1. Approval of Minutes of October 14, 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  
   (There were no courses to review)  

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee  
   a. Status Report  
   b. Mathematics – Final Response (Pages redacted due to confidentiality)  

5. Old Business  

6. New Business  
   a. Discussion - Designated Emphasis  
   b. Guidelines for University Oral Exams for Advancement to Candidacy  
   c. Conflict of Interest Policy for Composition of Oral Qualifying Exam Committees and Supervisory Committees  
   d. Discussion – Cross-Registration with Loma Linda University
Present:

M. Maduro, Chair
G. Gonzalez-Rivera
J. Arey
K. Barish
M. El Hafsi
I. Ethell
P.E. Green
Y. Hua
A. Jaworska
J.N. Medearis
N.V. Myung
C. Nugent
M. Vanderwood
D. Wong
S. Xu
J. W. Childers, ex officio.

Rachelle Cassel (Graduate Student Representative)
Jennifer Wright (Graduate Student Representative)

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2010 were approved as written. Chair Maduro asked the committee if anyone would be interested in serving as the Secretary for the Council. Professor Janet Arey agreed to act as Secretary.

2. Announcements

a. Chair of the Graduate Council

One of the items which came up at the last meeting was about developing policies for online courses. Since this is new to our campus it was the general consensus that we need to adopt some kind of standard practices. Chair Maduro spoke with Jose Wudka, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy, and they are looking at the same issue at the undergraduate level. He will be attending some of the CEP meetings since there will be overlap.
Dean Cardullo, Divisional Dean of the Life Sciences, would like to consolidate resources to have a unified graduate program seminar series. This could produce a change in requirements.

b. CCGA Representative

The committee met last Tuesday, October 5, 2010. The CCGA committee has the benefit of interacting with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. The big topic of discussion is Post Employment Benefits.

Another topic was the set of downsizing resolutions that came out of documents circulated through the divisions that came from UCOP. Until we secure funding from the state, the University should be in a downsizing mode through attrition. For the first time in a long time, the number of ladder rank faculty in the UC system decreased by 1% and number of lecturers rose by 3%.

CCGA has been hearing antidotal reports of money committed to new graduate programs that resulted in money being taken away from other graduate programs or a lack of fulfillment of money promised to new graduate programs that were recently approved at system wide. CCGA is now going to start asking, in the program proposals, that there be a very clear and specific statement about financial commitment to proposed graduate programs from the administrators. When we put program proposals forward, we should be looking for this kind of statement.

Hillary Baxter (Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination) talked about the WASC accreditation process for graduate programs and it seems they are backing down a little from some of the things they were initially asking graduate program proposals and graduate programs to be providing. They are working with WASC to focus primarily on educational outcomes. There has been frustration in the review process because of the length of time it takes new program proposals to go through. They are planning on setting up an electronic tracking site for seeing where proposals are in the review process. Approval of professional degree fees should not occur before the program has been approved. CCGA will be looking at and opining on documents that will establish policies for self-supporting programs.

In light of the NRC rankings, we need to do a better job in tracking our students after they have finished their degrees.

c. Graduate Student Council Representative

There were no announcements by the Graduate Student Representatives. They are currently in the process of setting up the academic officers in colleges and schools.
d. Dean of the Graduate Division

(1) Dean Childers reported that the NRC was made public on the 28th of September and released to the campuses on the 20th. The data collection stopped in 2005-2006. Some of the data is cumulative and some is snapshot, overall we did quite well. The NRC provided ranges. There are two overall ranges and three important dimensions. There are 20 different variables in determining the overall and then there are specific variables from those 20 that went into determining the ranges for the dimensions. The two overall ranges are called R and S. The R range which stands for regression was established by having people in particular fields rank programs in order. The S range which stands for survey is based on the ranking qualities that faculty felt were ideal in good programs and then ordering them in terms of weights. We did better on the “S” than the “R”. Most programs around the country chose to publish their “R” ranges. We decided to give the confidence range rather than to try to find a mid point. We took the confidence range, which is 90%. That means the top percentile would be the 5th and the bottom would be the 95th. Within that range, 90% of those responses would fall.

We showed the ranges and did it several ways. We showed it against all programs that were evaluated in a particular field. Then we looked at how programs did according to their ranges in terms of percentiles. Campus wide we had 14 programs out of the 27 evaluated in the top 33%. Eight of those were in the top quartile, 4 of those were evaluated for the first time and were in Engineering. Engineering did extraordinarily well.

Compared to the other UCs we found that we were very competitive. We also compared programs to our AAU comparison 11. 17 of our 27 programs are at the 50th percentile or higher.

This data is available at the EVC website. As a Graduate Council, how do we use this data? We need to be thinking about those programs that did not do well. It is clear that strategic investment has paid off for Engineering. Dean Childers will forward a copy of his report to the Council.

(2) SACNAS - The annual convention was held in Anaheim at the end of September first part of October and UCR was a platinum sponsor. There were dozens of faculty, staff and students that helped. The Chancellor spoke to the entire gathering. There were 5,000 students in attendance. 200 students were brought back to campus and they visited facilities, talked with students and faculty. The students who came to campus got their application fees waived. UCR will not be a platinum sponsor next year. The cost was $100,000. The Deans of the Colleges and the Chancellor pitched in some money so the cost to the Graduate Division was about $60,000. It was very successful.

