AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2010
9:30 am– 11:30 am
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of October 1, 2010

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

3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee
   a. Courses
      BCH 212 Signal Transduction and Biochemical Regulation [change]
      GEO 201A Research and Proposal Design [new]
      GEO 201B Proposal Writing and Review [new]

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee
   a. Status Report
   b. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology: draft Findings & Recommendations

5. Old Business
   a. Change in Review Policy for Courses-tabled from last meeting
   b. Neuroscience Internal Review

6. New Business
   a. Change in Graduate Council Procedures – tabled from last meeting
   b. Graduate Council Handbook – tabled from last meeting
   c. Proposed Changes to Regulation R.1 – Grading System
Present:

M. Maduro, Chair
G. Gonzalez-Rivera
J. Arey
K. Barish
I. Ethell
P.E. Green
Y. Hua
J.N. Medearis
N.V. Myung
M. Vanderwood
S. Xu

Absent:

C. Nugent
D. Wong
Rachelle Cassel (Graduate Student Representative)
J. W. Childers, ex officio.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of June 15, 2010 were approved with changes. On Page 6, item (c) its should have no apostrophe. In the second paragraph, Chair Maduro was quoted as saying that other Graduate Councils do not review course proposals. Change to read that not all Graduate Councils review course proposals.

2. Conflict of Interest Statement

The Graduate Council adopted the Conflict of Interest Statement for 2010-2011.

3. Announcements

a. Chair of the Graduate Council

Chair Maduro welcomed the new members as well as the returning members to the Council. He stated that this will be an interesting year and noted that agendas will be now be sent out to members electronically. He gave a brief
review of the Council’s charge. The Council is a committee of the Academic Senate and Chair Maduro will be attending the Executive Council meetings. He is continuing as the UC Riverside representative to the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). As the CCGA representative, he can bring issues from the Council directly to the Office of the President. Another function of the council is to provide input on various issues to the Senate at large through the Executive Council. The Chair asked that the council focus their discussions on things related to graduate education, to attract and keeping the best faculty and keeping graduate programs strong. The Council considers policies as they apply to graduate students and graduate education, approves proposals for new graduate programs, reviews existing graduate programs. At present we participate in the review of graduate courses as well as consider changes to program requirements. We also assist the Graduate Division in the review of fellowships, selecting the recipients of the Mentor Advisor of the Year Award.

The Graduate Council’s staffing has been provided by the Graduate Division for the last 20 years. When Tom Cogswell was Chair of the Academic Senate and Chris Switzer was Chair of the Graduate Council, discussions began about staffing the Graduate Council through the Academic Senate. Transition started July 1, 2010. At the same time, Dean Childers removed much of the participation of the Associate Deans to Graduate Council matters, to routine graduate matters. Therefore the Associate Deans will not be attending the Graduate Council meetings.

Chair Maduro presented a power point of the NRC published rankings of the various graduate programs. He will email the NRC information to the members of the committee.

b. Graduate Student Council Representative

Chair Maduro reported that Rachelle Cassel will be one of the GSA representatives to the Council for the next academic year.

c. CCGA Representative

Chair Maduro is continuing as the CCGA representative. The meetings will be held the 1st Tuesday of the month. This month the meeting is on Tuesday, October 5, 2010.

d. Dean Childers was not able to attend, he was attending SACNAS.

4. Courses and Programs Subcommittee

a. Courses

The following courses were approved.
Since the Council agenda will be sent electronically, the courses will be now be listed on the agenda. The Courses and Programs Subcommittee suggested that Council members go online through CRAMS after they have received the agenda and review the courses prior to the Council meeting.

b. Proposal to establish a Self-Supporting Online Master of Engineering Degree.

This proposal came to the Council last year. It was sent back to the program with questions and it has now come back with their responses to the questions but without a revised proposal.

The Subcommittee made the following recommendations:

1) Ask the Academic Senate form a task force to think about the relationship between online degree programs, distance learning and real time teaching. This should include members of the Council and members from other committees.

2) Chair Maduro will contact the Chair of the Senate to look into establishing an ad hoc task force to review policies for electronic classes and programs.

3) Provide a second version of the proposal which includes the feedback and also follows CCGA Guildelines and would include a sample lecture.

4) Invite Tom Payne to attend a future Graduate Council meeting and present what has been changed in the proposal as well as a sample lecture or demonstration.

The general consensus of the subcommittee was they thought that while the proposal has merit, and in general they wish to ultimately approve it, there are a number of issues that remain to be addressed.

Morris will draft a response to the proponents which will include the recommendations that were discussed. For example, CEP had concerns with the courses aspect of the
online degree. Some standards need to be developed for what we or CCGA believes are the essential elements of an internet based course program and should also have some level of interaction and accountability.

Morris will draft a letter that incorporates the comments of the Council.

5. GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
   a. Status Report

The status report was received. The Review Subcommittee B met on October 6, 2010 and discussed the preliminary response from EEOB and the Findings and Recommendations Draft for Biochemistry. The Findings and Recommendations Draft for Biochemistry will be sent to the Graduate Council for the next meeting. The Mathematics response was received in May. It was returned to the program and a second response is due by November 1, 2010. There are 6 reviews this year, 3 are internal and 3 are external. The external reviews are in Economics, Plant Pathology, and Spanish. Previously the Associate Deans would vet a list of potential reviewers and this information is used to compile a sorted list of potential reviewers. In July when the Graduate Council was handed over to the Academic Senate, Morris was given the three short lists and over the summer he invited the external reviewers. (This might normally be something that the Chairs of the Subcommittees or the Academic Senate could do in the future.) The dates of the reviews are January 24-25, 2011 for Economics, February 7-8, 2011 for Plant Pathology, and April 11-12, 2011 for Spanish. There are 2 internal reviews, Southeast Asian Studies and Religious Studies and 1 pending for Neuroscience. The program chairs have been notified of the pending internal reviews and the materials are due December 1, 2010. The internal reviews are meetings with the Chair of the Program, Graduate Advisor, Chair of the Council and the Review Subcommittee.

