AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday March 15, 2012
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of February 16, 2012 meeting

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
   Attendance Sheet

   1. Approval of Courses - The following Courses have to be approved:
      1. EDUC 212 (Research Methods) – Change
      2. EDUC 248T (Higher Education) - New
      3. CHEM 268 (Contemporary Catalysis) - New
      4. RLST 257 (The Sufis) - New
      5. CWPA 257 (The Sufis) – New
      6. SOC 206 (Proseminar in Qualitative Sociology) - New
      7. SOC 208 (Proseminar in Quantitative Sociology) - 206

   2. Program Changes and Proposals - The following programs need approval:
      1. Palm Desert Low Residency MFA – proposed changes
      2. Professional development requirement for graduate students in the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering
      3. Proposed revision of the program document for the five-year BS+MS program in computer science
      4. Dance Professional Development Course

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee:
   a. Status Report
   b. Update on upcoming reviews
      Consider the three requests for deferral and discuss general guidelines/policies for future deferral requests

5. Fellowship Subcommittee Report:

6. Old Business:
   Academic Integrity Policy for Graduate students

7. New Business:
   1. CEP Policy/Procedure for Discontinuations, Mergers, Splits of Undergraduate Programs and discussion of Regulation 7 and Graduate Program procedures.
   2. Discussion on disseminating GC policy changes.
Present:

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE
Deborah Wong, Music
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Aaron Jones, (Graduate Student Representative)

Absent:
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences

Guests:
Ken Baerenklau
Linda Scott

Approval of Minutes
The agenda and the minutes were approved as written. The new graduate student representative Aaron Jones from GSOE was introduced to the committee.

Announcements:
Chair of the Graduate Council:
Chair Barish gave an update of the Executive Council meeting that took place on February 13, 2012. He indicated that Peter Hayashida, the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, made a presentation on the comprehensive campaign that UCR is involved in. The Executive Council discussed among other issues, the lack of a University Club and a resolution on the academic senate agenda regarding academic freedom. Chair Barish also noted that the graduate student Integrity policy is undergoing further revisions that will require our attention and approval soon.

CCGA Representative: Prof. Mike Vanderwood indicated that CCGA had approved two graduate programs from UCR, the proposal for Master of Arts in Accounting, Auditing and Assurance and the online proposal from BCOE. Dean Childers indicated that it would be useful for Prof. Vandenwood to inform CCGA that the Graduate Division Dean and the Chair of Graduate Council should be copied on issues regarding program proposals just to keep them informed.
The other issue discussed was self-supporting programs. Notably, UCLA’s Anderson School of Managing has a proposal to become a fully self-supported program.

**Graduate Student Council Representatives:** The graduate student representative had nothing to report.

**Dean of the Graduate Division:** Dean Joe Childers gave the following updates:

1. As part of UCR’s comprehensive campaign Dean Childers mentioned that he has put forward a proposal to create six endowed chairs directly linked to the research areas that are part of the aspirations of the campus’ strategic plan. The College deans would nominate the endowed chairs to 3-year terms that could be renewed once. The idea behind this proposal is that about 50% of the funds from the endowments would go to the chair and the other half would be directed to named fellowships for graduate students.

2. Dean Childers also mentioned that he is working with a company that helps package online courses. They primarily deal with undergraduate courses, but they are interested in working on graduate courses. He will be talking with Dean Abbaschian and the company on how to do this. He also mentioned that the company is willing to provide investment upfront and is also willing to take a loss at the beginning.

3. Dean Childers discussed an idea to create an online post-baccalaureate program targeting students in India who obtain only three-year degrees. This could be a way to generate revenue. This would not be a degree, but rather a certification, and may be best offered in partnership with Extension.

4. Graduate Division has contracted with Hobsons to help with outreach recruitment for graduate students.

5. Finally, Dean Childers indicated that our recruitment numbers are up, with a lot of students highly qualified for Chancellor’s fellowships. The application numbers have increased by about 10% across all colleges.

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

1. **Courses:**
   1. BIEN 234 Orthopaedic Regenerative Engineering and Mechanobiology – New
   2. BIEN 249 Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology- Change
   3. CEE 249 Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology- Change
   4. CS 210 Scientific Computing - New
   5. ECON 207 Environmental Economics – Change
   6. ECON 210 (E-Z) Topics in Environmental Economics – New
   7. ENSC 210 (E-Z) Topics in Environmental Economics – New
   8. ENSC 211 Environmental Economics – New
   9. ME 221 – Advanced Dynamics – Delete
   10. ME 247 – Applied Combustion and Environmental Applications - Delete

   **Extension Courses:**
   1. MGT X200.01 – Strategic Management
   2. MGT X200.02 – Global Human Resources
   3. MGT X200.03 – Global Marketing Management
   4. MGT X200.04 – Multinational Financial Management
   5. MGT X200.05 – Managing Change and Technology
2. **Program Changes and Proposals:**

   1. The proposed additional to Biochemistry Graduate Program Requirements was unanimously approved.

**Graduate Program Review Update:**

Chair Barish indicated that the following programs below will be reviewed in 2012-13 and that they should be sent official notification immediately.

- Anthropology (May 2004)
- Art History (Feb 2005)
- Genetics Genomics and Bioinformatics (Jan 2003)
- History (May 2004)
- Plant Biology (Apr 2005)
- Mechanical Engineering (Apr) 2005

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

**Old Business:** The Graduate Council discussed the issue of conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict during an exam or dissertation and a motion to approve the policy was passed with 13 yes and 1 abstaining.

TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OR THE APPEARANCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, WHEN DOMESTIC PARTNERS OR SPOUSES ARE A MAJORITY OF THE FACULTY OVERSEEING AN EXAM OR DISSERTATION, ANOTHER FACULTY MEMBER WILL BE ADDED TO THAT COMMITTEE.

The policy will be included in the Graduate student and graduate advisor handbooks.

**New Business:**

**Integrity Policy for Graduate Students:**

Graduate Council discussed the proposed changes to the Integrity Policy and agreed that it was wise to separate out graduate students from undergraduate students. Chair Barish mentioned that he had met with Dr. Parker and the over the next couple of weeks he would be meeting with other Executive Committee chairs so that they can review the document in an effort to approve it before the spring division meeting. He indicated that he was going to form a task force to work with Associate Dean Ken Baerenklau to do the in-depth review of the document and the following people were appointed to the taskforce.

- Ken Baerenklau
- Kenneth Barish
- Mohsen El Hafsi
- Jim Tobias
- Ertem Tuncel
After some discussions, the GC agreed that it was important to add a sentence to advise faculty to consult with the Graduate Division regarding potential academic sanctions. The rationale behind replacing the word academic with research was that the authority of academic integrity lays with the chancellor and by leaving as written, it would delegate the authority to Graduate Division. It was also pointed out that the policy is just for graduate students and not post-doctoral researchers. The following changes were also approved:

Proposed Changes to
Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside:
Policies for Graduate Students and Post Doctoral Researchers

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the academic research misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge. He/she will determine if misconduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation, following the guidelines outlined in the UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the UCR Office of Research website. In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause with respect to research misconduct to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses, as outlined below, beginning with Review Stage 1.

If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution. If the discovery is made by a student, teaching assistant, reader, grader or tutor he or she should immediately communicate to the Faculty member in charge of the course, so that the Faculty member in charge can proceed with the investigation.

Self-Supporting Program Joint Task Force:
The Graduate Council agreed to the proposal to establish a joint Self-Supporting Program Taskforce which will include the Graduate Division, Privilege and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, Planning and Budget and someone from the Finance and Business Office department. The following people were selected as part of the group that will draft a template for discussion.

Joe Childers, Graduate Dean
Connie Nugent Courses and Programs Chair
Mike Vanderwood, Courses and Programs Chair
A member of P&B
Matt Hull, FBO

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Connie Nugent, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COURSES AND PROGRAMS SUB COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEETING DATE March 8, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mike Vanderwood, GSOE, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lynda Bell, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mohsen El Hafsi, SoBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deborah Wong, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUESTS**
To: Graduate Council

From: Tod Goldberg, Administrative Director, Palm Desert Low Residency MFA

Date: January 12, 2012

Re: Program Changes

Attached please find the proposed program changes to the Low Residency MFA Program. The changes reflect the Graduate Division's edict for a formalized course of professional development coursework, thus we are reducing our thesis units from 8 to 7, with the outstanding unit being used to create a new stand-alone course. Prior to this point, our program already had an extensive professional development aspect built into the curriculum – each of our students, since the inception of the Low Residency in 2008, has been on a course of directed professional development both during the term and during our residencies, with graduating students having a specific focus during their final quarter – and thus this change will formalize what has already been an integral part of our instruction. It is with this rationale that we feel it would be disingenuous to add further costs by adding more units to the program when we've included this aspect all along. We're of the opinion that moving a single unit of thesis over to this new course would be a good reflection of how much time would actually go into this course, while subtracting a unit of thesis would not negatively impact the students as it relates to their actual writing, particularly as much of the tangible work of the new course – the actual meeting with agents & editors, the lecturing et al – will happen during the physical residency itself. We have submitted a one unit Professional Fundamentals course to the Committee on Courses.
Please consider the following changes to the catalog text for the Palm Desert MFA Program.

Present:

Palm Desert Low Residency M.F.A.
Tod Goldberg, M.F.A., Administrative Director (760) 834-0928
Michelle Harding, Program Manager (760) 834-0926 \[palmdesertmfa.ucr.\]
Low Residency M.F.A. Core Faculty

Tod Goldberg, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Mark Haskell Smith, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Joshua Malkin, M.F.A. (Theatre)
Mary Otis, (Creative Writing)
William Rabkin, M.F.A., (Theatre)
Deanne Stillman, (Creative Writing)
David Ulin, B.A. (Creative Writing)
Mary Yukari Waters, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Matthew Zapruder, M.A. (Creative Writing)

PDGC Low Residency Program Students enroll in a prescribed number of units each term. Requirements are similar to the full-time program at UC Riverside, but courses are modified to fit low residency requirements. Low Residency MFA students come to Palm Springs, California for two ten-day sessions in the Fall and Spring quarters that include lectures, seminars, workshops and readings (please refer to website \[http://www.palmdesertmfa.ucr.edu\] for specific dates). Students also attend a final thesis residency their last quarter to file, continue their professional development series and present their Graduate Lectures. During the rest of the academic year, students participate in online workshops and seminars and work individually with faculty. Cross-enrollment between programs is not allowed.

