to research misconduct to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses, as outlined below, beginning with Review Stage 1.

- In cases where the Faculty member has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Initial Review, he or she shall submit a final grade to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] as to the question of misconduct.

- A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course in accordance with campus regulations. *a grade of “W”*

1. **Hearing Panels**

- For cases involving undergraduate students, SCAIP will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. For cases involving graduate students, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, in consultation with the chair of the GAIC, Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting, administrative chair of the hearing panel. Schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

- For , the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting, administrative chair of the hearing panel to facilitate
the hearing. For graduate students, the Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel. The chair of the hearing panel shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony.

- **Notification of decision:** Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or designee for undergraduates, and Associate Dean of the Graduate Division for graduate students, will send written notification.

The Graduate Council unanimously agreed to endorse the policy with the modifications above.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Kenneth Barish, Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. DUE</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R RECEIVED</th>
<th>FINAL RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Stud (Internal)</td>
<td>March 7, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/1/2011</td>
<td>9/1/2011</td>
<td>12/5/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td>May 25, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>March 12 - 13, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>April 30, May 1, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics and Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>March 5 - 6, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>January 12 - 13, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 01-17-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Last Review Date</td>
<td>Next Review Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>3/1/2007</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>3/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
<td>1/6/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
<td>5/6/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>3/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2/14/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1966/1967</td>
<td>2/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>5/1/2009</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>MA, MEd, PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>5/7/2007</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>5/6/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>4/1/2002</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>5/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Last Review Date</td>
<td>Next Review Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>4/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>4/1/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>5/3/2003</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>3/4/2004</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; Bioinformatics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1/1/2003</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>2/6/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MA, MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>2/1/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>11/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>5/6/2006</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>3/1/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>1/1/2010</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>11/7/2007</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>5/5/2005</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY ON SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Self-supporting programs allow the University to serve additional students above and beyond the resources provided by the state while fulfilling demonstrated higher education and workforce needs. Currently, there are populations of working adults not served by UC state-supported programs who would be willing to enroll in self-supporting graduate degree programs. This policy is designed to facilitate the establishment of self-supporting programs by the University and its campuses while ensuring that these programs do not use state resources. These programs will receive no state-support; however, they have the potential to generate resources that would enhance the quality, access, and affordability of core academic programs and departments. For example, they could provide additional support for graduate students and students in state-supported programs.

I. General

A. Self-supporting graduate degree programs should meet one or more of the following criteria, although meeting a single criterion is not necessarily sufficient justification for self-supporting status:
   1. primarily serve a non-traditional population, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students, and/or students supported by their employers;
   2. be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction or a hybrid model;
   3. be alternatively scheduled, such as during evenings, weekends, and summers; and/or
   4. be offered in an alternative location (e.g., off-campus centers).

B. Such programs should not be undertaken if they strain the resources of the department that sponsors them or have an adverse effect on regular programs on campus. If the campus determines a graduate degree program should be offered on a self-supporting basis, such programs should be fully self-supporting upon inception or within a short phase-in period; “self-supporting” means that full program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead, should be covered by student tuition and fees or other non-state funds, including funds raised through private philanthropy. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program should submit a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan with their request for approval of proposed student tuition and fees as defined in the Implementation Guidelines.

C. By expanding self-supporting programming that serves practitioners, the respective department may have access to additional field-based resources (working students, their employers, and field-based lecturers) that it might not otherwise be able to afford. Therefore, where appropriate, partnerships with the profession served are encouraged.

D. Courses may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or in a combination of on-campus and off-campus facilities. The programs may also use distance technologies (computer and video-based, e-mail, etc.) as appropriate. As provided by Academic Senate Regulation 694\(^1\), courses to satisfy the requirements of such programs may be given, either in whole or in part, at off-campus sites.

\(^1\) SR 694: A school, department, or group of departments which offers a program leading to a Master’s degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division, may, in cooperation with University Extension, provide at a center or centers other than a campus of the University, a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree. See http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/rpart3.html#r690
II. Programs Ineligible for Self-Supporting Status

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs are not eligible to become self-supporting programs. In addition, an academic Master’s degree program solely or primarily leading to a Ph.D. degree is not eligible to be self-supporting.