6. OLD BUSINESS
   a. Change in Review Policy for Courses (tabled to next meeting)

   b. Neuroscience Graduate Program Review - The program had a review in November 2006 and they responded in November 2009. At that time, the Council felt that some issues still remain unresolved and decided that the program would be reviewed internally in one year, at which time the issues would be revisited. There was a fair consensus that an internal review should take place but the question was whether it should be a full review or limited to the points in the finding and recommendations memo. It was agreed to send this to the Review Subcommittee B to discuss if this should be a full internal review.

7. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Change in Graduate Council Procedures was tabled to the next meeting
b. Graduate Council Handbook was tabled to the next meeting

c. Request for Systemwide Review - Renaming Fees as Tuition

   The Graduate Council approved.

d. Request for Systemwide Review - Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University

   Morris will draft a response to this report for Council review/approval that include the following points: The Graduate Council endorses the basic idea that we make sure we attract and retain the best faculty possible and that we try to find as many funding sources as possible to keep our graduate programs strong and that we not cut programs that are part of the mission of the university. Try to resist driving up costs for education as much as they impact affordability and access.

   e. Request for Systemwide Review Post Employment Benefits – Discussion

   One member commented that Option A was not acceptable. With Option B or C the most important thing is the cap on the amount contributed, 7.5%, to keep with the existing plan. Option A has no cap. There are also concerns for attracting and retaining future faculty who will be most affected by the changes. Option C was slightly favored over option B because it is better for those earning less.

Meeting adjourned @ 3:30 p.m.

Morris Maduro, Acting Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT RECEIVED</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. DUE</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R RECVD</th>
<th>FINAL RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08}</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09}</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
<td>May 21, 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>1/25/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Deferred to 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jan 24-25, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Feb 7-8, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>April 11-12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Internal)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10/5/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-96</td>
<td>Dec-96</td>
<td>Feb-05</td>
<td>Dec-06</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1965/1966</td>
<td>Apr-83</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Feb-83</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>*IR 1-99</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Feb-87</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Oct-95</td>
<td>Apr-96</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>Mar-07</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
<td>Dec-80</td>
<td>Apr-82</td>
<td>Apr-88</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>May-96</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/2007</td>
<td>Apr-86</td>
<td>Dec-87</td>
<td>Feb-91</td>
<td>Jun-92</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Nov-01</td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
<td>Apr-84</td>
<td>May-85</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jun-91</td>
<td>Nov-98</td>
<td>Nov-99</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Fall -82</td>
<td>May-89</td>
<td>Dec-90</td>
<td>*IR 11-97</td>
<td>Mar-99</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>Nov-85</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Dec-91</td>
<td>Nov-92</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>May-85</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Feb-10</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/1966</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>May-03</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>Nov-86</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-82</td>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Oct-01</td>
<td>May-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-81</td>
<td>Nov-82</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Jun-90</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jun-96</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Mar-89</td>
<td>Feb-97</td>
<td>Apr-98</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Mar-82</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Feb-97</td>
<td>Apr-98</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-80</td>
<td>Jun-82</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>May-95</td>
<td>Jan-96</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>May-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Apr-93</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; Bioinformatics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jan-03</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>*IR 3-99</td>
<td>Feb-00</td>
<td>Moratorium 11/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>Nov-09</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>May-81</td>
<td>Feb-83</td>
<td>Mar-88</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jan-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Feb-82</td>
<td>Dec-82</td>
<td>Jan-88</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>*IR 6-02</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>Jan-10</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>*IR 3-98</td>
<td>May-99</td>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1981/1994</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Apr-92</td>
<td>May-93</td>
<td>*IR 5-01</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Apr-92</td>
<td>May-93</td>
<td>*IR 3-98</td>
<td>May-99</td>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td></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>May-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
Proposal to Transfer Review of Graduate Courses out of Graduate Council  
Draft - May 17, 2010

Summary

Graduate course proposals and modifications are prepared by the graduate programs and sent to the Courses subcommittee of Graduate Council (GC). After final approval by the whole GC, courses are then sent to the Committee on Courses. Because the vast majority of these are routine approvals, and the Courses & Programs subcommittee is often unable to render informed opinions on course content as not all departments are represented by the GC, there is almost no “value added” by GC review as few if any relate to graduate policy issues. Rather, the GC review is redundant with what Committee on Courses, who is a similarly composed committee, does afterwards. A review procedure for graduate courses that went through the appropriate Executive Councils, and then to the Committee on Courses, would be a more effective structure and leave the GC able to focus on its primary functions.

Background

Current course review procedure. A faculty member prepares a course proposal. Individual programs or departments approve proposal and it is forwarded to GC via the Graduate Division. GC members can view and comment on proposals on UCR’s online Course Request & Maintenance System (CRAMS). The Courses & Programs subcommittee of GC (currently consisting of 4 members) holds a meeting also attended by the two Associate Deans of Graduate Division and the GC Coordinator to discuss the proposals (typically once per month). A summary of all the course proposals is prepared by the GC Coordinator and distributed to GC members prior to the next meeting. At the GC meeting the Courses subcommittee chair presents the course proposals that the subcommittee recommends for approval and the council votes. Approved courses move on to the Committee on Courses, while rejected courses are sent back to the proponents. The meeting dates for the GC are constrained to coincide with those for the Committee on Courses.

The Courses subcommittee of GC cannot provide consistent in-depth review. Because of the large number of graduate programs and the small size of the Courses subcommittee of GC, it is difficult to render informed opinions on the suitability of a proposed course to a particular program (e.g. its depth or content), and on possible overlap with existing courses in related programs. This might occur if one of the subcommittee members or Associate Dean has knowledge, but this typically does not happen. As a result, the main input of GC for most courses has been to confirm completeness of the proposal and units for workload. The type of useful input into the course proposals that should occur does not take place.

Proposed changes

Moving graduate course proposal review to the Executive Committees. We are endorsing a proposal to move routine review of graduate courses out of Graduate Council. Undergraduate courses already go through the Executive Committees (ECs) for approval before being sent to Committee on Courses. For course proposals that are part of inter-departmental graduate programs, multiple ECs would approve the proposals as necessary.
After the ECs have approved courses, they would go on to the Committee on Courses. If there was a need to consult with the GC (for example, if a course proposal needed an exception to policy) the course proposal would be sent to GC for discussion. This scenario would be anticipated for a very small percentage of all courses.