Proposed:

Palm Desert Low Residency M.F.A.
Tod Goldberg, M.F.A., Administrative Director (760) 834-0928
Michelle Harding, Program Manager
Agam Patel, Program Coordinator (760) 834-0926 \[palmdesertmfa.ucr.\]
Low Residency M.F.A. Core Faculty

Elizabeth Crane-Brandt, B.A. (Creative Writing)
Jill Alexander Essbaum, M.A, M.A.R. (Creative Writing)
Tod Goldberg, M.A. (Creative Writing)
Mark Haskell Smith, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Joshua Malkin, M.F.A. (Theatre)
Mary Otis, (Creative Writing)
William Rabkin, M.F.A., (Theatre)
Robert Robertson, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Deanne Stillman, (Creative Writing)
David Ulin, B.A. (Creative Writing)
Mary Yukari Waters, M.F.A. (Creative Writing)
Matthew Zapruder, M.A. (Creative Writing)

PDGC Low Residency Program Students enroll in a prescribed number of units each term. Requirements are similar to the full-time program at UC Riverside, but courses are modified to fit low residency requirements. Low Residency MFA students come to Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, California for two ten-day sessions in the Fall and Spring quarters that include lectures, seminars, workshops and readings (please refer to website \[http://www.palmdesertmfa.ucr.edu\] for specific dates). Students also attend a final thesis residency their last quarter to file, continue their professional development series and present their Graduate Lectures. Students also enroll in a one unit Professional Development Course during this quarter. During the rest of the academic year, students participate in online workshops and seminars.
Students enroll for 8 units each term for 7 terms and pay a per unit fee.

**PDGC Low Residency Program** Consists of workshops in chosen genres and course work culminating in a final project (the master’s thesis) which showcases the writer’s cultivated talents, in the form of a poetry collection, novel, short story collection, essay collection, memoir, full-length work of nonfiction, screenplay, or full-length play. The M.F.A. requires students to write in two genres, allowing for creative movement within disciplines. Structure and focus in screenwriting and playwriting can also be applied to fiction and nonfiction, and lyricism and metaphor in poetry can also enhance description and dialogue in the other genres, for example. Students engage in course work in varied areas of directing and acting, in film history and literature, in literary criticism and translation. Requirements consist of 56 units of course work.

**Course Requirements**
1. Six low residency genre workshop courses.
2. Six low residency literature, poetry, and film seminars.
3. Six low residency cross genre workshops.
4. Thesis. In the areas of playwriting and screen-writing, the final written project is a full-length play of two or three acts (90–120 pages) or screenplay or teleplay (approximately 120 pages). In the areas of poetry, fiction, and nonfiction, the final written project is a poetry collection (approximately 60 pages), novel, short story collection, essay collection, memoir or full-length nonfiction work (between 100-200 pages). Each student is paired with three faculty members who serve as the thesis advisor(s).

**Normative Time to Degree** 7 quarters and work individually with faculty. Cross-enrollment between programs is not allowed.

Students enroll for 8 units each term for 7 terms and pay a per unit fee.

**PDGC Low Residency Program** Consists of workshops in chosen genres and course work culminating in a final project (the master’s thesis) which showcases the writer’s cultivated talents, in the form of a poetry collection, novel, short story collection, essay collection, memoir, full-length work of nonfiction, screenplay, or full-length play. The M.F.A. requires students to write in two genres, allowing for creative movement within disciplines. Structure and focus in screenwriting and playwriting can also be applied to fiction and nonfiction, and lyricism and metaphor in poetry can also enhance description and dialogue in the other genres, for example. Students engage in course work in varied areas of directing and acting, in film history and literature, in literary criticism and translation. Requirements consist of 56 units of course work.

**Course Requirements**
1. Six low residency genre workshop courses.
2. Six low residency literature, poetry, and film seminars.
3. Six low residency cross genre workshops.
4. Thesis. In the areas of playwriting and screen-writing, the final written project is a full-length play of two or three acts (90–120 pages) or screenplay or teleplay (approximately 120 pages). In the areas of poetry, fiction, and nonfiction, the final written project is a poetry collection (approximately 60 pages), novel, short story collection, essay collection, memoir or full-length nonfiction work (between 100-200 pages). Each student is paired with three faculty members who serve as the thesis advisor(s).
5. One unit Professional Fundamentals Course.

**Normative Time to Degree** 7 quarters

Proposed:
Present:

Palm Desert Low Residency Program
Graduate Courses
See also graduate courses in the Theatre section of this catalog.

CWLR 201 (E-Z). Low Residency Seminar in Literature, Theatre, and Film (4-6)
Seminar, 21-31.5 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-1.5 hours; extra reading, 3-4.5 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. A study of a period, style, author, or issue in relation to literary, theatrical, or film history. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 16 units.

CWLR 202 (E-Z). Low Residency Seminar in Literature, Theatre, and Film (2-4)
Seminar, 1-2 hours; extra reading, 3-6 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. A study of a period, style, author or issue in relation to literary, theatrical, or film history. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. (Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 4 units.)

CWLR 211 (E-Z). Low Residency Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 10-20 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-2 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Involves study of chosen genre(s), emphasizing technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z).

CWLR 212 (E-Z). Low Residency Genre Workshop (4-6)

Palm Desert Low Residency Program
Graduate Courses
See also graduate courses in the Theatre section of this catalog.

CWLR 201 (E-Z). Low Residency Seminar in Literature, Theatre, and Film (4-6)
Seminar, 21-31.5 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-1.5 hours; extra reading, 3-4.5 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. A study of a period, style, author, or issue in relation to literary, theatrical, or film history. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 16 units.

CWLR 202 (E-Z). Low Residency Seminar in Literature, Theatre, and Film (2-4)
Seminar, 1-2 hours; extra reading, 3-6 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. A study of a period, style, author or issue in relation to literary, theatrical, or film history. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. (Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 4 units.)

CWLR 211 (E-Z). Low Residency Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 10-20 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-2 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Involves study of chosen genre(s), emphasizing technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z).

CWLR 212 (E-Z). Low Residency Genre Workshop (4-6)
Proposed:
Present:

Workshop, 3-4.5 hours; extra reading, 3-4.5 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Involves study of chosen genre(s), emphasizing technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z).

CWLR 221 (E-Z). Low Residency Cross-Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 10-20 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-2 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Includes introductory study of chosen cross-genres. Emphasizes technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 211 (EZ) or CWLR 212 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z).

CWLR 222 (E-Z). Low Residency Cross-Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 1-2 hours; extra reading, 3-6 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Includes introductory study of chosen cross-genres. Emphasizes technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 4 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z).

Proposed:

Workshop, 3-4.5 hours; extra reading, 3-4.5 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Involves study of chosen genre(s), emphasizing technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z).

CWLR 221 (E-Z). Low Residency Cross-Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 10-20 hours per quarter; consultation, 1-2 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Includes introductory study of chosen cross-genres. Emphasizes technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 8 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 211 (EZ) or CWLR 212 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z).

CWLR 222 (E-Z). Low Residency Cross-Genre Workshop (2-4)
Workshop, 1-2 hours; extra reading, 3-6 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing. Focuses on the production of original work. Includes introductory study of chosen cross-genres. Emphasizes technique, structure, style, and form. F. Fiction; N. Nonfiction; P. Poetry; S. Screenwriting; T. Playwriting. Each segment is repeatable as its content changes to a maximum of 4 units. If credit has already been awarded for a segment of CWLR 211 (E-Z) or CWLR 212 (E-Z), it is not awarded for the corresponding lettered segment of CWLR 221 (E-Z) or CWLR 222 (E-Z).
Present:

|CWLR 200. Professional Fundamentals (1). In this one unit course, students will learn the fundamentals of the writing profession. This will include learning how to write query letters to agents, how to research appropriate presses for both short and long-form pieces, creating book proposals, working with editors, understanding rights (both electronic and current print), how to pitch feature films and television shows, how to navigate the spec screenplay market and a thorough indoctrination in the understanding of standard publishing and film contracts. In addition, a teaching practicum will take place, culminating in a student-taught craft lecture or seminar during the student’s final residency. During residency, each student will meet one-on-one with industry professionals – agents, editors, publishers, producers – to discuss their work.|
Fundamentals of the Profession

In this one unit course, students will learn the fundamentals of the writing profession. This will include learning how to write query letters to agents, how to research appropriate presses for both short and long-form pieces, creating book proposals, working with editors, understanding rights (both electronic and current print), how to pitch feature films and television shows, how to navigate the spec screenplay market and a thorough indoctrination in the understanding of standard publishing & film contracts. In addition, a teaching practicum will take place, culminating in a student-taught craft lecture or seminar during the student's final residency. During residency, each student will meet one-on-one with industry professionals - agents, editors, publishers, producers - to discuss their work.

Professional Fundamentals 10 Week Syllabus

Week 1: Submitting: A guide to submitting work to journals, magazines, small presses & festivals.
*Students will be instructed to submit work to three different magazines/journals or contests/festivals.

Week 2: The Art of the Query: How to approach literary agents and editors
*Student will write sample query letters for the various projects and then send five queries out to agents or appropriate presses.
Reading: Selected reading from The Guide to Literary Agents

Week 3: The Art of the Pitch: A how to guide to pitching your projects to film and television studios.
*Students will be instructed how to pitch movie and television executives, strategies for success and earmarks for potential obstacles.
Reading: Selected reading from Writing the Pilot, Successful TV Writing and 101 Habits of Highly Successful Screenwriters.

Week 4: Self-Publishing & Self-Financing Film Projects: a guide to the current marketplace for entrepreneurial students interested in self publication.
*Options for new epublishing platforms, short films and indie features will be shown and discussed.
Reading: Selected readings from The Fine Print of Self-Publishing and The Reel Truth: Everything You Didn't Know You Needed to Know About Making an Independent Film

Week 5: Agent & Artist: How literary agents and their clients work together.
*An in depth look at various models for how agents and writers work together, including discussions regarding managers vs. agents and the various plusses and minuses of both.
Reading: Selected readings from The Guide to Literary Agents.

*A page-by-page look at what the boiler plate contracts provide and what writers need to be aware of in the negotiation process.
Reading: Kirsch's Guide to the Book Contract.