(3) Recruitment and Enrollment – (Final Enrollment Fall 2006-Fall 2009) AGSM is down about 25% this year. AGSM students pay professional fees which are quite high and a sur fee which is $500. CHASS is down 30% from last year which is about 70 students. CNAS is up 11% and COE is up 24%. COE
increased their domestic PhD yield by 110%. Chemical Environmental Engineering flipped from being 2/3 international to being 1/3 international. We are losing faculty and they are not being replaced. We have grown in terms of our student size but we have not grown concomitantly in terms of our faculty size.

(4) Budget – Dean Childers will be asking for more money for graduate students and if he gets it he will pass it through to the programs. He will also ask for an increase in our target for this year. Last year our target was 602 and will go to 620 this year. There are some new programs on campus. There is a new PhD program in AGSM, and GSOE wants to grow its PhD program.

The Medical School was funded by redirected dollars, $10 M. The cost to us could be $700,000.

Grad SIS is rolling out completely this year. Typically we begin to get files in December, January and peak by February. Last year we received all the files in February and couldn’t turn them around as quickly as we wanted to. This year we will be asking programs when they can send the bulk of their files which will make this process flow smoother.

3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee

a. Courses

The following courses were approved:

BCH 212 [Change] -- approved
GEO 201A [new] -- approved
GEO 201B [new] -- approved

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee

a. Status Report

The status report was received. Working on commitments from Religious Studies and Southeast Asian Studies for internal review dates.

b. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology: Draft findings.

Review Subcommittee B met last week and discussed the first draft of the Findings and Recommendations that Associate Dean Leah Haimo had prepared last year. The Subcommittee made some modifications to the draft. The Council voted to approve the modified draft Findings and Recommendations and forward onto the program.
5. Old Business

a. Change in Review Policy for Courses (tabled from last meeting)

   Last year the Council began the consideration of moving the approval of graduate courses out of the Graduate Council. The Council isn’t big enough to have expertise in some programs and it would be better served to have the Executive Committees take the role they have for undergraduate courses and to look at the graduate courses. If there are any questions, we could have a member of the Courses and Programs Subcommittee sit as ex officio on an Executive Committee Subcommittee. The courses would then go from the Executive Committee to Committee on Courses. Many of the courses are routine, course number changes, checking units, etc. The initial idea for the Executive Committees to review the courses came from discussions during the Reorganization proposal. The Chairs of the Executive Committees are in favor of this. Chair Maduro asked for approval from the Council to go forward with this. It would then go before various Senate committees and the Executive Council. We would have to change our bylaws as well as the divisional bylaws and the CRAMS portal would also have to be changed. A motion was made to move ahead with plans to remove regular course proposals out of the function of Graduate Council and subcommittees. Chair Maduro will draft a document that would reflect all of the Council’s arguments. Motion passed.

b. Neuroscience Graduate Program Internal Review

   The Subcommittee met and discussed whether there should be a full review or just meet with the leadership. There are very few statistics and return of student questionnaires. It was decided that there would be a full internal review scheduled for spring.

6. NEW BUSINESS

a. Changes in Graduate Council Procedures (tabled from last meeting)

Chair Maduro met with Dean Childers regarding procedures for new programs and program changes and it was agreed that the Council needs input from the Division. A program proposal would be forwarded to the Graduate Division first for procedural issues before coming to the Subcommittee. The new programs and program changes would also be vetted by the Graduate Dean and the Associate Deans. It should be made clear to programs that the proposals should come to the Graduate Division as a consultant. It would then be sent back to the program with a copy to the Council with items they have to address. The program can decide to return to the Division or directly onto the Council. The Council can invite the Dean or designates to attend a meeting to discuss issues if there is a difficult program.
b. Graduate Council Handbook (tabled from last meeting)

The revised handbook was distributed to the committee. The handbook will be posted on the Academic Senate website.

c. Proposed Changes to Regulation R.1 – Grading System. The Council approved the proposed changes,

Meeting adjourned @ 11:15 a.m.

Janet Arey, Secretary
**UCR GRADUATE COUNCIL - ORDER OF REVIEWS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**STATUS REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. DUE</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>F&amp;R RECVD</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO</th>
<th>FINAL RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>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>
<td>4/15/2010</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
<td>6/24/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jan 24-25,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>April 11,12,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<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>
<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-93</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>*IR 1-99</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>Oct-09</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>
<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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/1966</td>
<td>Feb-94</td>
<td>Jun-95</td>
<td>Feb-02</td>
<td>Dec-03</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>May-09</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>Jan-88</td>
<td>Dec-90</td>
<td>May-97</td>
<td>Apr-99</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Mar-09</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</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>
<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-92</td>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Oct-01</td>
<td>May-10</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Mar-82</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Feb-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-04</td>
<td>Jul-07</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 3-99</td>
<td>Feb-00</td>
<td>Moratorium 11/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>Nov-09</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>
<td></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>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 6-02</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>Jan-10</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 3-98</td>
<td>May-99</td>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 5-01</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
27 October 2010

To: Morris Maduro, Chair
Graduate Council

From: Manuela Martins-Green
Professor of Cell Biology

Re: Guidelines for University Oral Exams for Advancement to Candidacy

I am writing to request that the Graduate Council revise the Guidelines for Oral Exams to make them more detailed and inclusive of the rules and regulations that should govern such an exam. This request is prompted by an incident that occurred with one of my students. Because the Guidelines I found on the Graduate Division website were so vague, I was unable to help the student in her complaints. I then checked the Guidelines of other UC campuses and most of them have extensive description of what an Oral Exam should be, what it should not be, the procedures by which the exam should be administered, the role of the Chair of the Committee, the Role of the External Member, and the Role of the Major Professor. Unfortunately, our Guidelines contain virtually nothing addressing these issues.