In addition to tasking the ECs with grad course review, for the purposes of maintaining communication between the Committee on Courses and the GC, one member of GC or Committee on Courses could sit as a nonvoting (e.g. *ex officio*) member on the other committee.

**Rationale.** Some ECs review/comment on graduate course proposals informally already although they do not post comments in CRAMS. Because the workload for course review would be distributed among the various ECs, the anticipated increase in workload would not be that great. There would be added value in EC review of proposals because they would be more familiar with the course content and its suitability for their graduate programs, plus they could also relate proposed courses to other similar courses (both graduate and undergraduate).

**What would be required**

The Academic Senate Secretary-Parliamentarian (Dan Ozer) has informed us that this process would require the following:

“[This] would require amendment of at least two Divisional bylaws. First, graduate course approval is routed through Grad. Council by Divisional bylaw 8.14.2.14, which is one item in a list of charges to GC:

‘Recommend and supervise all graduate courses of instruction in the Division. In discharging this responsibility, the Graduate Council presents its recommendations on courses to the Committee on Courses.’

This bylaw would need to be removed. Then the Committee on Courses enabling bylaw would need to be amended. Currently, 8.10.2 states:

‘Subject to the provision of 8.10.3, the Committee has authority for final approval of all courses of the Riverside Division, except those courses in University Extension above the 200 series, giving due consideration to the findings of the Graduate Council, the Committee on University Extension, Executive Committees of the colleges and schools, and officers at Riverside. The committee will report its actions to the next regular meeting of the Division.’

An amendment to remove reference to ‘Graduate Council’ would be required. I do not think that the bylaws/regulations of the individual college executive committees would need to be altered, but this would be their call. Also, I would guess that the Division would want some assurance the Exec. Committees of the schools/colleges were on board with the change. I do not believe this change is problematic with respect to systemwide bylaws pertaining to Graduate Councils, but I have not studied the matter closely, and this is for Rules & Jurisdiction to determine as part of its review.
So, to make this happen, one would need a draft change in at least two bylaws for review and comment by: GC, Committee on Courses, all school/college Executive Committees, and Rules and Jurisdictions. A 2/3 approval at a Division meeting would then be required to pass the amendments.”

As well, the CRAMS portal would need to be modified to allow comments from ECs.

**Additional information**

**Other review structures.** Other options were considered, including having Committee on Courses proceed directly with reviews and routing queries to the GC as needed; and having only new courses come to the GC Courses & Programs Subcommittee (not deletions/changes). In both of these scenarios, the Subcommittee would also be allowed to approve courses without presenting them to full council. However, while these options save some time, they do not produce the benefit to the process that is needed.

**Other UCs.** While the Senate structures differ at the various UCs, the degree to which Divisional Graduate Councils participate in graduate course reviews is highly varied. A summary of results from an informal poll of CCGA representatives (taken April, 2010) is presented below. (Not all reps responded.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>campus</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>Proposals go through an intense review by administrative staff, then final approval is up to the Grad Council chair. I routinely approve—if everything is shipshape, I'm not in the business of telling departments what they should be teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>We delegate authority for approving graduate courses to the UCLA graduate division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>UCSC GC assigns a small subcommittee of two GC members that work with the registrar to approve graduate course proposals. Sometimes the GC chair approves graduate course proposals (if it is a rush). Course proposals are not considered at the GC meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCM</td>
<td>Our &quot;Grad and Research Council&quot; (combined cause UCM is small) reviews and approves grad curriculum. A subcommittee that makes recommendations to the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>The Irvine GC has a two-member Course Action Form Subcommittee. Typically, the GC analyst reviews and logs in the forms coming to the Council and sends the STEM forms to the science member to review and approve and the Social Sci/Arts/Hum forms to the other member for similar actions. We do this through campus mail. Rarely does any such request come up for discussion at a GC meeting, none so far this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>Our GC has delegated course approvals to a courses subcommittee. GC does not review any course submissions, although the subcommittee could choose to bring a specific submission to GC. After the courses subcommittee approves a submission it is forwarded to the divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI). (There is no presentation of the courses in a Grad Council meeting.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ken Barrish
Chair of Courses Subcommittee of Graduate Council

Morris Maduro
Chair, Graduate Council
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INTRODUCTION

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

Senate Regulations pertaining to the Graduate Council

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

STRUCTURE

A. Composition

The Council is composed of at least 15 members, including the Dean of the Graduate Division. The Council has three officers, a CCGA Representative, and four subcommittee chairs. The officers are Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. One member, who may also hold one of the other positions, serves as the Divisional representative to the University Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). There are four standing subcommittees: Review A (covering CHASS, Management, and Education), Review B (covering CNAS, the Biomedical Division, and Engineering), Courses and Programs, and Fellowship.

There is also an Administrative Committee composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, Chairs of the four subcommittees, and the Graduate Division Dean and Associate Deans, ex officio.

B. Roles

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

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

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

The subcommittee chairs are also appointed by the Chair.

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

The Council normally meets once a month. Meetings are scheduled with consideration of the Academic Senate meeting schedule to prepare business for submission to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Council on which the Chair serves, also meets twice a month.

The Courses and Programs subcommittee also meets monthly, a week or so before the Council meeting, to prepare business for presentation to the full Council. The Review subcommittees meet as needed, determined by the schedule of reviews. The Fellowship Committee meets once during Fall & Winter, and twice in Spring. The Administrative Committee meets whenever business needs to be done and the full Council cannot meet, normally in the summer and over holidays, particularly Christmas-New Year's. The CCGA meets monthly. Some of this might change based on our discussions last week.
The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is the systemwide equivalent of the campus Graduate Council. Each campus has a representative to CCGA. The Committee on Committees appoints the Riverside Division Representative to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs from among the Graduate Council members. This representative serves a two-year term and participates in the activities of the CCGA during that time period. He/She reports on CCGA activities to the Graduate Council each month and leads discussions on topics of interest to it. A handbook on the activities of the CCGA is available from the UCOP for each member. The membership and activities of CCGA are summarized below:

A. Duties

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

B. Meeting Schedule and Travel

CCGA meetings are held 9-11 times during the year on the first Tuesday of each month and are held at UCOP. Sarah Miller in the Academic Senate Office makes travel arrangements for the Riverside Division representative.