III. Relationship to State-Supported On-Campus Programs

A. Self-supporting graduate degree programs should be held to the same standards of quality as regular programs, as determined by the appropriate Graduate Council. Standards of admission and performance for any student, regardless of whether the program is a self-supporting or state-supported graduate degree program, should be demonstrably high. Just as in the case of state-supported graduate degree programs, the standards of admission and performance are governed by the Senate.

B. Any self-supporting programs should be established by academic departments or units and staffed with faculty on the same basis as state-supported programs. Teaching faculty should be appointed through regular campus processes irrespective of academic series. Certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion of non-regular faculty (e.g., clinical/adjunct faculty, lecturers, visitors), but that proportion must be in keeping with the standards of each campus’ Graduate Council. Under no circumstances shall anyone teach in self-supporting programs whose appointment has not been subject to the appropriate academic review.

C. The Dean of the school or college offering the self-supporting program is responsible for assuring that program publicity and marketing meet the highest standards of quality and accuracy, and the Dean is accountable to the Academic Vice Chancellor for such representations.

D. Self-supporting graduate degree programs may be administered in cooperation with University Extension.2 UC Extension’s role is generally limited to assisting in activities that are part of the administration of the program (e.g., course enrollment, collecting tuition and fees, advertising, career services, and technical support) although UC Extension may provide more services when requested by the department. However, authority over courses, curriculum, and faculty appointment must be fully exercised by the academic unit responsible for the program.

IV. Initiation, Approval, and Review Procedures

A. Departments, groups of departments, or schools offering graduate degree programs under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division may propose self-supporting programs.

B. Self-supporting programs should originate with an academic unit that is already authorized to conduct graduate work on the campus at the level that is at least equal to the level of the proposed graduate program.

C. The establishment of any new self-supporting graduate program shall be approved by the campus Graduate Council, Divisional Senate, Systemwide Academic Senate, campus administrators, the Chancellor, and the UC President according to established procedures and requirements as specified in the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units.3

---

2 SR 694. See footnote 1
3 The UC Office of the President (UCOP) and the CCGA review proposals for all new graduate degree programs, including self-supporting and professional degree programs. Self-supporting graduate degree programs must adhere to the same UC academic standards as do other graduate degree programs (Compendium, January 2011).
D. Graduate Councils or other duly appointed campus review bodies appointed by the Academic Senate shall review such programs as part of regularly scheduled campus program reviews, on the same basis on which regular academic programs are reviewed. Once established, the self-supporting program will be under the purview of the divisional Graduate Division, if appropriate,\(^4\) to ensure adequate progress of students according to campus criteria.

E. If approved, such programs shall be conducted in accordance with this Policy.

F. Courses for self-supporting programs are subject to normal campus procedures for approval (i.e., approval by Committee on Courses [see Implementation Guidelines]).

V. Admission and Enrollment

A. Admission standards for self-supporting programs should be comparable in effect to those for the state-supported programs. In many cases, there will be no comparable state-supported programs.

B. Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.

C. Access to courses offered as part of these programs must be equally available to all qualified students. No preference in enrollment may be given to members of any non-University organization.

D. Admissions criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field.

VI. Program Funding and Student Tuition and Fees

A. Self-supporting programs will not be funded from State General Funds and reports of state-funded enrollments will exclude students in self-supporting programs. However, these enrollments will be reported to the Office of the President as a separate category which is not counted against the campus budgeted (state-funded) enrollment target. During the approved phase-in period, distribution of enrollment between state and non-state targets will conform to specifications of the phase-in plan.

B. The President is responsible for reviewing and approving any proposed program tuition and fees for self-supporting graduate degree programs and subsequent increases or decreases. The President will report annually to The Regents on self-supporting graduate programs and their tuition and fee levels.

C. Programs administered in cooperation with UC Extension shall follow all requirements of this policy, and tuition and fees must be set to cover all program costs as defined in I.B, above.

D. Self-supporting program tuition and fees should be levied such that they will cover all program costs after a short phase-in period.