I am not at liberty to discuss the details of this situation in a memo but if you wish I can come and discuss with you the reasons why I am making this request.

Cc Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR Division of Academic Senate
Sellyna Ehlers, Director, Academic Senate
Susan Stracener, support staff to the Graduate Council
INSTRUCTIONS FOR CHAIRPERSON OF
DOCTORAL QUALIFYING COMMITTEE
(To be communicated by the Chairperson to Committee Members
before the examination is held.)

Upon the recommendation of the program chairperson or graduate advisor, doctoral qualifying committees are
appointed by and are responsible to the Graduate Council through the Dean of the Graduate Division. The
doctoral qualifying committee is charged with examining the student’s knowledge of the general field of study as
well as the related fields and areas of special interest, and with substantiating the adequacy of the student’s
preparation and qualifications to be advanced to candidacy for the doctorate.

The examinations are written as well as oral. At the discretion of the committee, the written portion may be
given as one examination or in several parts and may be administered by the department or the graduate group.
However, the oral examination must be conducted and reported by the student’s qualifying committee under the
following conditions:

• The oral examination must be administered in its entirety on one date. This date is to be communicated
  in writing to the Graduate Division at least two weeks (preferably one month) before the examination.
  Any changes in this date or the composition of this committee must be communicated in writing to the
  Graduate Division not less than 24 hours before the oral examination is held.

• All Members of the qualifying committee must be physically present for the entire oral examination
  period as well as the entire deliberation period.

• The qualifying oral examination is not open to the general public but members of the Academic Senate
  may attend.

• There are no conditional passes.

The findings of the committee must be reported within 48 hours to the Graduate Council through the Graduate
Division on Ph.D. Form 3, "Report of Qualifying Examination". An unanimous committee report for or against
approval will be accepted for the Graduate Council by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

If a student has failed the qualifying examination, the committee should make a recommendation for or against a
second examination, ordinarily not to be given until at least three months have elapsed. The date of the second
oral examination should be communicated to the Graduate Division in writing at least two weeks prior to its
occurrence. A third examination is not permitted.

If there is a divided vote, the committee shall first make every effort to arrive at unanimity. Failing unanimity, a
committee report that contains only one negative vote will be deemed a pass; a committee report that contains
two or more negative votes will be considered a failure. When the vote is split, the committee or any member of
the committee may petition (in writing) the Graduate Council to consider a reversal of the judgment. In that
event, the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council will make the final determination whether the
student has passed. In such cases no statement shall be made to the student regarding passing or failing the
examination until the final determination has been made. The student shall be informed within 48 hours that the
vote is split and the final determination will be made by the Graduate Council.

3/07(QualCom Inst)
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F2.6 Qualifying Examination

Last Edited: July 16th, 2009

The Qualifying Examination is administered by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Graduate Council. Approval of the committee membership and the conduct of the examination are accordingly subject to the Graduate Division’s review and approval. The exam is normally held on one day and lasts approximately two to three hours. The Qualifying Examination is an oral exam. A department may require written examinations or papers as prerequisites to the Qualifying Examination, but they are not a component of the Qualifying Examination itself, which is under the purview of the Graduate Council.

The purpose of the Qualifying Examination. The intent of the Qualifying Examination is to ascertain the breadth of the student’s comprehension of fundamental facts and principles that apply to at least three subject areas related to the major field of study and whether the student has the ability to think incisively and critically about the theoretical and the practical aspects of these areas. Some programs expect students to present a topic for the dissertation as part of the Qualifying Examination, but the examination must not be narrowly limited to this topic if the intent of the examination is to be fulfilled. In programs that do not have this expectation, students may be required to have in mind one or two areas from which the dissertation might be developed and to answer questions on its potential significance and possible design.

The examiners should satisfy themselves, by unanimous vote, that the student demonstrated sufficient command of the three subject areas in addition to showing the ability to design and produce an acceptable dissertation. The examination may consider a number of academic points of view and the criteria by which they may be evaluated.

The Graduate Council’s statement on the purpose and meaning of the Qualifying Examination is available on the Graduate Division website (http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/policies/degrees_office.shtml).

Applying to take the Qualifying Examination. Students should be encouraged to take the Qualifying Examination and be advanced to candidacy as soon as they are prepared. Before endorsing the student’s application to take the exam, however, the Head Graduate Adviser must also be certain that students who are non-native speakers possess the English skills necessary for participating in an oral exam since the Qualifying Examination must be conducted in English.

Students must apply to take the Qualifying Examination no later than three weeks before the examination date to allow the Graduate Division time to review and approve the application. Approval is absolutely required before the exam may take place. Holding the exam before the student and the committee members have been notified that admission to it has been approved will cause its results to be voided. Students must list on their applications at least three subject areas to be covered during the examination. The Graduate Services Degrees Unit is unable to
approve applications that do not contain this information. The application is available from the Graduate Division website (http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/policies/forms.shtml).