Week 7: The Academic Route: An overview of professional opportunities in academia, including lesson plan development and lecturing techniques.
*Teaching opportunities will be discussed at length and each student will prepare a 30 minute lecture to deliver at residency in three weeks.
Reading: Selected reading from Fiction Writer's Workshop, Essentials of Screenwriting. In addition, each student will be devising their lecture using the hundred books they've read during their literature component as source material for the lecture, as well as their previous critical papers.

Week 8: The Public Writer: A guide to public performance along with instruction regarding social media, public relations and branding.
*Students will be instructed on strategies for successful public readings as well as receive an extensive practicum on creating a public face via Twitter, Facebook and personal websites & blogs.

Week 9 (residency): Meetings with agents, editors and industry professionals to discuss work, pitch, query and present creative work.

Week 10 (residency): Academic lecture, public reading

Grading: Grades will be given on a S/N basis. Satisfactory completion of the weekly assignments will count for 60% of the grade while the graduate lecture & presentation will count for 40%.
October 7, 2011

To: Ken Barish, Associate Professor of Physics and Astronomy and Graduate Council Chair

CC: Ken Baerenklau, Associate Dean of the Graduate Division and Associate Professor of
Environmental Economics and Policy; Sellyna Ehlers, Academic Senate Staff Support

From: Sharon Walker, Associate Professor of Chemical and Environmental Engineering and
Graduate Advisor

Re: Programmatic changes to address new professional development requirement for
graduate students

The Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering would like to respectively request
the following activities be approved for meeting the new professional development requirement
for graduate students.

In response to the Graduate Council’s vote (May 2010) to require professional development
training for all of our MS and PhD students, the Department of Chemical and Environmental
Engineering propose the following programming and activities:

- In Chemical and Environmental Engineering we have a special course, CEE 286
  “Colloquium in Chemical and Environmental Engineering”. It is a 1 unit course that is
  required for all graduate students each quarter. It is also attended by faculty and post-
  doctoral fellows. The colloquium brings in expert speakers weekly from outside to
discuss their research. We have designated two sessions of this course each quarter to
use for professional development content. This will mean there will be 6 hours per
academic year of professional development content through this course. As a result a MS
student (one year course based program) will have six hours of content, a MS student
(thesis option) will have 12 hours of content, and a typical PhD student (four years) will
have 24 hours of content. Examples of material to be covered include research ethics,
scientific and technical writing, academic careers (research and primarily undergraduate
institutions), employment opportunities beyond academia (government laboratories,
public agencies, NGOs, industry, consulting, etc.), and professional networking. Two
presentations by Vice Chancellor Charles Louis on research ethics are scheduled for fall
quarter 2011. A presentation by Professor Joshua Schimel (UCSB) on scientific writing
and communications is already scheduled for winter quarter 2012.

- The Chemical and Environmental Engineering Department Graduate Student Association
  (GSA) will work with the Graduate Advisor to coordinate fellowship/scholarship writing
workshops. Our students historically have not actively sought competitive outside funding from the National Science Foundation, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Defense, etc. It is our intention to develop a departmental culture of students applying regularly for relevant, prestigious awards and fellowships. All incoming domestic students are encouraged apply for the NSF graduate fellowship at a minimum. We have also identified a number of fellowships that our foreign students are eligible to apply for. Hence, we will host a weekly fellowship/grant writing workshop each fall quarter to assist students in this process. Already this quarter we have had three writing workshops that were well attended.

- As part of our Chemical and Environmental Engineering (CEE 286) “Colloquium in Chemical and Environmental Engineering” the speaker visits with members of the department. We will institute a one hour appointment slot for all visiting speakers to meet with MS and PhD students. This will ensure that our students have the opportunity to interact directly with leaders of their field, develop a professional network, and improve their scientific communication skills through informal conversation with an expert.

Your approval of this request will be greatly appreciated.
Dr. Walker,

I just wanted to pass along the Graduate Division's comments on your recent changes to your catalog copy:

About the professional development proposal... will the instructional content be the same or different each year? Either has implications... if it is the same then each PhD cohort will repeat content. If it is different then each MS cohort will receive different content. The latter seems like the better option, but are there certain aspects of professional development that every MS student should have? If so, how will this be provided without repeating content for the PhD students?

There is no set curriculum. The idea is that each year we will vary the programs so that if there is any repetition is isn’t more than every 2 or 3 years. Considering we will have 6 seminars a year, I think this won’t be too hard to keep it interesting and different. The only element to be repeated annually is on the ethics of research to meet NSF guidelines – but even the approach to cover this content will be varied. The MS and PhD students (and post-docs) will receive the same training. Our MS cohort is a minor fraction of our graduate students (currently 8 MS vs 62 PhD), so I don’t feel we have the resources (time) to put on a separate training. However, we will ask speakers/presenters to address elements relevant to MS vs PhD if the advice differs.

Regarding the MS Exams..will the fact that they are only offered once a year be a disservice to students? Can they be offered at the end of summer as well?

We discussed the timing of the MS exams at length at our department retreat. There is a considerable amount of work involved in writing a new exam, proctoring, grading, and offering re-takes (as applicable). Due to this substantial time commitment, the faculty felt that it wasn’t worthwhile to offer it more than once. If a student is finishing up courses and the other requirements of the MS, they would be leaving UCR at the end of the academic year. This is why we put the exam the final week of the spring term. There was no resistance to this timing by last year’s crop of MS students. In fact, they liked the timing as they all went off to start jobs shortly after graduation.

Regarding the PhD preliminary exams...do you want to state that if they fail all three subjects on the first attempt they must leave the PhD program? It is not really clear reading the text. It may just be the way it is written here. Then are you trying to say if they fail one or two subjects they can do a make-up written exam that includes an oral defense and if they fail any portion then they can take course work and get a grade of B+ or better? Then, if they cannot pass the courses they must leave the PHD program. Do I have it right?

Yes, if the student fails all three subjects on the first attempt they are out. Before our wording was even less clear, so in a couple of cases we had to offer retakes to these students. We do not want that to happen again. It’s a “3 strikes and you’re out” sort of policy. If a student fails 2 sections, they can retake them through a written and oral exam. If they fail any one of these sections then they take course work in that area. If they do not pass the courses they need to leave the program. That
is right. In the past we didn’t have it clearly stated that they had to enroll in the course and earn a B+. So we had some students just audit – which makes it impossible to assess their learning of the subject. This is why we modified the wording to ensure clarity.

Best,

Linda

Linda G Scott
Director, Academic Affairs
UC Riverside
UOB 136
Riverside, CA  92521

951-827-3387
linda.scott1@ucr.edu
gdivls@ucr.edu
Graduate Program

The Graduate Program in Chemical and Environmental Engineering offers training leading to the degrees of M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical and Environmental Engineering. Fields of specialization include biochemical engineering and bioengineering, environmental biotechnology, air quality systems engineering, water quality systems engineering, thermodynamics, advanced materials, and nanotechnology.

Admission

Applicants should have a degree in chemical and environmental engineering or closely related fields, have a satisfactory overall GPA from their undergraduate studies, good letters of recommendation, and high scores on the GRE General Test. Normally, students admitted to regular standing have satisfied all prerequisite course work. Under special circumstances, students who have not completed all undergraduate requirements may be admitted provided that the deficiencies are corrected to the satisfaction of the student’s advisory committee within the first year of graduate study. Courses taken for this purpose do not count towards an advanced degree. International students, permanent residents, and even U.S. citizens whose native language is not English and who do not have a bachelor’s or postgraduate degree from an institution where English is the exclusive language of instruction must complete the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) with a minimum score of 550 (paper-based test), 213 (computer-based), or 80 (internet-based).

Language Requirement

All students whose native language is not English must achieve a “clear pass” on the TAST or SPEAK test before the completion of their first year or they will be asked to leave the program. However, for those who receive a “conditional pass,” a departmental committee will evaluate their English proficiency before a final decision is made.

Course Work

To ensure that advanced degree recipients in the graduate program have advanced knowledge in mathematics and chemical engineering principles that form the foundation for chemical and environmental engineering a core course program has been implemented. All M.S. and Ph.D. students must participate in the core course program. Students who have completed these (or equivalent) courses elsewhere may petition to have the core course requirement waived or some of their units transferred (see the Graduate Division policy for transferring course units). Competency in these areas will be tested as part of the comprehensive exam for M.S. students and in the written preliminary examination for Ph.D. students. The current core courses are as follows:
CEE 200 (Advanced Engineering Computations)
CEE 202 (Transport Phenomena)
CEE 204 (Advanced Kinetics and Reaction Engineering)
CEE 206 (Advanced Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics)

Incoming students without a B.S. degree in chemical or environmental engineering must demonstrate competency in these areas either by taking the appropriate undergraduate courses and/or by passing the written preliminary exam. At UCR, the required courses are CHE 100, CHE 110A, CHE 110B, ENVE 171, CHE 114, CHE 116, CHE 120, CHE 130, and ENGR 118. Students may also be required to take some of the above courses to satisfy the prerequisites of the core graduate courses.

Each quarter, all M.S. and Ph.D. students in residence must enroll in CEE 286 (Colloquium in Chemical and Environmental Engineering). In addition, all M.S. and Ph.D. students must participate each year in the CEE Graduate Student Symposium, usually held just before the beginning of the fall quarter.

Master’s Degree

The Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering offers the M.S. degree in Chemical and Environmental Engineering.

Plan I (Thesis) requires completion of a minimum of 36 units of approved course work including the core courses and submission of an acceptable M.S. thesis. At least 24 of these units must be in regular lecture graduate courses (200 series courses). No more than 4 units of CEE 290 or CEE 297 combined and 6 units of CEE 286 or special topics courses (CEE 250 or CEE 260 series) may apply towards the 36 units.

Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) requires completion of a minimum of 36 units of approved course work including the core courses and successful passage of a comprehensive examination. At least 28 of these units must be in regular lecture graduate courses (200-series courses), and none may be in courses numbered CEE 286, CEE 290, CEE 297, CEE 299, or CEE 302. Typically, the examination is a six-hour written, closed-book examination emphasizing fundamental knowledge and breadth of the study area rather than specifics covered in individual courses. An oral follow-up session may be requested by the examination committee following its evaluation of the written exam. No more than two attempts to pass the exam are allowed. Students who fail the exam once and then want to switch to the thesis plan should contact the graduate advisor. Students who fail the exam twice may not switch to the thesis plan.