E. Self-supporting program tuition and fees should be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs as defined in I.B. The proposed self-supporting program tuition and fees, its phase-in plan, and its justification shall be submitted with the proposal for the program to the President. When the self-supporting program tuition and fees have been fully implemented, no State General Funds (including student tuition and/or fee revenue from sources other than the program) will be provided to the program. Non-State funds can be used for a self-supporting program if a campus determines that it is necessary to meet a critical strategic need. If the program fails to reach self-support in line with its phase-in plan, state funds will be withdrawn.

\(^4\) Some degrees in professional schools are under Graduate Council and CCGA jurisdiction.
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from its support. Self-supporting programs will be periodically reviewed by campus and/or systemwide audit to assure compliance to policy.

F. University employees enrolled in self-supporting degree programs are not eligible for reduced course tuition and fees. However, this provision does not preclude the option of the employee’s department subsidizing a portion of the tuition and fees.

G. Program deficits including any deficits during the phase-in period, will be covered by the campuses; state funds cannot be used to cover any deficit. Campuses are encouraged to identify in advance one fund source to be used to cover deficits.

H. State-supported and self-supporting programs must separately account for their use of resources. Campuses shall not charge a “blended” tuition and fee level for any course or program (i.e., a program tuition and fee level that combines state-supported and self-supported students). However, self-supporting and state-supported students can be enrolled in the same courses so long as there is separate accounting for the self-supporting and state-supplied costs.

I. Self-supporting programs must have an articulated financial accessibility goal for their students and a student financial support plan for achieving their goal. Examples of possible student financial support plan components include providing scholarships or grants from the program’s own resources (e.g., return-to-aid from program tuition and fees assessed but not from state funds or tuition and/or fees charged to students in state-supported programs, or funds raised through private philanthropy), providing tuition and fee waivers, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, and participation in other external support programs such as veterans benefits. Self-supporting programs are responsible for meeting the administrative requirements and costs of financial aid program participation.

REVISION HISTORY

This policy supersedes the Presidential policy of the same name dated June 24, 1996 and any guidance issued by the Budget Office prior to the issuance date of this revision.
Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs

Program Approval

For new self-supporting graduate degree programs, campuses should obtain required program approvals. The establishment of any new self-supporting graduate program shall be approved by the campus Graduate Council, Divisional Senate, Systemwide Academic Senate, campus administrators, the Chancellor, and the UC President according to established procedures and requirements as specified in the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units.

Cost Analysis and Tuition & Fee Approval Request

All programs must submit an annual cost analysis to Budget and Capital Resources. This analysis includes an estimate of average costs for the campus and school in addition to direct program costs. Program costs include the direct costs of staff and faculty salaries and benefits, supplies and equipment, and financial aid. Campus and school costs are the indirect costs for items such as instruction, research, public services, academic and administrative support, and operation and maintenance of the plant.

Programs are expected to demonstrate that student tuition and fees cover full direct and indirect costs, and, to the extent that program tuition and fee revenue is insufficient to cover these costs, that only non-State fund sources (excluding student tuition and/or fee revenue from sources other than the program) are used to subsidize the program.

In addition to the cost analysis, campuses must submit a program tuition and fees approval request letter to the Vice President – Budget and Capital Resources for all of their proposed self-supporting programs. Campuses must provide requested program tuition and fee levels and the percentage tuition and fee increases for each program, as well as provide information about upcoming new programs and programs operated by University Extension.

Newly proposed self-supporting programs submit the same cost analysis to Budget and Capital Resources. Programs are expected to become fully self-supporting within three years, though campuses may continue to subsidize programs with non-State funds (excluding student tuition and/or fee revenue from sources other than the program) at their discretion. Program deficits including any deficits during the phase-in period, will be covered by the campuses; state funds cannot be used to cover any deficit. Campuses are encouraged to identify in advance one fund source to be used to cover deficits.

Faculty FTE

All faculty must be funded directly from the revenue of self-supporting programs in proportion to the faculty member’s workload commitment to the program, or the program must reimburse an amount equivalent to the cost of faculty time. This includes the involvement of faculty from other departments. Alternatively, faculty can be paid for overload teaching within the 120% salary limitation that governs teaching in University Extension. Appropriate campus review committees should be vigilant to ensure that the overload option and 120% salary limitation are used appropriately.