The form should be accompanied, if appropriate, by the student’s foreign language examination (both text and translation) or certification of native fluency, unless the department has already submitted these materials.

**Eligibility to take the Qualifying Examination.** To be eligible to take the exam, a student must:

1. be registered and enrolled for the semester in which the exam is taken or, if it is taken during the winter or summer intersessions, be registered in either the preceding or the following semester;
2. have completed at least one semester of academic residence;
3. have at least a B average in all work undertaken in graduate standing;
4. have no more than two courses graded Incomplete;
5. have satisfactorily completed departmental preliminary exam requirements, if applicable; and
6. have completed the foreign language requirement.

**Period of eligibility to take the Qualifying Examination.** Following approval, a student’s eligibility to take the Qualifying Exam is valid for 18 months. Eligibility continues even if the student fails on the first attempt but is recommended for reexamination. However, if the student does not take the examination during the 18-month period, he or she must file a new application.

**Scheduling the examination.** The student is advised to confer with the chair of the Qualifying Exam Committee when he or she is prepared to set the date of the examination so that necessary arrangements can be made. The student should begin this consultation well in advance of the planned exam date to ensure the availability of the examination committee and approval of the examination application by the Graduate Division. If the student’s health or personal situation makes it too difficult to take the examination as scheduled, or if accommodation for a disability is necessary, the student is required to make this known before the exam so the chair can arrange for a postponement or appropriate accommodation.

**Qualifying Examination Committee.** Service on a Qualifying Examination Committee is an obligation of membership in the Academic Senate. Departments can require either a four- or five-member Qualifying Examination Committee, but whichever option they choose must apply to all students in the degree program and be on record in the Graduate Division.

The majority of the committee must be in the student’s major field. In the case of a four-person committee, at least two Academic Senate members must be from the student’s major. The chair of the Qualifying Examination Committee must be from the student’s major and a member of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate; the chair cannot also serve as chair of the student’s Dissertation Committee. At least one committee member must come from outside the student’s major, and also be a member of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate.
Conducting a Qualifying Examination. The Chair of the Qualifying Examination Committee is responsible for making sure that the committee administers the exam fairly and follows the procedures outlined in the next section. The committee’s outside member, an Academic Senate faculty member who does not hold an appointment in the student’s major department, serves as the Dean’s representative to observe that the chair fulfills this responsibility and should report any infractions to the Graduate Division. An exam that is not conducted according to Graduate Division guidelines may be invalidated. Both faculty and students should refer to the Graduate Council’s statement on the nature of the Qualifying Examination, available on the Graduate Division website (http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/policies/degrees_office.shtml).

Absence of committee members. The exam must be held with the entire committee present for the length of the exam. If a committee member cannot attend, the exam should be rescheduled or the committee reconstituted. A student may not be examined separately by committee members.

If a committee member’s absence may be resolved by telecommunications (e.g., a conference call, videoconferencing, Skype), the chair should request prior approval for this arrangement from Associate Dean Duggan. The distant member must be online for the entire examination and deliberation period and be audible to all present.

If an emergency, such as an illness or an accident, occurs just before the exam, the committee chair should call Graduate Services Degrees (642-7330), explain the problem, and request permission from Associate Dean Joseph J. Duggan to conduct the exam under special circumstances. If an emergency situation also compels a committee member to depart before the exam is concluded, he or she must write a memo to Associate Dean Duggan, explaining the reason for the absence and presenting an opinion of the student’s performance on topics covered during the time the committee member attended the exam. This information and a memo from the chair of the examining committee will be considered in determining the final results of the examination.

Nonappearance by the student. If a student is not present at the time of the scheduled Qualifying Examination, both the committee chair and the student must submit reports explaining the circumstances to Associate Dean Duggan within six working days following the date of the exam. Only the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council may rule the student’s non-appearance at the scheduled time constitutes a failed examination. Conversely, the Administrative Committee may find that the department, the examination committee, or both acted improperly, and act to monitor a rescheduled examination to ensure proper conduct of the exam.

Adjournment. If a student suffers from illness or psychological stress that prevents him or her from answering questions effectively during the exam, or if there are other problems that prevent the exam from proceeding properly, the chair should recess the examination immediately. The committee should meet without the student to decide whether or not to continue the exam.
If the committee decides that the exam cannot continue under the circumstances, the chair will adjourn the exam without a vote and immediately report the adjournment to Graduate Services Degrees (642-7330). The chair must explain why this step was taken and give the committee’s recommendation for further action. The committee can recommend that the exam be continued, but no later than 21 days from the date of the adjourned exam. If the exam is not resumed within 21 days, the reason must be reported and the exam may be judged to be a total or partial failure.

The student may be informed of the recommended action by the chair but must also be told that the recommendation must be reviewed by the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council for approval. The committee should adjourn the exam only as a last step and only when other attempts to remedy the difficulty have been exhausted (such as a short recess to put the student at ease). Exams should not be adjourned simply because the student’s performance was not of passing quality, unless circumstances beyond the student’s control contributed to the failure. An exam that lasts for more than one-and-a-half hours will be considered a complete examination by the Graduate Council and should not be reported as an adjournment but as a total or partial failure. Committees should never recommend adjournment because a student’s English skills are not adequate for the exam.