C. Participants

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

Written materials are typically sent out in advance of a meeting. At the meeting matters are discussed, and revised. Subsequent revisions may be made via e-mail or fax and re-discussed at a subsequent meeting. Voting is done as needed and reports are revised and final drafts are communicated. There are seven types of business carried out by the committee:

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

Reviews of graduate programs are conducted by the Graduate Council, usually with the aid of extramural review teams. The process has the approval of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. There are two Review subcommittees. Review Subcommittee A is responsible for programs in the College of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences, the Graduate School of Management, and the Graduate School of Education. Review Subcommittee B is responsible for programs in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, the Division of Biomedical Sciences, and the College of Engineering.

The primary aim of the review process is to help improve graduate programs or, if necessary, to close programs found to be undesirably weak.

**A. Duties**

Each graduate program on the campus is reviewed on a regular 7-9 year cycle. New programs are provided an internal review in the third or fourth year of operation. The Council also may conduct internal follow-up reviews in mid-cycle, if it feels it is necessary.

The Council determines the sequence and schedule of reviews. The program is notified of a proposed review at least six months and preferably a year in advance. The program submits required data to the Graduate Council. Questionnaires are sent to program faculty, current students, and graduates at least two months before the review. The Graduate Council and Computing Center compile the results of the questionnaires.

A normal review involves the use of a three-person team of outside reviewers. The subcommittee, in consultation with the program under review, assembles the review team and schedules the review. The Graduate Council assists in handling the details of team members’ travel and schedule. The members of the Review Subcommittee are responsible for studying the program materials (program statistics, faculty and student questionnaire responses) and meeting with the review team at the beginning and end of the campus visit. After receiving the team’s report, the subcommittee meets to develop Findings and Recommendations, which are then drafted by the Graduate Council member in charge (typically the Chair). After approval by the subcommittee, the Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the Council for consideration and approval.

Some interim and special reviews are conducted internally. In these cases the subcommittee itself conducts a streamlined version of the business normally done by the extramural review team. In most cases only the Chair and Graduate Advisor are interviewed, rather than all faculty and many students.

**B. Schedule**

The Review Subcommittees meet on an as-needed basis. Each Review Subcommittee normally conducts six to eight reviews per year. The sequence of upcoming reviews is discussed at least annually and can be altered by action of the
Council. Normally, six to eight programs are scheduled for review each year. This pattern typically yields a 7-9 year cycle between reviews.

C. Principles and Process

The process of reviewing graduate programs at the University of California, Riverside is conducted by the Graduate Council, a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Through the review process, the Council gathers information from a variety of sources, including information provided by the graduate program, the Council's own assessments, and the assessments of an extramural review team. After considering all of this information, and corresponding with the program, the Council issues its Findings and Recommendations, which is the only document which contains items for action by the program.

1. The Review Process

A detailed articulation of the procedures involved is found in the document Graduate Program Review Procedures, available from the Academic Senate website. The Graduate Program review consists (in its entirety) of:

Collection of information from the program under review
Graduate Council evaluation of this and related information
Usually, an evaluation of the program by an extramural review team and its report
Synthesis of this information into the Graduate Council's Findings and Recommendations to the program under review.

The steps involved in the review process are as follows.

1. In Winter Qtr, the Graduate Council should identify 6 programs to be reviewed the following year. New programs should have an internal review at about 4 years. All other programs should be reviewed in a 7-9 year cycle, if possible.

2. Sue Stracener (Academic Senate staff support) then notifies these programs (chair or director, graduate advisors) that they are scheduled to undergo a review the following academic year. As part of the notification, the programs are asked to provide by a certain date a list of potential reviewers with contact information. The program should compile the list with input from all participating faculty members to ensure there are no conflicts of interest. The list should contain multiple UC and non-UC faculty to ensure that a team with at least one UC and one non-UC faculty can be put together. If a program has multiple sub-disciplines that it wishes to have represented on its team, it should provide a list for each sub-discipline.

3. When the list of potential reviewers is received, the Graduate Council member in charge should vet the list with chairs of similar departments at other UCs [see sample letter to chairs]. If there are insufficient numbers of similar UC departments to appropriately vet the list, then chairs of similar departments at non-UCs can be asked. Additional reviewers may be suggested by these chairs.
but these names must be sent to the department/program for approval before any of them can be considered for membership on the team.

4. Graduate Council member in charge should rank the reviewers in each of the disciplinary areas based on the comments received from vetting the list, then the Graduate Council subcommittee should decide on an order to invite. At least one reviewer must be from a UC and at least one must be from outside UC.

5. The Graduate Council member in charge should extend invitations to 3 reviewers [see sample letter to reviewer]. To the extent possible, invitations should be made during spring qtr and early summer to ensure that times for all 6 reviews can be scheduled for the following year. If invitations are declined, work down the list ensuring appropriate representation on the team across disciplines and from within/outside UC.

6. Once three reviewers have agreed to serve, Sue Stracener (Academic Senate staff support) then asks the program to provide dates when a review should not be scheduled, such as when a number of faculty might be away at meetings. The Graduate Council member in charge should then select a number of possible dates and ask the reviewers to identify those dates that are not feasible for them [see sample possible dates letter]. It is advisable to distribute reviews throughout the year. It is often necessary to be very persistent with the reviewers to find a common date.

7. Once a common date is found, the Graduate Council member in charge should confirm date with the three reviewers [see sample confirm dates letter] and introduce reviewers to each other [see sample introduce team letter].