Enrollments

Because enrollments in these programs are self-supported, they should not be included in counts of state-supported enrollment. Programs should be identified in the Corporate Student System by a separate major code and attribute flagging the enrollment as self-supporting.
Timeline

Campuses receive cost analysis templates for the next academic year in December, as well as the previous year’s actual self-supporting enrollment numbers from the Corporate Student System. Campus financial statements, used in the preparation of the cost analysis, are posted online late in the month. Detailed instructions for the program tuition and fees approval request letter are also given at this time.

Templates and letters are due back to Budget and Capital Resources (BCR) by March 1. After review by BCR, templates and a summary of program tuition and fee requests are given to the President for approval, which usually happens by April. Campuses are then notified of approved program tuition and fee levels for the upcoming academic year. This information is also reported to The Regents annually.
October 14, 2011

Joseph Nagy, Chair
Graduate Council

Re: Guidelines for the Graduate Council Review of Self-Supporting Program Proposals and the Academic Senate Review of Self-Supporting Programs

As part of its charge, the Graduate Council reviews and evaluates all degree-granting programs of study (often in conjunction with the Undergraduate Council) on an eight-year cycle. It also recommends proposals for new graduate degree programs to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA).

The CCGA recently endorsed guidelines for the review of self-supporting degree program proposals (Appendix A). Additionally, in its recent review of a self-supporting program at UCLA, the Graduate Council determined that guidelines should be instituted at the divisional level as well to ensure that the review of new degree proposals and of departments with graduate degree programs is consistently applied and affords an honest assessment of the various, unique components of self-supporting degree programs.

In response to the increasing interest in self-supporting programs, 2010-11 Graduate Council Chair, Professor Steven Nelson, convened a workgroup in Spring 2011 to review current and proposed policies for self-supporting programs (Appendices B and C respectively) as well as the Report of the Joint Senate-Administration Task Force regarding Non-traditional Programs, including Self-supporting Degree Programs and Certificate Programs, which was commissioned by Executive Vice Chancellor Scott L. Waugh and then-Senate Chair Robin L. Garrell in 2009-10 (Appendix D). The workgroup also met with Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget, Glyn Davies, whose office provides resource analyses – and administrative assistance – to departments and programs interested in developing self-supporting programs.

The following, proposed guidelines serve as the workgroup’s report and offer a general overview of the issues that should be explored when the Graduate Council reviews proposals for new, self-supporting graduate degree and Senate-regulated certificate programs, and when it reviews a department/program that offers these self-supporting degree program(s) as part of the Academic Senate’s eight-year program review process. The guidelines represent an amalgamation of the UC Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs, the CCGA guidelines, the recommendations of the Task Force Report, and the workgroup’s own assessments as they relate to the Graduate Council’s responsibility for the oversight of self-supporting degree and Senate-regulated certificate programs with the overall intent of assuring the academic excellence that is the hallmark of UCLA.
As identified in the Task Force’s report, the proposed guidelines presented below would only apply to those academic degree and certificate programs over which the Graduate Council has authority (henceforth referred to as “Senate-regulated programs”). Such programs include:

1. Online, self-supporting graduate degree programs;
2. MA, MS\(^1\) and graduate professional degree programs; and
3. Senate-regulated certificate programs (excluding interdisciplinary certificates for matriculated graduate students, the approved guidelines for which explicitly prohibit the charging of fees).

These programs are not only subject to the Graduate Council’s approval, but are also monitored by the Graduate Council via the Academic Senate’s program review process. It bears noting that the policy on self-supporting graduate degree programs does not permit Ph.D. programs to become self-supporting programs.

The proposed guidelines presented below would **not** apply to:

1. University Extension (UNEX) certificate programs;
2. Non-UNEX, continuing professional education certificate programs, or
3. Summer Institute certificate programs.