Voting procedures. All members of the Qualifying Examination committee must be present to vote on the exam, and each member is expected to vote either “pass,” “fail,” or “partial fail” on the student’s performance during the entire examination. Committees should make every attempt to reach a unanimous decision.

The committee’s final decision should reflect the student’s performance on the exam. A vote to pass the student is only warranted if his or her academic performance was satisfactory and for no other reason. It is also not appropriate to add conditions to the examination verdict related to the dissertation topic, how the research should be conducted, who should be the dissertation chair, or how the student will be supported during the research phase. Moreover, conditions, such as subsequent service as a GSI in a particular course or presentation of a paper at a seminar, cannot be used to substitute for a student’s failure of any part of the examination and will not be accepted by the Graduate Division. If allowed a retake, the student must be orally examined before the full committee on all portions failed in the first Qualifying Examination.

For details on reporting the vote, refer to the following sections. Instructions for filling out the report form are available in the section “How to report the results of a Qualifying Examination” below.

MEMO: Service on Qualifying Examination Committees

Office of the Dean
Graduate Division
University of California, Berkeley

February 2002
To: Chairs and Members of Qualifying Examination Committees
From: Mary Ann Mason, Dean, Graduate Division
Subject: Service on Qualifying Examination Committees

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of a "Policy Statement Approved by the Graduate Council Regarding Qualifying Examinations for the Doctoral Degree," which I urge you to read carefully. I hope you will keep the points addressed in mind as you participate in future examinations. I would like to remind you also that the Qualifying Examination should be designed, among other things, to reveal the extent of the student's knowledge in terms of breadth, depth, and sophistication of reasoning. The examination should also give the student an opportunity to demonstrate his or her ability to synthesize the factual information and training in techniques learned through course work and seminar research. It is not to be concerned solely with the dissertation prospectus. Based on the student's performance, the faculty should determine whether the candidate is ready to enter the research phase of graduate studies.

It is the Chair's responsibility to insure that the examination is handled fairly. The Chair should do all in her or his power to put the student at ease in the oral examination, perhaps by asking a few general questions of a personal or professional nature before the questions concerning formal fields of knowledge begin. Also, it is our tradition that the committee ordinarily allows the candidate to state a preference for the order in which the subject areas will be discussed. Should it become necessary for the committee to discuss the progress of the examination in the student's absence, an explanation should be given to alleviate undue concern.

That all members of the examining committee be present for the entire examination is obligatory. Non-voting observers who are members or visiting members of the faculty may be invited or not, upon the unanimous consent of the committee and the candidate. At times, the mere presence of a faculty member who knows the candidate well but who does not participate in the examination may be a strong source of support for the student.

The purpose of these suggestions is to continue our efforts to humanize an inherently difficult examination without lowering standards. Ideally, the examination should be a source of genuine satisfaction for all parties concerned. Failure is unavoidable in some cases, but serious frictions can, for the most part, be averted. In summary, I am most concerned that the student be given a fair examination and that the committee members feel free to express themselves to me personally if they believe that all or part of the examination was not conducted in a fair and reasonable manner.

The student may be recommended for conferral of the Candidate in Philosophy (C.Phil.) degree (which is offered by the department, school, or group) upon successful completion of the Qualifying Examination and formal advancement to candidacy.

Policy Statement Approved by the Graduate Council Regarding Qualifying Examinations for the Doctoral Degree

1. The Purpose of the Examination. The examiners should satisfy themselves, by unanimous vote, that the student is clearly expert in those areas of the discipline that have
been specified for the examination, and that he or she can in all likelihood design and produce an acceptable dissertation. The examination will ordinarily consider a number of studies and points of view and the criteria by which they may be evaluated.

Some programs expect students to present a topic for the dissertation as part of the Qualifying Examination (although the examination should not be limited to such a topic). Others do not. In those that do not, students may be expected to have in mind one or two areas from which the dissertation might be developed and to answer questions on its potential significance and possible design.

2. **Scheduling the Examination.** The student is advised to confer with the chair when he or she is prepared to set the date of the examination so that necessary arrangements can be made. If the student's health or personal situation makes it too difficult for him or her to take the examination as scheduled, it is incumbent on the student to make this known before the examination so the chair can arrange for a postponement.

3. **The Oral Component.** The oral examination of candidates for the doctorate serves important professional functions. Not only teaching, but the formal interaction with one's students and colleagues at colloquia, annual meetings of professional societies and the like, often require the ability to synthesize rapidly, organize clearly, and argue cogently in an oral setting. To fulfill his or her professional responsibilities adequately, the holder of the doctorate will frequently be called upon to display these skills, and it is consequently necessary for the University to ensure that a proper examination is given incorporating them. Please note, however, that a possible adjustment may be made on the basis of campus policies for cases in which an otherwise able individual is prevented from meeting an oral requirement by a physical handicap. It is recommended that the Graduate Division be consulted before such adjustments are made.