Examination - The exam consists of three written tests in three different areas emphasizing graduate level fundamental knowledge and breadth of the study area rather than specifics covered in individual courses. Exam areas can include, but are not limited to:

1. Advanced Air Pollution Control and Engineering
2. Advanced Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics
3. Advanced Kinetics and Reaction Engineering
4. Physical and Chemical Separation Processes
5. Transport Phenomena

An oral follow-up session may be requested by the examination committee following its evaluation of the written exam. No more than two attempts to pass the exam are allowed. Students who fail the exam once and then want to switch to the thesis plan should contact the graduate advisor. Students who fail the exam twice may not switch to the thesis plan.

The Comprehensive Exam is only offered once an academic year during the Spring quarter. Students should state intent to take the exam by week 10 of Winter quarter.

Professional Development Training

1. Two sessions of CEE 286 each quarter will be dedicated to professional development content. The subjects will include but are not limited to: research ethics, scientific and technical writing, academic careers, employment opportunities beyond academia, and professional networking.
2. A weekly one hour networking meeting with a visiting colloquia speaker.
3. Fall quarter fellowship/grant writing workshops. Focus will be on incoming domestic students applying for NSF graduate fellowships.
For the M.S. degree, students must complete a minimum of three quarters in residence in the UC with a GPA of 3.00 or better in all 100- and 200-level course work related to the degree.

**Thesis Committee** The committee consists of three members. The student and advisor nominate the committee before the end of the first year with the concurrence of the graduate committee. After review of the nominations, the dean of the Graduate Division appoints the committee on behalf of the Graduate Council. The committee, once approved by the graduate dean, rather than the department, becomes responsible for the student’s academic guidance and evaluation. The chairman of the committee is the director of the candidate’s research and is normally a faculty member of the CEE department or a cooperating faculty member. A member may be appointed who is a researcher on campus, from off-campus, or a visiting lecturer within the department; however, a memo indicating the academic degree and affiliation of the nominated member, as well as a curriculum vitae, must accompany such a request. (Memos need not accompany the nomination of an adjunct faculty member.) After the committee is formed, the committee must approve the subject of the thesis. A joint meeting of the committee members and the student should be held before work on the thesis is begun to ensure the topic is clear and acceptable to all. Once the thesis is completed, all three members of the committee must approve the thesis and sign the title page. Students must give a departmental seminar presentation of their thesis work to the department and members of the academic community before completing the thesis.

**Normative Time to Degree** 6 quarters

**Doctoral Degree**
The Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Chemical and Environmental Engineering. Satisfying the requirements for the degree consists of four parts:

1. Successful completion of an approved program of course work
2. Passing a written preliminary examination
3. Approval of a dissertation proposal
4. Defense and approval of the dissertation

**Course Work** Upon choosing a faculty advisor, each Ph.D. student is appointed a Ph.D. advisory committee consisting of two CEE faculty members and the faculty advisor. This advisory committee is responsible for guiding the students in formulating their research activities and preparing for the preliminary and qualifying exams.
The program of course work is formulated by each student and a faculty advisor in the first or second quarter after admission to the program and must be approved by the student’s advisor and advisory committee. Every student must complete a program of study that includes:

1. A major area of study intended to increase the student’s depth of knowledge in an engineering research specialty and
2. A minor area of study intended to support and increase the student’s breadth of knowledge in the major area

The CEE graduate program requires a coherent program of

1. Sixteen (16) units of core courses and
2. Eight (8) units of graduate and/or upper-division work approved by the advisory committee

None of these credits may be in courses numbered between CEE 250 and CEE 270, CEE 286, CEE 290, CEE 297, CEE 299, or CEE 302.

**Preliminary Examination** The preliminary examination tests students’ understanding of the fundamental principles of chemical and environmental engineering at the undergraduate level. This comprehensive examination consists of three written tests in three different areas selected from the following five subjects:

1. Thermodynamics
2. Kinetics
3. Transport (heat and mass transfer, fluid dynamics)
4. Air pollution control and engineering
5. Water quality engineering

The three subjects selected should be closely connected to the student's undergraduate training and approved by the student's advisory committee. Students who fail any portion of the exam are granted a final attempt to pass a makeup written examination that includes an oral defense of their answers in front of a faculty committee. Students who fail one or two subjects after the retest must enroll in remedial undergraduate courses and pass with a grade of “B+” or better. Credits from these remedial courses do not count toward the Ph.D. course work requirement. Students who fail all three subjects after the retest must leave the Ph.D. program.

**Teaching Requirement** All students must be employed as teaching assistants for at least one quarter. All TAs must take CEE 302 (Teaching Practicum) to help them learn effective teaching methods such as handling discussion sections; preparing and handling laboratory sections; preparing and grading homework, examinations, and lab reports; and student relations.
**Oral Qualifying Examination** Selection of the Qualifying Committee is as follows; 2 members are selected by the Graduate Committee, 2 members are selected by the student, and the student’s advisor will chair the committee. All members of the qualifying committee are expected to have the appropriate expertise to guide and evaluate a candidate’s research. No more than 2 members can be non-academic senate. After review of the nominations, the dean of the Graduate Division appoints the committee on behalf of the Graduate Council. This committee becomes responsible for the student’s academic guidance and evaluation until advancement to candidacy and administers the qualifying examination.

**Dissertation Proposal** After successful completion of the written preliminary examination, each student, with advisement from an advisor, prepares a dissertation proposal. Typically, students submit a dissertation proposal to their qualifying committee within one year after successfully completing the written preliminary examination. The proposal should clearly demonstrate the student’s adequate preparation for the completion of the thesis research, which includes but is not limited to a thorough review of the pertinent literature, a presentation and discussion of the candidate’s own research, and a detailed research plan with sufficient breadth and depth for the completion of the thesis. The qualifying committee chair schedules an oral defense normally within one month of the written proposal submission. The presentation is given only to the dissertation committee members.

The oral presentation/defense of the proposal focuses on the dissertation problem. Students should demonstrate considerable depth of knowledge in the student’s area of specialization and a clear understanding of the research methods that are needed for successful completion of the dissertation research. The oral presentation/defense begins with a presentation by students on their dissertation topic and is followed by questions and suggestions from the qualifying committee.

On the basis of the written proposal and oral defense, the qualifying committee decides whether the student should be advanced to candidacy, asked to modify and enhance the proposal, or requested to withdraw from the program.

**Dissertation and Final Oral Examination** Following advancement to candidacy, students formally focus on their dissertation research. The progress of the dissertation is monitored by the student’s dissertation committee. Candidates should interact frequently with members of their dissertation committee to insure that dissertation progress is acceptable.
The graduate committee nominates the dissertation committee after consideration of the suggestions made by the student and thesis advisor. The dissertation committee consists of a minimum of three UCR Academic Senate members. The chair and majority of members must be from Chemical and Environmental Engineering. All committee members should be in a position to offer guidance and be able to judge the scholarship of the dissertation work. Upon recommendation of the graduate advisor, doctoral dissertation committees are appointed by the dean of the Graduate Division.

After completing the dissertation research, students must submit a written copy of the dissertation for approval for defense by the student’s dissertation committee. Once a draft has been approved, an oral defense of the dissertation is scheduled. This defense consists of a seminar open to the entire academic community, followed by a question-and-answer period conducted by the dissertation committee.

Students must complete at least six quarters in residence in the UC with a GPA of 3.00 or better in all 100- and 200-level course work related to the degree.

**Normative Time to Degree** Three years for students with a UCR M.S. degree in Chemical and Environmental Engineering (five years for those without an M.S. degree in Chemical and Environmental Engineering)
January 31, 2012

TO: Dr. Kenneth Barish
    Chair, Graduate Council

FR: Dr. Laxmi Bhuyan
    Chair, Computer Science & Engineering (CSE)

RE: Proposed revision of the program document for the five-year BS+MS program in Computer Science.

Dear Dr. Barish:

The CSE department would like to revise the program document for the existing Computer-Science (CS) BS+MS combined five-year program (which was approved in 2007 and has not since been amended).

The aim of the revision is to clarify substantial inconsistencies and missing details in the existing document, and to make some small functional changes based on experience with the program since 2007.

The proposed revision is in keeping with the essential structure and intention of the standing CS BS+MS program document. The proposed changes are also consistent with the current implementation of the program in practice.

The proposed revision was approved by the CSE department in October 12, 2011.

It was approved by the Engineering College Executive Committee on November 18, 2011.

The remainder of this letter includes:

- a summary of the proposed changes and their justifications (pp. 2-4),
- the full text of the proposed revision (pp. 5-11),
- comments from Graduate Division on a previously proposed revision (submitted but not approved in 2010), and our replies summarizing how this revision addresses the issues raised (pp. 12-14).

Accompanying this letter should be copies of relevant background documents, including

- the senate guidelines for five-year programs,
- the standing CS BS+MS program document (as approved in 2007),
- the document for the most recently approved 5-year BS+MS program in engineering (Bioengineering, approved in 2009; this was the template for the 2010 proposed revision of the CS BS+MS document on which Graduate Division previously commented).

The proposal is not in the standard two-column format. As explained in the justifications (in the paragraph headed “Rewrite”), the document is a complete rewrite; we ask that you please consider it as presented.

Our undergraduate advisor, Dr. Neal Young (neal.young@ucr.edu, x8-2147), would be happy to attend any meeting or answer any questions concerning this proposal.

Thank you.
Double-counting of twelve units. The 2007 document allowed double-counting of up to eight units of technical electives.

*Change:* The revision allows double-counting of up to twelve units.

*Justification:* Eight units was simply a mistake — for Computer Science, double-counting of twelve units is necessary for the MS to be completable in one year. (See the sample program in the revision, Section 2.3.) Allowing twelve units is consistent with the senate guidelines.

Junior-year requirements. The engineering college has a batch of BS+MS programs. All were approved during 2007-2009 and all are intentionally very similar. The most recent such programs (such as the 2009 Bioengineering program) include junior-year course and GPA requirements that students must meet in order to continue to the MS portion. The 2007 CS BS+MS doesn’t have such requirements.

*Change:* This revision adds junior-year course and GPA requirements.

*Justification:* Adding the requirements makes the CS BS+MS program consistent with the more recent BS+MS programs in engineering. Such requirements are warranted because students who meet all requirements are generally accepted (pro-forma) into the MS program, and students who don’t meet the new requirements are unlikely to successfully complete the MS portion (especially in the one-year time frame of the program).