8. Sue Stracener (Academic Senate staff support)
   a. Notifies the program of the identity of the reviewers and the date of the review.
   b. Notifies the program of the dates when specific materials will be required from them.
   c. Schedules the Dean of the appropriate college and the Dean of Graduate Division to meet with the review team (both the first morning and the exit interview).
   d. Makes reservations for the reviewers at the Mission Inn.
   e. Works with C&C to send out student and faculty questionnaires specific to that review about 2 months prior to review. [Important note: the cost to GC from C&C will be greatly reduced if questionnaires for all programs under review (both internal and external) during an academic year are set up with them at once. In order for this to be done, the DATES of all reviews, including the internal reviews, need to be set]. The program should have provided current contact information for its graduated students, and these students should be sent a questionnaire (specific for completed students) by mail.
   f. Contacts reviewers again to remind them about the upcoming review, reminds them to make travel arrangements and lets them know the notebooks will be coming about 1 month prior to review.
g. Collects data for the notebooks with goal to assemble them and send them to team 1 month prior to review. Various reminders may need to go out to the program for information.

h. Finalizes the detailed schedule, including ensuring that the program schedule faculty/students to meet the team, pick up and return team to airport/hotel/campus etc. Blocks of time should be designated for faculty/student interviews which are then filled-in by the program (i.e., staff does not schedule individual interviews).

i. Invites chairs of related programs, normally suggested by the program, to have lunch with the review team on the first day of review.

j. Plans for light breakfast (coffee/bagels etc) for day 1 of review. Plans for lunch for day 1 and for the team members to order their meals for day 2 on day 1.

k. Plans for providing guest wireless accounts, copies of any recently revised documents (e.g., schedule), and note taking materials for team members. Assists with parking arrangements on campus should team members seek to drive onto campus on day 2.

2. Purpose and Scope of Graduate Program Reviews

The Graduate Council uses the reviews to monitor the quality of graduate programs at UCR and to focus its attention on how programs may evolve in quality in their curriculum, course offerings, graduate instruction (including teaching and creative activities), and degree administration (including admissions, advising, etc.).

The primary scope of the Graduate Council’s concern is with academic matters, including but not limited to program structure, course offerings, program quality and competitiveness, adequacy of facilities and resources, and program administration.

3. Unity of the Review Process

No document generated during the review process, nor any part of the review process, should be considered independently, or considered outside the context of the entire review process.

In particular, the extramural team report, commissioned by the Graduate Council, is not intended for use outside the review process. This report is intended for use by the Graduate Council in formulating its Findings and Recommendations. The extramural team report may contain errors of fact, interpretation or omission which must be corrected during the review process before the preparation of the Findings and Recommendations. For this reason, the focus of the review process should be the conclusions and findings of the Graduate Council.

4. Matters for Action Resulting from the Review

During the review process, the Graduate Council may decide to require or recommend actions by the program. Matters requiring attention by the program, together with recommended actions, are communicated by the Graduate Council in its
Findings and Recommendations. The Council integrates its knowledge of the history and status of each program, together with the information and material generated by the program during the review process, into a cohesive plan of action (the Findings and Recommendations) for improvement of each program. This plan takes into consideration the material and interviews in the entire review process, together with the correspondence and dialogue with the program under review.

5. Confidentiality

The review is conducted by the Graduate Council on behalf of the Academic Senate. The review documents generated by the program, Council, and extramural review team are treated as confidential during the review process. This confidentiality extends to information copies of such documents which may be distributed by the Council to members of the program under review, the Academic Senate, and the campus administration. These documents should not be used, discussed or distributed except for the purpose of accomplishing the Graduate Program Review by Graduate Council.

The review process is not complete until it has concluded with Step 8 above, by formal memorandum from the Chair of the Graduate Council. After closure of the review process, copies of documents generated during the review, including the Council’s Findings and Recommendations, are placed on file in the Academic Senate office.

One exception to this confidentiality is recognized. If a program wishes to distribute confidential documents generated during the review process, either prior to the closure of the review process or at any other time, it may request permission to do so from the Graduate Council. The Council, upon consultation with the Graduate Division, may grant or withhold permission for such exceptional distribution on a case-by-case basis.

6. Limitations of the Graduate Review Process

The review of a graduate program is not a review of the home department of a departmental or interdepartmental graduate program. Academic departments have resources, strengths, and responsibilities that may lie outside the scope of a graduate program and hence outside the scope of a graduate program review.

D. Specific Procedures

1. Preparation for Council Review

The graduate program is notified approximately 6-12 months prior to the scheduled review. At the time of this notification the program is asked to prepare the following information regarding its program for submission to the Graduate Council and to outside reviewers (see attached formats):
1. A brief (approx. 2-5 pages) statement concerning the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council.

2. Program material distributed to graduate students (handbook, program description, procedures, statement, etc.).

3. A list of faculty members with digested biographies (abbreviated version of full biography).

4. Placement data for all Ph.D.s awarded since the last review, arranged by date of award of degree, listing dissertation director, first position and current position.

The Graduate Division gathers statistical information from sources around the campus. The Office of Institutional Planning provides:

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

The Graduate Division provides:

12. Admissions profiles, enrollment data, degrees awarded (and time to degree), dropout rate, and historical statistics including fraction of UCR undergraduates and international students admitted to each program.
13. Summary of financial support provided all graduate students for last two years.
14. A report on grant information for all faculty.
15. Catalogue copy of all graduate courses taught by the program.

Items 1-15 are sent to the program before dissemination to anyone else so that any differences concerning the statistics can be resolved.

A questionnaire dealing with academic program quality matters including space for written comments is sent to each faculty member. A separate questionnaire is sent to present graduate students and Ph.D. awardees since the last review (masters awardees in the case of a masters only program). Statistical summaries are provided where appropriate, and a compilation of all comments, copied verbatim, is included in the review materials.
2. Composition of Extramural Review Team

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

...15 names of distinguished potential extramural evaluators. Please include names from the following categories: 1) faculty from other UC campuses; 2) faculty from other institutions throughout the U.S. If you could arrange these names in groups which cover your program’s major areas and include their specialties, it would be helpful. Please indicate research areas that should be covered in the appointment of reviewers.… The Graduate Council Review Subcommittee asks that it be assured in writing that the proposed extramural reviewers can carry out an “arms-length” review in the sense that they are not closely allied to UCR members in the program under review. The Graduate Council Review Subcommittee is specifically concerned about the following indicators: (1) personal friendships; (2) visitor and UCR faculty member present in same graduate (or postdoctoral) program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or postdoctoral mentors; and (4) cooperative research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these four items apply to a proposed Reviewer, the individual should be eliminated or the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee should be informed of the facts of the relationship. This paragraph is inserted in all requests for nominations from programs under review; it is not pointed specifically at your program.