The workgroup noted, however, the usage of the University’s state-supported infrastructures (including faculty resources) by these non-Senate-regulated certificate programs and the impact they have on the Senate-regulated programs offered through the same academic unit. Such impacts are identified in the following guidelines as they relate to Senate-regulated programs, but warrant further attention and guidance from the Office of Academic Planning and Budget and, ultimately, the Executive Vice Chancellor to ensure that they do not detract from, or in any way diminish, the quality and delivery of Senate-regulated programs. As such, the workgroup recommends sharing this report, upon its approval, and the workgroup’s concerns about the potential conflicts (i.e., resource and financial implications) of non-Senate-regulated programs of study on Senate-regulated programs with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget and Executive Vice Chancellor for their information, if not further action.

The workgroup makes the following recommendations to the Graduate Council for implementing:

I.) **Guidelines for the Development and Review of New Self-Supporting Degree and Senate-regulated Certificate Proposals:** to be incorporated as a new appendix in the *UCLA Procedural Manual for New Graduate Degree Programs* (Appendix E)

II.) **Guidelines for the Review of Self-Supporting Degree and Senate-regulated Certificate programs as part of the 8-year review of departments by the Academic Senate.**

---

1 The original UC Policy on Self-Supporting Programs (implemented in June 1996) covered only part-time professional degree programs; revisions to the policy have been approved that now permit self-supporting status for academic master’s degree programs (M.A. and M.S.) and graduate level, Senate-regulated certificates. The new Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs was announced by President Yudof on September 23, 2011.
1. SELF-SUPPORTING PROGRAM CRITERIA: Per the 2011 *Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs*, a self-supporting program should meet one or more of the following criteria ("although meeting a single criterion is not necessarily sufficient justification for self-supporting status"): 1) primarily serve a non-traditional population, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students and/or students supported by their employers; 2) be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction or a hybrid model; 3) be alternatively scheduled, such as during evening, weekends, and summers; and/or 4) be offered in an alternative locations (e.g., off-campus centers).

2. LADDER FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: Proposals for new, self-supporting, Senate-regulated graduate degree and certificate programs must provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the self-supporting program to ensure that faculty members will continue to provide at least the current level of support to existing academic graduate programs. Ladder rank faculty must be involved in the conception, review, approval, teaching, and ongoing evaluation of all proposed self-supporting programs; a description of ladder faculty’s role with the proposed self-supporting program is expected in the proposal.

3. PROGRAM INTENT AND CONGRUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION: New proposals should explain the intent for creating the self-supporting program and how congruent it is with the mission of the university and the department’s educational programs; proposals should elaborate on how the program will contribute to meeting campus strategic goals and priorities. Additionally, the proposal should state how the proposed program will enhance the reputation of the department, school and/or university.

4. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: New proposals must provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed, as well as an explicit discussion of teaching assignments in relation to the usual workload of faculty members; the proposal must indicate whether the concerned faculty members are teaching on an on-load or off-load basis. A description of the department, division and/or campus policies that deal with teaching load must be included in the proposal.

5. RECRUITMENT AND RELATION TO EXISTING PROGRAMS: New proposals must describe the intended audience and academic goals of the program, including how the proposed curriculum offers students an opportunity to achieve these goals. The proposal should include a comparison to existing departmental degree programs and a description of how the proposed program may overlap in the goals, missions and target audience. A description of the recruitment process and any marketing channels and media that will be deployed to promote the program should be included in the proposal, as well. In such cases where a contractual agreement is being contemplated between the university and a private company (including University Extension) to support the self-supporting program, the proposed arrangement and draft contract should be submitted with the proposal.

6. RESOURCE ANALYSIS AND DISPOSITION OF PROGRAM REVENUE: New proposals must include a detailed resource analysis from the Office of Academic Planning and Budget (APB), which ensures that the disposition of the proposed program’s projected revenues will be transparent and implemented to assure that secondary support services receive a return of the support needed to maintain excellence in the campus infrastructure. Per the standard proposal guidelines, the cognizant Dean should consult with the APB upon receipt and endorsement of
the proposal and the APB analysis must be appended to the proposal at the time it is submitted
to the Graduate Council. Upon receipt of the proposal by the Graduate Council, the proposal will
be forwarded to the Academic Senate’s Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) for further
analysis and comment. A CPB statement will be required before the Graduate Council moves to
recommend approval of the proposal to the CCGA. The CPB is specifically asked to make an
assessment of the demonstrated potential of the proposed program for offering fiscal support
to state-supported academic programs on campus.