Honors program. The 2007 BS+MS document (Section 1.2) lists “Automatic admission into the Honors Program. (Will need to be adopted by the Honors Program.)” as a key element.

*Change:* The revision drops any mention of the Honors Program.

*Justification:* The tie to the Honors Program was never implemented in practice, and, in the most recent BS+MS program documents such as the Bioengineering BS+MS (proposed and approved in 2009), it is essentially dropped — that program document refers (in Section 1.2) only to “Opportunity to participate in the Honors Program.” As all students have this opportunity, this is, de-facto, no longer actually part of the combined program, so mention of the Honors program complicates the program document in a confusing way.

Internship. The 2007 CS BS+MS document (Section 1.2) and the 2009 Bioengineering document (Section 1.2) state “A career-related ... summer internship will be required.”

*Change:* The revision does not mention internships.

*Justification:* Requiring an internship is problematic. Which internships would qualify? What if none are available? The previous document (and more recently program documents) do not elaborate, no practical way of administering the requirement has been developed, and the existing engineering 5-year programs have ignored this requirement in practice.

The department does not feel that having an internship is a necessary aspect of the combined program. For example, regular MS applicants are not generally required to have had an internship. Finally, the authors of the original 2007 program document have subsequently clarified that the intention was that the internship would be optional, not required, in which case the wording, though approved, is a mistake. (Of course, the department and college would continue to encourage internships in any case.)
**Clarification of process details.** In the 2007 document, it is unclear when students are supposed to transition from the BS portion of the program to the MS portion. It is unclear exactly what steps that students should take during this transition — for example, whether or not the student has to submit an application for the MS. Parts of the 2007 document suggest that students will have graduate standing during senior year, but it is not clear how this could be done consistently with the rest of the requirements. For example, the junior-year course and GPA requirements (present in the recent program documents such as 2009 Bioengineering) preclude transition to graduate standing by senior year.

**Change:** The revision resolves the inconsistencies, and details the processes and requirements. With few explicit exceptions, each student has the same standing as a regular BS student until all BS requirements are met (nominally the first four years), and then has the same standing as a regular MS student (nominally the fifth year). An MS application is required during senior year. Acceptance is pro-forma for students meeting the requirements, provided the department has capacity. For details see the revision (Section 2.1).

**Justification:** Feedback (from Graduate Division and student advisors in the college and the department) suggests that the inconsistencies and lack of detail in the 2007 document make the document hard to interpret, and hard to know specifically how to administer the programs. The same problems are also present in the more recent program documents such as the 2009 Bioengineering document. We feel that the benefits in fixing these problems outweigh the costs of revising the document.

Also, the CS BS+MS program has been in place since 2007. During this time we’ve learned better how to make it work in practice, giving us confidence in the suggested process. Finally, the suggested process is consistent with the current implementation. It requires no substantial changes to the current implementation of the program. This revision will bring the formal document in line with the current implementation.

**New catalogue entry.** The existing catalogue entry for the program fails to describe the program requirements and processes that students need to know. Instead, it refers students to their advisors for details.

**Change:** We are proposing a longer entry that explicitly states all relevant program requirements. See Section 2.4 of the revision for a comparison of the current and revised catalog entries.

**Justification:** As pointed out by feedback from Graduate Division and student advisors, program requirements should be documented in the catalogue.

**Rewrite.** The text of the program document is completely rewritten, not based on line-by-line changes of the previous documents. Also, the text is not presented here in two-column format for line-by-line comparison with a previous document: instead, the revision and the relevant previous program documents are attached separately.

**Justification:** Previously, in 2010, the CSE department proposed a different revision of the 2007 CS BS+MS program document. Since the various 5-year BS+MS programs in engineering are intentionally similar, we made that 2010 proposed revision as similar as possible to the most recently approved one, which was the
2009 Bioengineering program document. We only changed a few words, substituting in necessary details such as the program name, course requirements, and units to be double-counted.

Since the 2009 Bioengineering BS+MS program had been fully approved, we expected that our 2010 proposed revision would also be approved. However, feedback from Graduate Division (most of which is documented later, below) indicated that the 2010 revision was unclear in several significant ways. On consideration, we agreed with that assessment. However, the unclear aspects are also present in all the existing engineering 5-year program documents (such as for Bioengineering). Further, we judge that small changes will not fix the issues.

The alternative, which we decided to pursue, was to rewrite the program document from scratch. Given that decision, we felt it also made sense to improve the program, based on our experience with it since 2007, in the various ways described above. As it turned out, these improvements also simplified the program, allowing the new document to be textually simpler. We feel that collectively these various considerations justify the rewrite.

Regarding the two-column format, we judge that, because almost all of the wording and organization of the revision is textually different from that of the 2007 document (that is, it is a complete rewrite), there is no way to usefully put the two documents into two-column, side-by-side format. Also, both the 2007 CS BS+MS document and the 2009 Bioengineering BS+MS document are equally relevant as background documents, so it is not clear to which document the revision should best be compared. Instead, the main changes and their justifications are outlined above, and we hope that also reading and judging the revision in its entirety (seven pages), will not take too much time.

We have, however, put the proposed new catalogue entry in two-column format so that it can easily be contrasted with the old catalogue entry.
A PROPOSED REVISION OF THE

Computer-Science BS + Computer-Science MS
Five-Year Combined-Degree Program

October 2011

Proposed by the Faculty of
the Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

1 Introduction

Aims and objectives. This proposal describes a combined BS+MS program, leading to a Computer-Science BS and a Computer-Science MS in five years.

The proposed program is within the framework established by UCR’s Committee on Educational Policy and the UCR Graduate Council in 2007. The motivation and means for the program are as established in pages 2-3 of the framework document.3

motivation: Quoting from the document: “Combined programs can better attract top high school graduates, transfer students, and returning students, especially those interested in advanced degrees. Thus, UCR departments can expect a higher proportion of good undergraduates.

Combined program students will be more inclined to stay at UCR for their Masters studies instead of applying to other institutions. Thus, UCR departments can better retain these students.”

In sum, the program should attract top students into both the BS and MS programs.

method: To make it possible to complete both degrees in five years, the programs can allow double-counting of up to twelve credits of coursework done for the undergraduate degree towards the MS degree. The justification is that many UCR MS programs, including the Computer-Science (CS) MS, require up to twelve units of preparatory undergraduate coursework that may be necessary for undergraduates from other institutions but redundant for undergraduates coming from an appropriate UCR program.

Relation to existing programs. The program consists of the regular Computer-Science BS program, followed by the regular Computer-Science MS program, with minor modifications to the MS degree requirements, allowing up to twelve units of undergraduate technical-elective coursework to be counted towards the MS elective requirements, so that the (Plan II) MS requirements can be met in a single year.

As the primary motivation for the program is simply recruitment of top students, the program involves no new courses or requirements.

3Online at http://senate.ucr.edu/about/policies/establishment_of_combined_programs_at_ucr.pdf
Interrelation with other UC institutions. Beyond making the respective BS and MS programs more attractive, the program does not compete or inter-relate with other UCR or UC programs or institutions. It may indirectly recruit top students into the UCR (or other UC) CS PhD programs, via the MS program.

Department that will administer the program. The program will be administered by the Computer Science and Engineering Department. Some administrative tasks will be done by the Engineering Student Academic Affairs Office. Some admissions tasks will be done by the Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate Admissions Offices.

Timetable for development. The original CS BS + CS MS program began operating in 2007. In 2010 the first three students entered the MS portion of the program. Based on current levels of participation, over the 2011-2015 period, we expect a few additional students per year to participate.

Historical development of the field. Over the past two decades, Computer Science and Engineering has expanded from a discipline with a few core areas to a broad field with many application domains. Meanwhile, commercial applications of Computer Science and Engineering are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Graduate-level training of students has become more applied, and students with graduate-level training (MS or PhD) are better prepared than those without such training to work on sophisticated applications. Thus, demand for, and awareness of, graduate-level training is increasing, making it a good time to leverage interest in the MS program and to facilitate entry into it.

Plan for evaluation of the program. The effectiveness of the program will be evaluated by monitoring the extent to which it increases the quality of students in the BS and MS programs.

2 Program

Broadly, the program consists of the BS program, followed by the MS program. A student in the combined program must meet the program requirements of both programs, in that order, with minor modifications to the requirements of the MS program. Once the student meets the BS program requirements, s/he is granted the BS degree. Subsequently, once the student meets the (modified) MS program requirements, s/he is granted the MS degree.

The normative time to complete the BS portion is four years; the normative time for the MS portion (with double-counting of twelve credits) is one additional year, provided the student chooses the Plan II (project) option.

The modifications to the MS portion are as follows:

- The MS requirements are modified, allowing up to twelve-units of technical elective coursework may be double-counted. This making it possible to complete the MS portion in a single year.
- The GRE requirement for the MS application is waived. Acceptance of the MS application is pro-forma, provided the program criteria below are met (and subject to some restrictions).
- In the first (and normatively only) year of the MS, the fee-differential (if positive) between undergraduate and graduate student fees is paid by the BCOE.
These minor modifications allow the program to be viewed as a single, 5-year, BS+MS program, making the program even more attractive to incoming students.

2.1 Program requirements and process

1. *Performance in junior year.* By the end of junior year (specifically, at the end of the last junior-year term during which the student is enrolled), the student must be enrolled in the UCR Computer-Science BS program, with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.4, and must have completed the following four courses with no grade less than a B-, and average grade at least 3.2: CS 100, 120A, 120B, 161.

“Junior year” refers to the classification by academic requirements completed (not by number of years in the program). “Senior year” refers to the first academic year following Junior year and during which the student is enrolled.

2. *Application to combined program in senior year.* Before the deadline for MS applications during the senior year (typically early January), the student applies to the combined program. To apply, the student submits a regular application to the MS program. The student’s MS application must include at least two recommendation letters from UCR Academic Senate faculty members. At least one letter, and preferably both, must be from UCR CSE faculty. All letters must give positive recommendations. The GRE requirement for the application is waived, but it is recommended that the GRE be taken nonetheless, to keep open the option of receiving financial aid if the student later pursues a PhD.