The Graduate Council obtains published biographies from standard sources, communicates with related programs elsewhere to ask about scholarly reputation and probable utility in the review process. Other names may arise from these queries; they are sent to the program for comment. The combined lists are examined by the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee, and (typically) a list of three names is selected by the subcommittee, along with a list of alternate names for each area of expertise selected. The Graduate Council typically contacts and assembles the review team and coordinates their travel arrangements. Team members receive travel expenses and an honorarium.

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

About thirty days ahead of the scheduled visit, the information above and a current catalog are sent to each member of the Extramural team (contents of package follow
below). An identical information package is provided the members of the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. The Program, College Dean, and Executive Vice Chancellor receive a copy of the package from which the questionnaire responses have been deleted for purposes of student/faculty confidentiality.

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

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

3. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

A typical team visit begins Monday morning with a briefing by the Graduate Council Chair and the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. The team then meets with the Graduate Dean. The briefing includes discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the program being reviewed and any particular areas of concern. The team then meets separately with the relevant College Dean. The reviewers are asked to provide an assessment of the quality of faculty, students, and the program; areas of strength and weaknesses; advice on areas to remove or strengthen; adequacy of facilities, morale, and any other issues they wish to address. They are asked to participate in an exit interview and to furnish a written report of 10-15 pages within 30 days of their visit.

Following the morning meetings, the Team meets to organize itself and select a chair, and then meets the program chair and graduate advisor, after which the Team begins to meet with faculty and students in the program. At noon the Team usually meets with chairs of closely related programs. These chairs are chosen by the Associate Dean in consultation with the Chair of the program being reviewed. After lunch, the team meets with faculty/students and examines the physical facilities. The second day of the visit continues with more interviews with faculty and students. The reviewers have a working lunch on this day. The last on-campus activity is the exit interview. At 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, the Team meets together with the College or School Dean, Graduate Dean, Associate Dean, Graduate Council Chair and Graduate Council Review Subcommittee to discuss their findings. In this meeting Team members usually present their findings, followed by free questioning by Graduate Council Review subcommittee members and members of the administration. Sometimes the whole session is devoted solely to question-and-answer. The Chair of the Graduate Council chairs this exit interview.
When the Team report is received, the honoraria are sent. The Team report is reviewed by the Graduate Council for matters of confidentiality, and the report (redacted if necessary) is sent to the Program with a three week response deadline for preliminary comment about factual inaccuracies and misperceptions.

4. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

The Graduate Council Review Subcommittee integrates its knowledge of the history and status of each program, together with the information and material generated by the program during the review process (including the extramural team report), to formulate a draft of the Findings and Recommendations -- a cohesive plan of action for improvement of the program. The writer of the first draft is usually the Graduate Council Subcommittee Chair or designate, with revisions or redrafting by the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. If the draft Findings and Recommendations appear to be seriously detrimental to the program under review, the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee usually meets with the Chair and/or graduate advisor of the program to discuss the matters in the preliminary document. On occasion, the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee has met with the College Dean and limited numbers of faculty members to discuss the Findings and Recommendations. Where the Findings and Recommendations appear to be non-controversial, the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee does not usually meet with program chairs or other representatives. When the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee has prepared a draft set of Findings and Recommendations that meets with its approval, the document is sent to the Graduate Council for its approval.

For its consideration of the draft Findings and Recommendations, the Council is provided with copies of the extramural team report and the program’s preliminary response to the extramural team report. Not usually sent to all individuals on the Council, but available to members upon request, are all other data available to the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee. If substantial problems are anticipated, arrangements are made to have all members of the Council become familiar with the entire data set. When a draft acceptable to the Council is achieved, it is sent to the program as a working document with a request for a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The Findings and Recommendations are a policy document, and failure to comply or to provide justification for noncompliance can lead to a moratorium on graduate admissions or other actions.

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

Copies of the unedited extramural team report, the program preliminary response, the Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations, and program final response are sent to the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, College or School Dean and
Academic Senate office. A brief summary of the programs reviewed and Graduate Council actions are included in the Graduate Council Annual Report to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The review of the master’s level programs follow the same format, but the Graduate Council Review Subcommittee may play the role of the extramural team at the option of the Council.

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

Each year the Graduate Council may query programs that have been reviewed recently to ensure compliance with Council requests.

COURSES & PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE

A. Duties

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

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

B. Schedule

The Courses and Programs Subcommittee meets monthly, in advance of the Council meeting, to prepare recommendations on courses and programs for the Council.

C. Business

1. Graduate Course Forms

One of the primary responsibilities of this subcommittee is to review graduate course forms (courses to be offered only once, new courses, deletions, changes and restorations). A copy of the General Rules and Policies Governing Courses of Instruction issued by the Academic Senate will be distributed to subcommittee members. Guidelines that pertain in particular to graduate course forms have been extracted from these guidelines.
Graduate course forms are routed (electronically) from the department to:
   Courses office
   Dean of the College (or Division)
   Graduate Council
   Committee on Courses

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

200-285 Lecture and Seminar courses
286-289 Interdisciplinary courses
290 Directed Studies (1-6 units)
291 Individual Study in coordinated areas
292 Concurrent Studies in department/program (1-4, repeatable for credit; concurrent enrollment by graduate student in undergraduate course, with credit for additional graduate level participation).
297 Directed Research (1-6 units)
298G Internship, Group (1-12, repeatable to 16 units)
298I Internship, Individual (1-12, repeatable to 16 units)
299 Research for the Thesis or Dissertation (1-12 units)
300-399 Professional Courses for teachers
301 “Teaching of __________ at the College Level” or “Directed Studies in the Teaching of __________” (to be graded S/NC. Units most accurately reflect hours of training.)
302 “Apprentice Teaching” or “Teaching Practicum,” variable (1-4 units). Open to TAs with units assigned to accurately reflect individual teaching activity time during the applicable quarter. To be graded S/NC.
398G Internship, Group (1-12, repeatable to 16).
398I Internship, Individual (1-12, repeatable to 16)
400-499 Other Professional courses.