7. PROGRAM GOVERNANCE: New proposals may require a set of bylaws that detail the governance
of the proposed program, including the levels of engagement by ladder and adjunct faculty in
the administration and execution of the program (i.e., committee structures) and assurances of
financial transparency (i.e., annual reporting requirements).

8. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION: Proposals for new self-supporting programs that rely heavily on
digital technologies in the delivery of instruction should explain in the proposal how those
technologies will enhance learning and provide access to a larger and more diverse student
population. An assessment of whether the proposed program will create a “substantive change”
as outlined by the Western Associate of Schools and College (://www.wascsenior.org/ ) must
be conducted to ensure compliance with WASC regulations.

9. EXPEDITED REVIEWS: CCGA generally requires up to two years to review new degree program
proposals. On an exceptional basis, the CCGA may grant an expedited review. In such cases, the
proposal must meet the following criteria:
a) The proposal must have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny at UCLA;
b) The proposers must solicit reviews from appropriate UC faculty from other campuses, or
appropriate professionals (whose reviews must address criteria as detailed in the CCGA
Handbook, found at: ://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ccga/reports. );
c) Proposers must address issues raised by the solicited reviews and make appropriate
adjustments to the proposal;
d) When the proposal is submitted to the UCLA Graduate Council, it must be accompanied by a
detailed narrative explaining how the proposers selected the reviewers and responded to
the issues they raised. Mere endorsement letters will not be accepted.

10. PROGRAM EVALUATION: Following approval of the proposal and three years after the
admission of the program’s first cohort, the Graduate Council should conduct an independent
review of the self-supporting program. Such a review will involve the collection of a written
progress report from the program’s department chair. The progress report will first be
presented to the Committee on Degree Programs (CDP). The CDP will vet the report and make
its recommendations for further actions to the Graduate Council. In the precedent years, the
self-supporting program will be reviewed annually by the Office of Academic Planning and
Budget; the resultant annual reports should be made available to the program’s department
chair and appended to the year-three progress report to enable the Council to consider the
financial feasibility of the program, in addition to the academic merits of the program. If
necessary, the Graduate Council may request assistance from the Council on Planning and
Budget to conduct a more thorough assessment of the program’s financial feasibility.Following a
successful year-three review by the Graduate Council, the self-supporting program should then
be incorporated into the Academic Senate’s regular, eight-year program review process. Should
immediate concerns arise as a product of the year-three review the Graduate Council will
address them directly with the department chair and monitor the program’s progress with addressing the concerns. Should the concerns not be satisfactorily addressed within a reasonable specified period of time, the Graduate Council will move to suspend admissions to and/or discontinue the self-supporting degree program as afforded under the Academic Senate’s Appendix V procedures and as recommended by the CCGA guidelines.

II. Guidelines for the Review of Self-Supporting Degree and Senate-regulated Certificate Programs as Part of the 8-Year Review of Departments by the Academic Senate: suggested revisions to be incorporated into the Academic Senate Program Review Process Manual (Appendix F)

Per the Academic Senate Guidelines for the Self-Review, departments/programs are already expected to provide a full report on self-supporting programs in their self-review, which is “the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals of (the) program.”

The following guidelines are proposed additions to the Academic Senate Program Review Process Manual to provide concrete information about a self-supporting program, both in the department’s self-review and to aid the review team with its written assessment of the department/program:

1. Revision to Academic Senate Program Review Process Manual, Guidelines for the Self-Review; Section 4.G – new section:

   Report on Self-Supporting Programs: Departments/programs that offer self-supporting programs should provide a full report on all self-supporting programs that fall under their purview. Such a report should include:
   
   A. an overview of the financial and academic aspects of the self-supporting programs;
   B. an overview of the ladder faculty involvement in the self-supporting program;
   C. the impact of their on-load or off-load teaching in the self-supporting program;
   D. an overview of digital technologies that are used in the delivery of instruction; and
   E. a copy of the bylaws that govern the operation of the self-supporting program.