The MS application is normally accepted by the department and graduate school in Winter or Spring of senior year. Acceptance is expected to be pro-forma provided the student meets the requirements above, except that, in the unlikely event that the number of qualifying applicants exceeds the number of MS slots available, applicants will be ranked and offers will be made according to the normal MS-applicant evaluation process. (It is expected that students meeting the above requirements will be among the top in the MS applicant pool.)

For combined-program applicants, any acceptance of the MS application is conditional: to be accepted the student must subsequently meet this senior-year performance requirement:

3. *Performance in senior year.* At the end of each senior-year term, the student’s cumulative GPA must be at least 3.4. By the end of senior year, all BS program requirements must be met (at which point the BS degree is granted as usual).

4. *Acceptance into the combined program.* The student is accepted into the combined program if and when the student’s MS application has been accepted by the department and graduate school and the student has met all requirements above.

If the student does not meet the senior-year performance requirement, the student is not accepted into the combined program or the MS portion of the program. (The student may apply to the MS via the regular application process.)

5. *Completion of the combined program; modified MS requirements.* Once the student is accepted into the combined program, to complete the program and receive the MS, the student must complete all degree requirements for the MS, with the following modification (in keeping with the established five-year program framework).

Normally, courses taken as an undergraduate at UCR cannot be used to satisfy the MS requirements. For students in the combined program, this constraint is relaxed as follows: up to 12 credits of
coursework that the student took as an undergraduate at UCR may be counted towards the 32-unit elective requirement of the MS. The courses that can be double-counted towards the MS elective requirement are those that are eligible to be counted as a technical elective for the BS requirements.

This modification makes it possible for a student to complete the MS requirements in a single year by taking three courses in each of the Fall, Winter, and Spring terms. (See the sample program below.) However, the student is not required to complete the MS requirements in a single year.

Upon completion of the modified MS requirements, the student receives the MS degree.

2.2 Preliminary admission of incoming freshmen

When a freshman applicant applies for admission to the UCR CS BS program (typically after high school), if s/he meets the criteria below, s/he may also apply for preliminary admission to the combined program:

1. high-school GPA $\geq 3.6$,
2. SAT-I combined score $\geq 1950$,
3. satisfaction of the Entry-Level Writing Requirement before matriculation,
4. ready for MATH 9A or higher.

Preliminary admission status will be granted provided the student meets these requirements and is accepted into the UCR CS BS program. To maintain preliminary admission status, the student must remain an undergraduate CS BS student in good standing with a UCR cumulative GPA of at least 3.4; otherwise the student loses preliminary admission status.

A non-freshman student can apply (or reapply) for preliminary admission status, which will be granted if, throughout the student’s three most recent active terms, the student was an undergraduate CS BS student in good standing with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.4.

Preliminary admission is intended solely to help identify, recruit, and advise UCR CS BS students who are interested in the five-year program. Students apply for full admission to the combined program in junior year, as previously described, whether or not they have preliminary admission status. Preliminary admission status does not alter the requirements for full admission to the combined program.

2.3 Sample program

A combined CS BS + CS MS student could satisfy all course requirements by taking courses as follows: in the first four years, take any set of courses that meets the BS degree requirements (e.g. the default course plan at [http://student.engr.ucr.edu/majors/CS_courseplans.html](http://student.engr.ucr.edu/majors/CS_courseplans.html)); in year five, complete the MS Plan II (Project option) requirements. The MS (Project option) requires 48 units (meeting some specific constraints about area coverage), up to twelve of which can be graduate or undergraduate technical electives. The latter twelve units can be satisfied by double-counting three CS tech electives that were taken in the first four years (and happened to be used for the tech elective requirement for the BS). So, in year five, the remaining 48-12=36 units can be satisfied by taking three appropriate 4-credit graduate courses each quarter. For example:
MS students are also required to take the 1-credit colloquium seminar, CS 287, each quarter they are in residence. MS (Project option) students are further required to complete a project and pass an oral examination.

### 2.4 Catalog entry

Below is the proposed catalog entry. The current catalog entry is on the left; the proposed catalog entry is on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS students are also required to take the 1-credit colloquium seminar, CS 287, each quarter they are in residence. MS (Project option) students are further required to complete a project and pass an oral examination.</th>
<th>2.4 Catalog entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS students are also required to take the 1-credit colloquium seminar, CS 287, each quarter they are in residence. MS (Project option) students are further required to complete a project and pass an oral examination.</td>
<td>Below is the proposed catalog entry. The current catalog entry is on the left; the proposed catalog entry is on the right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combined B.S. + M.S. Five-Year Program

The college offers a combined B.S. + M.S. program in Computer Science designed to lead to a Bachelor of Science degree as well as a Master of Science degree in five years.

Applicants for this program must have a high school GPA above 3.6, a combined SAT Reasoning score above 1950 (or ACT plus Writing equivalent), complete the Entry Level Writing Requirement before matriculation, and have sufficient mathematics preparation to enroll in calculus in their first quarter as freshmen.

Interested students who are entering their junior year should check with their academic advisor for information on eligibility and other details.

3 Projected need, resource requirements, student support

As noted in the introduction, in keeping with the framework established by CEP and Graduate Council, this combined program is primarily a recruitment tool, intended to leverage the increasing interest in graduate education to attract top freshmen into the BS program, and to attract top UCR BS students into the MS program.

In the BS program, it should attract students that are more likely than average to make it through the
program. Combined with ongoing increases in admissions standards, this should increase both retention and the overall quality of the students.

In the MS program, we anticipate growth in combined-program enrollment of only a few students per year. But more rapid growth would be welcome and would not significantly increase overall enrollment in the MS: each student accepted into the MS program via the combined program is likely to be near the top of the applicant pool, and thus to simply displace a less-qualified student from admission into the MS. (In the unlikely event that the number of students applying through the combined program exceeds the number of MS students that the school wants to accept, recall that the department can cap the number of students accepted at the MS level.)

In short, the main effect of the program should be to increase the quality of students in the BS and MS programs, without significantly affecting enrollment levels. Similarly, it should increase the employability of students produced by the BS and MS programs, and help meet the increasing demand for CS students with graduate degrees.

Resources. Note that each student in the combined program is essentially just a regular student (in the BS program, or, in fifth year, in the MS program), and requires the same resources as a regular student at the same level. Also, BS and MS enrollments will not be significantly affected. Thus, the program requires no change in faculty, courses, or resources such as library, computing, equipment, space, etc. Likewise, the program requires no change in levels or mechanisms for student funding.

The program does require minor administrative support. The administration of the program at the undergraduate level requires processing applications for preliminary acceptance, tracking preliminarily enrolled students, and identifying and informing juniors who will be eligible to apply in senior year. These administrative tasks are already being performed by the Admissions Office and the Engineering Student Academic Affairs Office. At the MS level, the college and department will have to track which MS students are in the combined program and account for the double-counting allowance. Appropriate infrastructure for this is already in place.

Finally, only to the extent that existing resources allow, B.S. students with “preliminary admit” status will be given additional advising appropriate for MS-bound students. This is already being done during regular advising activities by the department and by the Engineering Student Academic Affairs Office.

4 Changes in Senate regulations

No changes in Senate regulations are required.

\[4^{\text{Unless the school chooses to use it increase enrollment levels.}}\]
Here are comments received by the CSE department from Graduate Division via email on a previous proposed revision to the CS BS+MS description, from 2010. That draft was based on the Bioengineering BS+MS program description, approved in 2009. These comments point out some of the inconsistencies and omissions in the 2010 document; these inconsistencies and omissions are also (generally) present in the previously approved proposals on which the 2010 proposed revision was based, such as the 2007 CS proposal and the 2009 Bioengineering proposal. The feedback from Graduate Division was a main reasons why we judged that a rewrite of the program description was probably a better option than making line-by-line changes to existing program documents.

Each comment is in italics, followed by our response. Our responses pertain to the proposed revision currently submitted for consideration.

Leah (cs 1): *I fail to see the logic in requiring the students to get 2 letter from faculty in their major. Why would other science faculty not be appropriate to serve as letter writers* (p. 4, part c).

*response:* To address this, the revision allows one letter to be non-departmental. See Section 2.1.

Leah (cs 2): *I am confused about the process for applying to graduate school as outlined on p. 4. Do the students not need to apply via grad SIS and pay the application fee? The wording on p. 4 a-e indicates how a person matriculates as a grad student but is silent on part of the application procedure.*

*response:* The description was missing these details. These are clarified in the revision. See Section 2.1. (They do need to apply. Only the GRE requirement is waived, although it still recommends taking the GRE.)

Vicki Long (cs 1): *The information below needs to go somewhere in the admission process area(s). It’s a bit scattered now but there should be a section on admission requirements. Section 2.6 shows the flow chart with some graduate admission information but the header says: Provisions for Students Not Able to Complete Both Degrees Within Five Years. This is very confusing.*

Matriculation as a graduate student will occur when the following criteria have been met:

a. Official graduate application has been submitted and appropriate application processing fee has been paid.

b. A five-year combined BS/MS degree program student is in good standing.

c. All requirements for the baccalaureate degree are complete.

d. Two letters of recommendation from UCR Academic Senate faculty members in the student’s major.

e. Approval by the relevant graduate program admission committee and subsequent recommendation to the Graduate Division for admission.

f. When the recommendation for admission is reviewed and approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division

*response:* Yes. All of these criteria should be clear now in Section 2.1.

Ken Baerenklau (cs 1): *Same issue regarding double counting of 12 units.*

*response:* I’m not sure what the “same issue” refers to. See the end of Section 2.1 for a careful specification of what double counting is allowed.

Ken (cs 2): *Same issue regarding the opportunity to participate in the honors program seems irrelevant.*
response: We agree. In the revision, mention of the honors program has been dropped.

Ken (cs 3): Page 4: Change "For preliminary admission status as a lower division student" to "upper division student"

response: This section has been rewritten. Hopefully the revision is clearer. Please see Section 2.1.

Ken (cs 4): Same issue regarding instructional resources.

response: This section has been rewritten with a new explanation of the various resources required. Please see the new Section 3.

Ken (cs 5): Same comment regarding clarification of junior admission criteria in the catalog.

response: Hopefully this is clearer now. Please see the new Section 2.1.