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

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

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

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

2. Graduate Program Changes

Any change to a graduate program should be submitted to the Graduate Council for review and approval. We request that departments/programs submit the change in “catalog copy style” which lists the current requirement on the left side of the page, and the proposed changes on the right side of the page. We also request that a memo be attached to the copy that briefly describes the requested change as well as the justification for the change. It is the subcommittee’s responsibility to review the requested change to insure that the change is appropriate.

3. New Program Proposals

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

Development of the Preliminary Proposal

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

The proposing faculty are advised to meet early on with the Associate Graduate Dean and Council Chair and to consult the current guidelines dictated by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) as well as any other pertinent information which will help the faculty in drafting this document. The proposal must be prepared according to the CCGA guidelines and format. In addition, the final proposal should also include the proposing faculty’s responses to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) questionnaire (found in Appendix D of CCGA guidelines).
During the preparation of this proposal, various drafts of the document should be reviewed with the College Dean or his/her designee, and if desired, with the Graduate Dean and/or Associate Graduate Dean. These consultation sessions should provide constructive criticism and advice that would make the proposal more likely to garner campus approval after official submission.

**Development of the “Final” Proposal**

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

The College Dean - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement endorsing the proposal and committing appropriate resources to ensure the success of this proposal once approved and initiated

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

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

**(optional step)** The Graduate Council Courses and Programs Subcommittee - who will provide their initial review and comments concerning the proposal [Note: the comments of this subcommittee should be considered as advisory only and should not be appended in any way to the proposal; the proposing faculty may or may not elect to incorporate the subcommittee recommendations into the final draft of the proposal].

**Submission of the Proposal to the Campus for Review**

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

**Suggested Timelines for New Program Review**

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

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

Campus approval process = after approval by the Graduate Council, the proposal is forwarded to Planning and Budget Committee, Committee on Educational Policy, and the Library Committee for review at its next quarterly meeting (if the proposal reaches the Senate in time for the Call – if not, it must await another academic quarter before being voted on).

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

4. Proposals for New Centers

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

A. Duties

The Fellowship Subcommittee is responsible for allocating Dissertation Research Grants and Masters Thesis Research Grants. The committee allocates a limited pool of funds on a competitive basis. One goal of the program is to promote and reward effective proposal writing.

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

B. Schedule

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

C. Business

Committee members are primarily responsible for evaluating proposals from students in their college/school and related colleges/schools. Normally, members rate the proposals, first individually, on a 1-5 scale as follows:

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

4 Very Good: recommend full or partial funding

3 Good: wait for full discussion

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

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

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

1. Dissertation Research Grants

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Research grants are not for stipends nor for the actual preparation of thesis copy such as typing, charts or photos.
Budgets that exceed $1,000 will not be considered. Funds are available during a specified award period. Extensions of grant periods should be requested in writing. Awards terminate upon leaves of absence or filing fee status. Expenditure reports are due two weeks after the termination of award period.

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


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

Deadlines are quarterly, on the first working day after the third week of classes. Applicants will be notified in writing about their competition results.

Only registered graduate students enrolled in Anthropology (M.S. degree), Art History, Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts, Experimental Choreography, and Visual Art may receive and utilize grants.

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

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

Permanent equipment is rarely funded.

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

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

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

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

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

3. Diversity Awards (forthcoming)

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

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

The Graduate Division is currently organized as follows:

Administration
Academic Preparation and Outreach
Admissions
Graduate Academic Affairs
Financial Support
Teaching Assistant Development Program

Administration

Dean: Joseph W. Childers

Head of the Graduate Division. Provides leadership in promoting graduate education at UCR. Responsible for seeing that Graduate Council policies are implemented. Oversees all of the functions of the Division described below. Represents the Graduate Division on campus, system-wide, and national committees. Appoints Graduate Advisors. Has final approval on graduate admissions. Works with colleges and schools to construct Fellowship and financial aid packages for new graduate students.

Associate Dean: Ken Baerenklau

Liaison with Colleges/Schools for all matters related to graduate student education. Responsible for Academic Student Employees collective bargaining issues and the TA Development Program. Advises program staff on contract compliance. Holds workshops for all graduate programs on Academic Student Employee labor relations practices. Provides support for program reviews and Fellowship subcommittee.

Associate Dean: Leah Haimo

Liaison with all Colleges/Schools for all matters related to graduate recruitment and outreach activities. Provides support for program reviews and Courses and Programs subcommittee. Advises Dean and program Staff on graduate admissions and financial aid packages for new graduate students.

Assistant Dean, Budget Control: Bette Quinn
Chief staff officer. Manages staff employment, payroll, and all other accounting functions. Manages graduate student financial aid.
Graduate Student Cohort Funding: Yung Phung.
Monitors cohort funding for the various colleges and schools.

Graduate Council Coordinator: Sue Stracener
Manages administrative matters for the Graduate Council, including program reviews, new graduate program proposals, graduate program changes, catalog copy, and course proposals. Prepares minutes of Council meetings for the Secretary of the Council.

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

Admissions: Victoria Long, Director; Patti Fagan, Kim Bryson, Elisa Gutierrez, Assistants
Receives and processes applications, enters applicant data into SIS and Graduate Division data bases, and monitors implementation of admissions criteria. Assists the Graduate Dean and College Deans in constructing competitive financial support packages for admitted students. Develops statistical reports on applicants and admits. Provides training and support for department/program staff. Monitors state, national, and international educational policy changes that impact graduate admissions.