2. Revision to Appendix XVI, Section 6 (subject to confirmation by the Legislative Assembly):

   Site Visit Structure: The immediately incoming and immediately outgoing UgC and GC Chairs (ordinarily a total of 4 people) shall establish the basic structure of the site visit, considering the advice they have received. Ordinarily, the site visit will last two days. For small units, it may be shorter; for large units, longer. Ordinarily, the review team will work as one group. However, for larger units and/or longer site visits, the team may divide up at certain times. When a department operates a self-supporting program, in addition to its academic degree programs, the site visit will normally be extended by at least a half-day to insure sufficient time for the review team to conduct a thorough evaluation of the self-supporting program.

The workgroup attempted to address the review of self-supporting degree proposals and programs in as comprehensive a fashion as possible, but also acknowledges the need to monitor policies and guidelines over the coming years to accommodate likely revisions – be they additions, deletions or updates to the proposed guidelines. It would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and express its appreciation for the efforts of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and the Joint Senate-
Administration Task Force for their time and efforts with identifying issues unique to self-supporting programs at the system-wide and divisional levels. Those efforts proved invaluable to the workgroup in its development of these proposed, divisional guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

SSP Workgroup:

Karen Gylys, School of Nursing, Chair
Stuart Brown, Physics and Astronomy
Ian Krouse, Music
Ichiro Nishimura, Dentistry

Appendices:

C. Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (approved September 23, 2011)
TO: Ken Barish  
Chair, Graduate Council

FROM: David R. Parker  
Chair of the CNAS Faculty

DATE: December 12, 2011

RE: Cooperative Extension Specialists as Sole Graduate Advisors

On November 19, 2008, the Graduate Council voted to

"allow either research series or adjunct faculty to serve as chairs of dissertation committees on an ad hoc basis and only where in those circumstances there is at least one Academic Senate member also serving on the committee."

Several people that I have contacted (including Dean Childers) recall that the primary intent of this action was to include our non-Senate CE (and CE/OR) Specialists as part of the policy. The exact wording here is perhaps unfortunate, because it does not specifically mention the Specialist title. Moreover, the inclusion of “on an ad hoc basis” has led to the current interpretation of policy by the Graduate Division wherein CE Specialists must still submit some sort of request for approval in order to chair a dissertation committee. On behalf of the CNAS AES departments, I am writing to ask for (i) a clarification of Council’s original intent, and (ii) a mandated change in the Division’s policy such that committee chairmanship would henceforth be an “automatic” privilege enjoyed by our CE Specialists, and would therefore not require case-by-case approval.

Our arguments can be summarized as follows:

1. The duties and responsibilities of CE Specialists are enumerated in APM 334. The ranks, steps, and salary scales are all identical to those in the professorial series (APM 220). Moreover, the criteria for appointments and advancement are identical except that, in the former case, “extending knowledge” takes the place of “teaching”. Significantly, the language concerning research and creative activity is functionally the same, except that it is explicitly stated that CE Specialists’ research is of an applied bent. Finally, I note that all of our CE Specialists do possess doctoral degrees, although the same cannot be said of all of our faculty who enjoy Senate membership.

2. At UCR, all of the departmentally-housed CE Specialists are also appointed as Lecturers (without salary). According to APM 283 and 285, Lecturers (who are not Senate members) and Lecturers with Security of Employment (who are) all enjoy the privilege of being able “teach courses of any grade”. Implicitly then, it
would seem that lecturers can serve as the instructor or record for 297 or 299, and thus supervise graduate-student research.

Taken together, these lines of evidence suggest to me that there is no basis for denying CE Specialists the right to serve as the sole major advisor for graduate students, and that this privilege should be routine rather than “on an ad hoc basis”. Such an interpretation is consistent with the fact that virtually all of our CE Specialists are now housed within academic departments (and have been since 1987), and with the campus’ efforts to enhance and strengthen the continuum between basic research and field-application in the context of our AES mission. Moreover, such a shift is needed to help vitiate persistent problems associated with a perception of “second-class citizenship” of our non-Senate academic colleagues housed within the relevant departments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification of this request is needed. I would also be more than happy to attend a Council meeting if there are any questions that I may be able to address.

c: Dean Childers
Divisional Dean Paine
Chair Gauvain