Linda Scott (cs 1): Let me begin by stating that combining the two BS/MS programs in one memo is very confusing. I personally would have them redo both. It’s made even more confusing by the fact that Amy included the original proposal for the BS/MS in Computer Science. That program is in operation right now. Usually they only include relevant information when sending over changes. She included the whole thing. The reason she did not send over revised Catalog copy is because there is nothing in the catalog about requirements for the BS/MS program. Kara said students don’t know what the regulations are and they are very confused. They need to put these regulations into the Catalog. The Catalog copy that they included in the Appendix needs to be amended to indicate the number of units that can be double-counted and which courses they can be.

response: This time we are submitting the CS+CS revision independently from the CompEng+CS proposal. (But note that the CE+CS program description in the latter proposal is essentially the same as the CS+CS revision here, so the CE+CS program proposal should probably be considered just after the CS+CS proposed revision.)

For reasons outlined in the summary of changes (see the paragraph with heading “Rewrite”), we ask that the committee please consider the revision in its entirety.

We are also proposing a new and more complete catalog entry that summarizes the program and its requirements. The catalog entry is attached, shown in side-by-side format with the previous catalog entry, as requested.

Linda (cs 2): They are changing the allowable number of units that can be double-counted from 8 to 12. That is in line with other BS/MS programs. They are also changing when they can take the courses that are double-counted. Previously it was their last quarter or two and they are ending that. However it is unclear if those are 100, 200, or 100/200 level units. Page 6 says it is 100 or 200 level. Page 3 says it is 100 level.

response: This is clarified in the new Section 2.1. (There is no longer any restriction on when the courses were taken. Any course that is eligible to be counted as a tech elective for the BS can be double-counted towards the MS electives.)

Linda (cs 3): Under header "2.3 Plans Offered" they state that "Plan II which substitutes two additional courses and a small research project in place of the thesis". First of all, Plan II is the comps plan not thesis plan. I don’t understand what they mean by "substitutes two additional courses". Above this is says that students will not receive GSRs or TAs and on the very next page it says that GSRs are allowed upon the formal commitment from a faculty member to provide such funding.
response: First, the confusing sentence regarding Plan II has been removed. All such details of the program are now specified in the new Section 2.1. See also the new sample program added in Section 2.3.

Second, regarding funding, the revision does not mention funding at all. It treats students in the MS portion of the program the same as regular MS students. (The college and department are never obligated to fund them, but may do so at their discretion on a case-by-case basis, when it suits the needs of the college and the department.) See Sections 2 and 3 of the revision.

Linda (cs 4): On page 4 it says the GRE will be waived. Has Joe or Vicki seen that?

response: This is a feature of all engineering BS+MS programs to date. Although the revision still waives the requirement, we’ve added a recommendation that the student take the GRE anyway in order to keep open the option of receiving funding in the event of later application to the PhD.
RE: Hispanic Studies and CWLR

Sellyna,

We all reviewed these and have no comments. They seem fine.

Linda

On Jan 25, 2012, at 3:39 PM, Sellyna Ehlers wrote:

Dear All:

Attached for your review are program changes from Hispanic Studies and CWLR.

Thanks.

S

Looks fine to us.

Linda

On Jan 6, 2012, at 3:03 PM, Sellyna Ehlers wrote:

Dear All:

Attached for your review are:

1. Department of Dance’s Proposal to fulfill the new Professional Development Requirement
2. Proposed addition to graduate program requirements for the Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Graduate Program

Please return your comments to me by January 20, 2011.

Thanks.

S

From: Anthea Kraut [mailto:antheak@ucr.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 12:06 PM
To: Ken Baerenklau
Cc: Amanda Wong; Linda J Tomko; Katrina Oskie
Subject: Re: Professional development requirement for graduate students

Dear Amanda and Dean Baerenklau,
Attached please find the Department of Dance's proposal to fulfill the new Professional Development Requirement, along with syllabi for the relevant courses. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or if you need anything additional from us at this point.

Thanks so much,
Anthea
Professional Development requirement
Department of Dance
Winter 2012

The PhD in Critical Dance Studies program and the MFA in Experimental Choreography program in the Department of Dance propose to implement the following requirement:

Students in both programs will be **required** to complete:

Dance 301: Seminar in Dance Studies Pedagogy and Professional Development (4) Seminar, 3 hours; consultation, 1 hour. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Prepares students to teach dance studies in an academic setting, and to participate in the dance studies profession. Students create course syllabi, discuss a range of practical teaching and professionalization issues, and develop skills necessary for succeeding in the academic field of dance. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable to a maximum of 8 units.

Note: This is a proposed revision of our existing DNCE 301, which previously focused only on pedagogical issues. A syllabus for the new course, which combines pedagogical and other professionalization issues, is attached.

Students will also have the option of taking two additional courses:

- **Dance 14:** Introduction to Choreography plus two units of Dance 302: Teaching Practicum Currently, this combination of undergraduate and graduate units is a prerequisite for students who will serve as TAs for Dance 5: Introduction to Dance. To fulfill their units of 302, graduate students hold additional meetings with the instructor to focus on different pedagogical issues related to teaching and evaluating movement and choreography in the studio setting. Taken in conjunction with each other, these units help prepare graduate students to teach studio courses.

- **Dance 280:** Colloquium in Current Topics in Dance Research: Taught once each year, the course will feature at least one professionalization session each time it is taught. Professionalization sessions will cover such topics as: grant writing, conference presentations, CV and portfolio development, transforming a paper or dissertation chapter for journal publication, job search strategies.
Proposed Revision to Catalog of DNCE 301 - CRAMS

Current:
DNCE 301. Directed Studies in the Teaching of Dance (4) Seminar, 3 hours; consultation, 1 hour. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. An assessment of the field of dance studies as preparation for organizing and teaching general education courses. Analyzes current anthologies and other dance publications. Students create course syllabi and lesson plans and discuss a range of practical teaching issues. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable to a maximum of 8 units.

Proposed Revision:
DNCE 301: Seminar in Dance Studies Pedagogy and Professional Development (4) Seminar, 3 hours; consultation, 1 hour. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Prepares students to teach dance studies in an academic setting, and to participate in the dance studies profession. Students create course syllabi, discuss a range of practical teaching and professionalization issues, and develop skills necessary for succeeding in the academic field of dance. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable to a maximum of 8 units.
Dance 301:
Seminar in Dance Studies Pedagogy and Professional Development

Spring, 2012
Professor Jacqueline Shea Murphy
Tuesdays 10:10- to 1:00 p.m.

This course prepares students to teach dance studies in an academic setting, and to participate in the dance studies profession. Through assigned readings and discussion, we engage with critical pedagogy theory, consider curricular questions within dance studies, and explore issues related to race, gender, and power in the classroom. Alongside these theoretical issues, the course also provides students with practical experience in designing syllabi, leading classroom discussion, giving lectures, and teaching dance writing and movement analysis. Throughout, we will discuss the state of the field of dance studies, and address practical issues of how to position oneself within it, such as CV design, cover letter writing, grant writing, and conference paper submission.

Because it is collaborative in nature, the course will require students to be open to sharing and exchanging pedagogical ideas, professional development materials, and constructive feedback with one another.

Course is graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC).

Required texts:
Posted on class Blackboard site

Course Requirements:
Attendance: Required in every sense of the word, including active listening, and thoughtful, informed contributions to class discussions. As graduate students, you are expected to attend every class session and to come to class on time. Because of its format, the strength of this course depends largely on your input and the quality of your contributions. To prepare for class each week, you should read the assigned material thoroughly; consider how the readings for that week bear on one another, as well as on readings for previous weeks; and be ready to talk.

Discussion Leadership Exercise: Alone or in pairs (depending on time constraints), you will be required to create and facilitate one 15-20 minute in-class discussion. For this assignment, you should select and prepare a short reading passage (no longer than a page) or short video excerpt (no longer than a few minutes) on any topic of your choosing and design a discussion activity around it that is geared toward undergraduates. The goal is to create a lively and productive discussion that maximizes student participation.

Mini-lecture: Each of you will be expected to design and present a stand-alone 15-minute
lecture on a topic of your choosing. The goal is to create an engaging, clear, and polished lecture with an introduction, body, and conclusion that advances one main argument with several supporting points. You are encouraged but not required to use PowerPoint. You may incorporate visual and/or kinesthetic materials, but these should take up no more than a total of five minutes of your lecture.

**Syllabus Construction:** You are each required to design three separate syllabi for undergraduate courses: one dance history syllabus, one “world dance” or “cross-cultural dance” syllabus, and one dance studies syllabus (however you conceptualize dance studies). A first draft of one of these syllabi must be brought to class on May 1<sup>st</sup>. Use Woolcock, “Constructing a Syllabus” (week 5 reading) to help guide your process. Final drafts of all three syllabi are due on the last day of class, June 2<sup>nd</sup>. Two of these syllabi can remain more partial (course description, required texts, rough schedule of units), but one of them (your choice) must be fully fleshed out (course description and objectives, required texts, assignments, evaluation breakdown, schedule of readings/assignments).

**Professionalization workshops:** You will participate in several workshops designed to prepare you to be part of the dance studies profession. This quarter we will workshop draft copies of your teaching philosophy, Curriculum Vitae, and a sample job application cover letter, and as a class we will examine and analyze publishing venues in the field. You are required to bring copies of these materials to class and be prepared to comment on and offer helpful critique to your peers.

---

**Dance 301**
**Spring, 2012**
**Prof. J. Shea Murphy**

**Week One, April 3**
**Introduction**
Bring to class information about the dance department and curriculum at your ideal job (what academic courses exist, how they fit into the mission of the department). We will look at currently-posted job descriptions in dance studies and discuss the state of the job market and the field.

**Week Two, April 10**
**Critical Pedagogy 1**

**Workshop:** Bring to class a 1-paragraph statement of your teaching philosophy
Week Three, April 17

Critical Pedagogy II

bell hooks, “Embracing Change: Teaching in a Multicultural World,” “Essentialism and Experience” and “Eros, Eroticism, and the Pedagogical Process” from *Teaching to Transgress*


Bring to class: one syllabus from a dance history, world dance, dance studies, or dance appreciation class passed on to you from a colleague, or found online.