4. **Responsibilities of the Outside Member.** The "outside" member of a Qualifying Examination Committee is responsible for seeing that overall standards of quality and equity appropriate for the award of the doctorate are being met. The Graduate Division relies on the "outside" member for assurance that comparably high and humane standards are being applied in Qualifying Examinations in all degrees programs. In addition, the "outside" member lends "the necessary balance and independence needed to ensure that the student's mastery of the subject matter is both broad and comprehensive" (*Graduate Adviser's Handbook*), and, in some programs, contributes an area of knowledge to a student's examination topics. Graduate Adviser Chairs should take special care in recommending "outside" committee members to the Dean of the Graduate Division; in the event of a split vote on a Qualifying Examination, the Administrative Committee of the Graduate council will take special cognizance of the view of the "outside" member.

5. **Voting Procedure.** Before the examination begins, the chair should remind members of the examining committee about voting procedures, especially new or non-Berkeley faculty members. In order for the student to pass the Qualifying Examination, the committee must vote unanimously for a Pass. Each committee member's vote should reflect his or her opinion about the overall performance of the candidate, including the candidate's responses to questions asked by other committee members. For detailed information on adjourned examinations, partial failure, etc., please see the Degrees
section of the current *Graduate Adviser's Handbook*. When in doubt about procedural matters, please call the Degrees Office in the Graduate Division at 642-7330.

6. **Split Votes.** The jurisdiction for ruling on split votes rests with the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. Before submitting the results of the Qualifying Examination that eventuated in a split vote, however, the chair should make every effort to bring the committee to a unanimous vote. This may involve extensive discussion among the committee members. If, after adequate discussion, the committee is still split, the chair should ascertain exactly what the areas of disagreement are. Each member of the committee must then write a detailed assessment of the student's performance for submission to the Administrative Committee. The chair's letter should outline the progress of the examination itself, the efforts made to come to unanimous agreement, and the remaining areas of disagreement among the committee members, as well as the chair's own assessment of the student's performance. Faculty are reminded that such letters could eventually be released to the student under provision of the 1972 Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, current regulations of the Department of Health and Human Services, and elements of California public records legislation. The student is not regarded as having either passed or failed the examination until the decision of the Administrative Committee has been made, and no statement to the student should be made by the members of the examining committee other than that the matter has been sent to the Council's Administrative Committee for a final decision.
Dear Dan,

Graduate Division seems to lack rules about conflicts of interest (COIs) as they pertain to construction of supervisory committees, dissertation committees and oral qualifying exam committees.

In your current role as Senate Parliamentarian and also as your past role as Associate Dean in the graduate division, could you confirm if this is the case (as far as Grad Div rules go), and whether the Senate bylaws (or elsewhere) have a written 'blanket' policy that applies to COIs and formation of any committees at UCR?

My goal would be to codify some kind of local instance of the rules into Grad Div policy governing who may or may not serve on a such a graduate supervisory committee. Like many such policies it would be open to exception by written approval on a case-by-case basis, perhaps by a Graduate Advisor or program director/chair, because of situation (e.g. the only additional expertise on the campus comes from a spouse).

Thanks for any comment you could provide on this.

Best,

Morris

--- Original message ---

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 2010 10:35:47 -0800 (PST)
From: Daniel Ozer <daniel.ozer@ucr.edu>
Subject: Re: senate rules question
To: "Morris Maduro" <mmaduro@ucr.edu>

Dear Morris,

I believe that your premise is correct: I have never encountered any "conflict of interest" language regarding appointment of faculty to student committees.

The only general policy about conflict of interest and committee appointments that I am
aware of is the Senate's rule that each Senate committee annually adopt a COI statement (Bylaw 8.2.5, text appended below).

I do want to point out that any attempt to codify what might constitute a COI for a student's qualifying exam or dissertation committee might well violate a faculty members right to serve on such committees. I am reminded of the days (into the 1980s) when UC would not hire the spouse of anyone who had a faculty appointment (even in a different department) because of COI concerns. Clearly, this was discriminatory in effect.

I am quite worried about difficulties that might arise in trying to define COI in this context. In the typical kind of case (e.g., Grad council member does not participate in the review of a program she or he is affiliated with) two legitimate interests (representing one's program vs. reviewing a program) conflict. I have difficulty seeing a COI in a dissertation or quals committee as being a conflict between two academically appropriate interests. Rather, one of those interests may well represent an impropriety (e.g., inability to exercise independent judgment due to the presence of a spouse on the committee) that may, or may not rise to the level of actually violating the faculty code of conduct.

Is COI really the appropriate way to deal the possible perception of impropriety? Are spouses on the same committee necessarily evidence of COI? If so, how can spouses who are members of the same Department vote on merit and promotion files of other members of their department? And they most certainly do have that right.

I guess I am trying to urge caution, but that is unsolicited advice that I can't resist offering...my apologies...

Best,
Dan

Bylaw 8.2.5 Each standing or ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate shall annually consider the impact of conflict of interest considerations on the ability of that committee to conduct its business with the highest possible degree of credibility. To this end, each Academic Senate committee shall place on file each year as the first item of business of that committee procedures by which conflict of interest concerns will be mitigated. These procedures will be submitted to the Executive Council within 30 days of their adoption. For these purposes, "conflict of interest" is taken to refer to those situations in which personal affiliations of individual committee members with departments or programs or with individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. (En 22 May 86)(Am 20 Nov 07)
Hi Dan,

Thanks for the thoughts on this.