Graduate Academic Affairs: Linda Scott, Director; Kara Oswood, Karen Smith, Assistants
Oversees adherence to Graduate Council and Senate regulations concerning employment, academic matters, fellowships, and graduation. Monitors progress of enrolled students: degree requirements, dissertation and qualifying exam committees, advancement to candidacy and awarding of degrees, filing fee requests, transfer units, and dissertation format requirements. Processes student petitions. Monitors student employment and fellowships for enrolled students. Oversees graduate student discipline and dismissal for both academic and non-academic reasons. Provides workshops on thesis preparation and handles the filing of dissertations. Conducts training for Graduate Advisors and program assistants. Produces written support documents such as the Graduate Division Calendar, the Graduate Student Handbook, the Graduate Adviser’s Manual, and the Student Employment Handbook. Provides statistical information and surveys concerning graduate students and post docs to programs, the campus, the Office of the President, system-wide committees, and outside agencies.
Financial Awards Processing

Processes all graduate student awards that are non-payroll, including fellowships, grants, department block fellowship awards, Partial Fee Remission (PFR), Graduate Student Health Insurance Program (GSHIP), Non-Resident Tuition Remission (NRTR), Dissertation and Masters Thesis Research Grants, and Humanities Graduate Student Research Grants. Maintains resource materials on extramural funds for graduate students. Audits and reconciles graduate student financial aid accounts.

Teaching Assistant Development Program:  Kim Palmore, Coordinator

Responsible for campus TA training program. Administers quarterly evaluations of TAs.
APPENDIX 1

Academic Senate By-Laws Relating to the Graduate Council

Chapter 8. Committees of the Division

8.14 GRADUATE COUNCIL

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.14.2.5 Admit qualified students to candidacy for graduate degrees;

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

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

8.14.2.8 Supervise the conduct of public and other examinations for higher degrees;
8.14.2.9 Make final report to the Division on the conferring of graduate degrees;

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

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

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

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

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

8.14.2.15 Set policy and standards for appointment of postdoctoral scholars or their academic equivalent and for their enrollment by the Graduate Division.(Am 21 Nov 06)
APPENDIX 2

NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

New Graduate Program Proposal Review Process

Development of the Preliminary Proposal

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

The proposing faculty are advised to meet early on with the Graduate Dean and Associate Graduate Dean to acquire a copy of the current guidelines dictated by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) as well as any other pertinent information which will help the faculty in drafting this document. The proposal must be prepared according to the CCGA guidelines and format. In addition, the final proposal should also include the proposing faculty’s responses to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) questionnaire (found in Appendix D of CCGA guidelines).

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

Development of the “Final” Proposal

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

- The College Dean - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement endorsing the proposal and committing appropriate resources to ensure the success of this proposal once approved and initiated
- The College Executive Committee - who should render their review and endorsement of this proposal before being submitted to the campus for formal review
• Related Campus Department Chairs - who should review the proposal and prepare a written statement concerning the proposal and delineating whether this new program positively or negatively impacts on his/her own programs and what level of interaction between the 2 programs are likely to occur

• (optional step) The Graduate Council Courses and Programs Subcommittee - who will provide their initial review and comments concerning the proposal [note the comments of this subcommittee should be considered as advisory only and should not be appended in any way to the proposal; the proposing faculty may or may not elect to incorporate the subcommittee recommendations into the final draft of the proposal]

Submission of the Proposal to the Campus for Review

Once these additional documents are secured and added to the proposal, and any modifications to the proposal suggested by these individuals/groups completed, the final proposal should be bound and photocopied and 50 copies forwarded to the Graduate Division to initiate the formal review process. The attached flowsheet demonstrates the progression of the proposal through the campus and off-campus administrative channels.

Suggested Timelines for New Program Review

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

Approved by Graduate Council on 12/08/00
September 29, 2010

TO: DAVID PARKER, CNAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
DAVID HERZBERGER, CHASS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
JAY FARRELL, BCOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
ERIK ROLLAND, AGSM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MELANIE SPERLING, GSOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
DANIEL STRAUS, BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL  
JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR, CEP  
CHAIR, RULES AND JURISDICTION

FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

Attached for your review are proposed changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division – R.1- Grading system.

Please discuss with your committee and let me have your response by Friday October 25, 2010.

Enclosure
To Be Adopted

Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.1.1 The grade GD (Grade Delay) shall be entered on the student’s record: a) when administratively the faculty member is not able to assign a grade or b) when disciplinary proceedings are in progress. The GD shall not itself be calculated in any way in the student's grade-point average. The GD shall be changed to a grade, or perhaps to an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor which indicates that the student has clarified the situation. Once an instructor has decided to proceed with disciplinary proceedings, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the student. If the course concludes before the charge has been resolved, the instructor will assign a grade GD and indicate as a note that this GD is for a &quot;Pending Charge of Academic Integrity”. (En Nov-2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.5.1 A student who has been referred for a pending academic integrity violation may not drop or withdraw the course to escape the consequences of the misconduct. If a student drops or withdraws the course prior to the resolution of the case brought to Student Conduct, they will be re-enrolled in the course. Students are encouraged to attend and engage fully in the course during the academic integrity review. (En Nov-2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:** The purpose of this proposal is to suggest for consideration two additions to the UCR Grading Policies, so that the grade policies are in line with current practices and policies on campus. 1) The grade GD currently is utilized administratively and during academic integrity reviews; however, the GD grade is not defined as an official grade in the UCR Grading Policy and 2) The Committee on Educational Policy requested and approved in 2005 the Academic Integrity at the
University of California, Riverside policy which includes language that a student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. This policy and the Grade Policy for withdrawal do not appropriately match and therefore, the proposal requests the addition of a regulation to address withdrawals in the case of academic integrity.

Approvals:

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: Date
Approved by the Faculty of CHASS: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: Date
Approved by the Faculty of CNAS: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of BCOE: Date
Approved by the Faculty of BCOE: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Date
Approved by the Faculty of AGSM: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: Date
Approved by the Faculty of GSOE: Date
Approved by Graduate Council: Date
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: Date
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: Date
Endorsed by the Executive Council: Date