At the level of voting on files, in our department and at least a couple others, spousal faculty always excuse themselves from discussion and vote on merit files. When CAP votes on a file they construct a 'shadow CAP' to decide on a file for which a CAP member is a spouse. So there is some precedent, at least in practice, for avoiding such conflicts.

How about some middle ground, say on the form to approve a committee there is a disclosure statement about possible COI? Then when the student and grad advisor sign they are at least acknowledging awareness of a 'possible' conflict.

The issue would be one of the perception of fairness and objectivity. A spouse on a committee of a 'marginal' student may vote to keep the student in the program, or award a degree. This may be seen as a conflict of interest.

MM
appearance of a question on this should be disclosed at the time of the committee's nomination. On the down side, this would often just be ignored...

Dan
All:

Our Bioengineering graduate program would like to cross-register one or more courses with Loma Linda University. Similarly, Loma Linda would like their students to take one or more of our courses. I am seeking your input/advice on how to develop an appropriate agreement for this.

Do we already have a similar agreement with Loma Linda in place? I know that we have a cross-registration agreement with CSUSB. Could it be used as a model if necessary?

I’ve found that Berkeley has several cross-registration agreements with private universities (such as Stanford and Mills College). An excerpt from the Berkeley General Catalog regarding these agreements is copied below.

Your suggestions/recommendations would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,
Mark R. Matsumoto
Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education
Bourns College of Engineering
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

**Stanford-Berkeley Exchange Program**

If you have a superior academic record, you may participate in the Stanford-Berkeley Exchange Program when it is considered desirable for you to take a limited number of courses that are offered at Stanford but not at Berkeley. Participation in the program must be approved by the Graduate Division and your department. Normally, you will not be allowed to participate in this program until you have completed a year of graduate study at Berkeley. Participants register and pay the applicable fees at Berkeley and are exempt from tuition and fees at Stanford. The same privilege is accorded to Stanford students who want to take courses at Berkeley. If you apply for this program, you must enroll in at least one course at Berkeley. You may obtain further information and an application form from Graduate Services: Degrees, 318 Sproul Hall.
The Exchange Scholar Program
The Exchange Scholar Program is designed to enable doctoral students with superior academic records to study at one of the participating institutions to take advantage of educational opportunities that are not available at Berkeley. Normally, you are eligible to become an exchange scholar only after you have completed one year in a Berkeley graduate degree program. You may take courses or conduct research with particular faculty at the host institution for no more than one year while remaining registered at Berkeley.

Participating institutions are Berkeley, Brown University, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, and Yale University. You may obtain further information and an application from Graduate Services: Degrees, 318 Sproul Hall.

Cross-Registration Agreements with CSU and Other Institutions
Berkeley has cross-registration agreements with the Graduate Theological Union, Mills College; Holy Names University; John F. Kennedy University; Dominican University; and St. Mary’s College. In addition to these established exchanges, any UC Berkeley student to attend a class each semester at any one of the campuses of the California State University.

With the approval of the Graduate Division and your department, you may register and pay applicable fees at Berkeley and be exempt from tuition and fees at the host campus, except for an administrative fee, depending on the institution. Note: You may enroll for only one host-campus course per semester. Cross-registration applications are available from Graduate Services: Degrees, 318 Sproul Hall.

From: Jerome Schultz [mailto:jerome.schultz@ucr.edu ]
Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2010 8:41 PM
To: mark.matsumoto@ucr.edu
Subject: Cross registration Loma Linda and UCR

Mark,

This is one of the courses that we would like to have our students take for credit. And they would like to have some of our courses available for their students.

Please look into logistics.

Thanks,

Jerry

From: Andre Obenaus [mailto:aobenaus@llu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2010 7:24 PM
To: Jerome Schultz
Cc: 'Kido, Daniel'; 'Andre Obenaus'
Subject: Meeting

Jerome – Thanks for your time the other day with regards to the student.

I also wanted to followup on the other two items we discussed.

1) Meeting with Dr. Kido (head of Neuroradiology) with regards to exploring potential avenues for collaboration and areas of mutual interest. I talked to Dr. Kido and he is interested in meeting with you at your convenience. I am happy to assist in coordinating this between the two of us. Perhaps if you give me some dates and can confirm these with Dr. Kido. I look forward to this.

2) The second item is the Intro to Medical Imaging Class. I have attached the course description from the catalog and also a better overview of the syllabus. Please feel free to circulate to faculty or students as you see fit. I currently have some interests from about 4-5 students here and am thinking that doing the course in the winter quarter might work well. If you or your staff have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Thanks again

Andy

Andre Obenaus, Ph.D.
Director, Non-Invasive Imaging Laboratory
Department of Radiation Medicine
Loma Linda University
11175 Campus St, CSPA1010
Loma Linda, CA 92324
909-558-7108, 909-558-0320 fax
http://radiobiology.llumc.edu/radio2/index.html
http://www.stemcells.ucr.edu/index.php

BPBE 510 - Intro to Medical Imaging Course Description.pdf

BPBE 510 Lect
BIOL 558 Philosophy of Science and Origins (4)
Studies selected topics in the history and philosophy of science, and applies these principles in analyzing contemporary scientific trends.
Cross-listing: GEOL 558.

BIOL 559 Philosophy of Science and Origins (1)
Studies selected topics in the history and philosophy of science, and applies these principles in analyzing current scientific trends. Provides an advanced update in the topic for students who have had a similar course at the undergraduate level.

BIOL 588 Current Topics in Biology (1–5)
Reviews cutting-edge literature in the biological sciences. Different sections may be repeated for additional credit.
Prerequisite: Consent of instructor.

BIOL 589 Readings in Biology (1–4)
Studies, analyzes, and discusses current and classic papers.

BIOL 607 Seminar in Biology (1)
Seminar presentations by guest scientists on recent research and developments in biological science. No student presentation required.

BIOL 616 Research and Experimental Design (2)
Concepts, methods, and tools of research, including experimental design and data analysis.

BIOL 617 Proposal Writing and Grantsmanship (2)
Skills and practice of effective proposal writing and strategies for locating and obtaining research grants.

BIOL 695 Special Projects in Biology (1–4)
Student responsible for a special research project in the field, laboratory, museum, or library. May be repeated for additional credit.

BIOL 697 Research (1–8)
See department checklist for recommended number of units.

BIOL 698 Thesis Research (1–8)
Credit for research and for writing the master's thesis. Grade received does not indicate whether thesis is completed and approved.

BIOL 699 Dissertation Research (1–8)
Credit for research and for writing the doctoral dissertation. Grade received does not indicate whether dissertation is completed and approved.

BIOPHYSICS AND BIOENGINEERING

BPBE 510 Introduction to Medical Imaging (3)
Increases understanding of and facilitates proficiency in the major medical imaging modalities currently used, including: magnetic resonance, positron emission tomography, ultrasound, computed tomography, and x-ray. Discusses the physical and theoretical bases for the use of an instrument to provide specific information. Incorporates real-life examples and utilizes imaging specialists with expertise in various modalities, as appropriate. Provides laboratory experience in the extraction and analysis of content.
Prerequisite: Advance college level mathematics and biology recommended.

CARDIAC ELECTROPHYSIOLOGY TECHNOLOGY

CEPT 245 Cardiovascular Anatomy and Physiology (3)
Explores normal and pathological cardiovascular anatomy and physiology. Emphasizes myocardial excitation, contraction, intracardiac flow, intracardiac pressure, valve function, coronary anatomy, and ventricular function. Studies in detail the electrical conduction system and cardiovascular hemodynamic principles. Introduces pathological coronary anatomy, as well as abnormalities of the cardiovascular system.
BPBE 510: Introduction to Medical Imaging

This course is an introduction to medical imaging that will cover all the major medical imaging modalities. The student will learn the physical and theoretical basis behind each instrument and the types of information that can be obtained. The types of medical imaging that will be covered in this course are magnetic resonance imaging, positron emission tomography, ultrasound, computed tomography, x-ray and others. Each class will delve into how each of these instruments obtain their images, what information content is contained in the images and real-life examples will be also shown. Finally, the student will also be required to know analysis techniques that are available to further enhance the information content from these images. In the laboratory section of the course the student will be introduced to the instruments and basic analysis and content information will be extracted. At the end of the course the student is expected to have a proficient understanding of the major imaging modalities used clinically today, the physical basis for the images and what information content the resultant images can provide. Imaging specialists will be brought in to provide expertise in various imaging modalities as needed.

Instructor and TAs   Office Location   Office Hours   Laboratory Sections

Andre Obenaus, Richard Sun, Helen Huang

Materials
1. Dhawan    Medical Image Analysis: (Bookstore or internet)
2. Bushberg, Seibert et al  The Essential Physics of Medical Imaging: 2nd Edition (Bookstore or internet)
3. Provided by Instructor  Lecture notes & images in class

Grading
Attendance   ~10%
Laboratory Reports   ~50%
Presentations   ~10%
Final Exam   ~30%

Lecture Schedule   (2hrs lecture)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>X Ray Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Computed Tomography (CT) Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI): Physical basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI): Pulse sequences, Image types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI): Clinical and research applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ultrasound Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Radiotherapy: Conformal and intensity modulated radiation therapy, Fractionation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Molecular Imaging: The future of medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Image Analysis, Statistical analysis of medical images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYLLABUS: Medical Imaging Laboratory

**Location:** Griggs Conference Room, Non-Invasive Imaging Laboratory, Chan Shun Pavilion

**TAs:** TBD

**BOOK:** (see previous page)

**Laboratory SCHEDULE**

**Week 1, Medical imaging safety.** X-ray, computed and positron emission tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, What to do and what not to do.

**Week 2, X-Ray/Computed Tomography.** Collect phantom data, extract quantitative values. Learn 3D reconstruction software.

**Week 3, Magnetic Resonance Imaging:** Image data collection and analysis, T1, T2

**Week 4, Magnetic Resonance Imaging:** Image data collection and analysis, SWI, DWI, DTI

**Week 5, Magnetic Resonance Imaging:** Image data analysis. Computational approaches, HRS, Symmetry etc

**Week 6, Positron Emission Tomography:** Collect live data, process data and analyze

**Week 7, CT/PET/MRI Image Registration:** use software to merge data sets and provide overlay’s

**Week 8, Ultrasound:** Data collection and process data

**Week 9, Radiotherapy:** Overview and visit to Proton treatment facility

**Week 10, Molecular Imaging/Statistical Analysis:** Contrast imaging, new probes, statistics

*NOTE:* Wear older clothes if possible on “laboratory days”; closed toe shoes.