Week Four, April 24: Dance History, World Dance, Dance Studies


Professionalization workshop: The CV

Bring to class copies of your CV, designed for your ideal job

Week Five, May 1: Syllabus Construction

Hour one: Mini lecture #1
Student-led discussion


Hour three: Workshop: partial draft of dance history (or similar) syllabus due in class

Week Six, May 8: Online Teaching: Learning Objectives

Hour one: Mini lecture #2
Student-led discussion


Hour three: Professionalization Workshop: The Cover Letter bring draft of cover letter for your ideal job to class.
Week Seven, May 15: Teaching Dance Observation and Writing
Hour one: Mini lecture #3
Student-led discussion
Hour three: Workshop: partial draft of ‘world dance” (or similar) syllabus due in class

Week Eight, May 24: Rubrics, Feedback, Evaluation
Hour one: Mini lecture #4
Student-led discussion
Hour two: bell hooks, “Language: Teaching New Worlds/New Words,” from *Teaching to Transgress*
Discussion of grading issues, feedback, rubrics

Hour three: Workshop: Publication Possibilities. Pick one of the following journals and come to class prepared to present its focus, submission requirements, and evaluation procedures.
- Dance Research Journal
- Dance Discourses
- Women and Performance
- Emispherica
- Theatre Journal
- TDR

Week Nine, May 31:
Hour one: Mini lecture #5
Student-led discussion
Workshop: partial draft of syllabus in your area of interest due in class

Week Ten, June 7:
Hour one: Mini lecture #6 [7, 8 depending on number of students]
Student-led discussion
Final revised syllabi due; one must include course description and learning objectives, required texts, assignments, evaluation breakdown, schedule of readings/assignments and grading rubrics.
### PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences (last reviewed Apr-2002)</td>
<td>March 12 - 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (last reviewed Feb-2003)</td>
<td>Apr 30 - May 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (Internal - first review - Winter 2007)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology (last reviewed May-03)</td>
<td>Jan 12 - 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>March 5 - 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2012/13

- Anthropology (May-2004)
- Art History (Feb-2005)
- Genetics, Genomics & Bioinformatics (Jan-2003)
- History (May-2004)
- Plant Biology (Apr-2005)
- Mechanical Engineering (May-05)

### PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2013/14

- Philosophy (Jan-06)
- Political Science (May-06)
- Management (May-06)
- Chemistry (Apr-06)
- Geological Sciences (Feb-06)
- Physics (May-06)

### PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2014/15

- Management (MA/PhD - 2009/10) - Internal review
- Materials Science & Engineering - (MS/PhD - Fall 2010) - Internal review
- Critical Dance; Experimental Choreography (Mar-07)
- Education (May-07)
- Applied Statistics/Statistics (Mar-07)
- Computer Science (Nov-07)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>MA, MS, PhD</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1965/1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1966/1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>MA, MEd, PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Stat/Statistics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1978/1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution, Ecology &amp; Org</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ Toxicology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; B</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MA, MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Water Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1981/1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DATE OF REVIEW</td>
<td>TEAM REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2007/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Toxicology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2010/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Stud (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves Reviews Scheduled for 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCR GRADUATE COUNCIL - ORDER OF REVIEWS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS - STATUS REPORT
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
As discussed February 10, 2012

To be adopted:

Proposed Changes to Appendix 6 to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Riverside Division of the University of California Academic Senate

PRESENT:

Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside (Approved by Educational Policy on 4-5 June 2005 after consultation with the Graduate Council) (En Nov 04)

PROPOSED:

Academic Integrity for Students at the University of California, Riverside (Approved by Educational Policy on DATE after consultation with the Graduate Council) (En Nov 04)

[no change]

Principles of Academic Integrity

At the University of California, Riverside (UCR) honesty and integrity are fundamental values that guide and inform us as individuals and as a community. The culture of academia requires that each student take responsibility for learning and for products that reflect their intellectual potential, curiosity, and capability. Students must represent themselves truthfully, claim only work that is their own, acknowledge their use of others’ words, research results, and ideas, using the methods accepted by the appropriate academic disciplines and engage honestly in all academic assignments. Anything less than total commitment to honesty circumvents the contract for intellectual enrichment.
that students have with the University to become an educated person, undermines the efforts of the entire academic community, and diminishes the value of an education for everyone, especially for the person who cheats. Both students and faculty are responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the University.

These guidelines establish definitions for academic misconduct and procedures for the adjudication of academic integrity cases by the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP) for undergraduate students and Graduate Division for graduate student cases.

Misunderstanding of appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse for academic misconduct. If a student is in doubt about appropriate academic conduct in a particular situation, he or she should consult with the instructor in the course to avoid the serious charge of academic misconduct.

Types of Academic Misconduct

The following provides definitions of academic misconduct to assist students in developing an understanding of the University’s expectations, recognizing that no set of written guidelines can anticipate all types and degrees of violations of academic integrity. To the extent that these definitions are not exhaustive, duly appointed representatives of the University will judge each case according to its merits.

Academic misconduct is any act that does or could improperly distort student grades or other student academic records.

Cheating. Fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, or using or attempting to use materials, or assisting others in using materials that are prohibited or inappropriate in the context of the academic assignment in question.

Fabrication. Making up data or results and recording or reporting them, including laboratory or field research results. In the context of student academic integrity, this also includes falsifying academic or university documents and providing false information or testimony in connection with
Procedures

Requirements and Expectations

Research
To foster intellectual honesty, schools, departments, and research units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage, and standards for any investigation or hearing under this policy.

Plagiarism. The appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. This includes the copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing (explicitly or implicitly) the work to one’s own efforts. Plagiarism means using another's work without giving credit.

Facilitating academic dishonesty. Assisting another in violating the policy of Academic Integrity, such as taking an exam for another student or providing coursework for another student to turn in as his or her own effort.

Unauthorized collaboration. Working with others without the specific permission of the instructor on assignments that will be submitted for a grade. This applies to in-class or take-home tests, papers, labs, or homework assignments. Students may not collaborate without faculty authorization.

Interference or sabotage. Damaging, removing, or otherwise harming another student’s work or University materials and systems to affect the academic performance of others.

Failure to comply with research regulations such as those applying to human subjects, laboratory animals, and standards of safety.

Retaliation of any kind against a person who reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct and who has not acted in bad faith.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Requirements and Expectations

Research
To foster intellectual honesty with regard to undergraduate research, all academic units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage.
merits and promotions which value quality over quantity.

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of the policies and procedures of the agencies funding his or her research. Copies of relevant policies are available in the Office of Research and will be provided at no cost.

Courses
Faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel are encouraged to include statements addressing academic integrity as part of the syllabus for every course and to educate students about expectations and standards in the context of the course in order that students may not, through ignorance, subject themselves to the charge of academic misconduct. Instructors are further encouraged to inform students of campus resources available for dealing with academic difficulty.

Undergraduate Procedures

Throughout the process of reviewing allegations of academic misconduct, this policy articulates deadlines for action based on calendar days. If the day of a deadline falls on a weekend, holiday, or day the University is otherwise closed, that deadline will be moved to the next day the University is open.

Faculty Actions

In cases of alleged academic integrity violations in research, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should report suspicion of fraudulent or unethical research practice by students immediately to the Chair of the department, Dean of the school or Director of the organized research unit. The report must then be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research who will be responsible for coordinating further actions.

In cases of alleged academic integrity violations in undergraduate research, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should report suspicion of fraudulent or unethical research practice by students, including but not limited to undergraduate student researcher employees, immediately to the Chair of the department, Dean of the school or Director of the organized research unit. The report must then be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Research who will be responsible for coordinating further actions.
If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, she or he must communicate with the student regarding the alleged act of misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based within 30 business days of discovery of the alleged act. Under special circumstances, the instructor may make a request for an extension of time through the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. Whenever possible, the communication should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects each student's privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When a meeting is not possible or practical, an instructor may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication will be sent by U.S. mail to the address most recently filed with the Registrar's Office, or to the student's University e-mail address. When multiple students are involved, faculty members are encouraged to communicate with each student separately.

An instructor may request the assistance of the Ombudsperson or a member of the Student Judicial Affairs staff to be present at the conference to assist in a fair and focused discussion about what may have occurred.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 business days to respond.

After conferring with the student and/or considering the student's written response, the instructor will determine whether it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct. In making this determination, the instructor will pay attention not to whether the student meant to engage in misconduct, but whether the misconduct occurred. The instructor may then follow up with one of the following

If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, she or he must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged act of misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based within 30 calendar days of discovery of the alleged act. Under special circumstances, the instructor may make a request for an extension of time through the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution. If the discovery is made by a teaching assistant, reader, grader, or tutor, he or she should immediately communicate to the Faculty member in charge of the course, so that the Faculty member in charge can proceed with the investigation.

Whenever possible, the communication should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects each student's privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When a meeting is not possible or practical, an instructor may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication will be sent to the student's University e-mail address. When multiple students are involved, faculty members are encouraged to communicate with each student separately.

The Faculty member or the student may request the assistance of the Ombudsperson at the conference to assist in a fair and focused discussion about what may have occurred.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 14 calendar days to respond.

After conferring with the student and/or considering the student's written response, the faculty member may determine there has been no misconduct, in which case she or he may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

If the faculty member determines that it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct, regardless of the student’s
actions:

A. In cases where the instructor determines that there is no misconduct, s/he may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

B. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor may impose an appropriate academic sanction, taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and pre-meditation of the misconduct.

Actions taken must be documented through the Academic Misconduct Referral form, or a referral memo to Student Judicial Affairs, the central location where all records of incidents of academic dishonesty are kept on file. It is essential that the form or referral memo include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge, and the academic sanctions assigned.

C. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to Student Judicial Affairs. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (except where prohibited by law), and the academic sanctions recommended. Faculty are encouraged to forward a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course. Faculty are further encouraged to evaluate the assignment or examination on its merits and to make note of the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the intent to engage in misconduct, the instructor may then pursue one of the following actions:

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor may impose an appropriate academic sanction, taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student’s experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and pre-meditation of the misconduct. These admissions of guilt and the sanction the instructor imposes are final.

Actions taken must be documented through the Academic Misconduct Referral form, or a referral memo to SCAIP, the central location where all records of incidents of academic dishonesty are kept on file. It is essential that the form or referral memo include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge, and the academic sanctions assigned.

B. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to SCAIP. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken by the instructor, all original documentation supporting the charge (except where prohibited by law), and the academic sanctions recommended. Faculty members are encouraged to forward a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course. Faculty are further encouraged to evaluate the assignment or examination on its merits and to make note of the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the
University's policies or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

**Instructors who are in part-time or temporary appointments or who will be on sabbatical or other leave or who will be leaving the University are required to** provide a copy of all documentation to the Department Chair, who will serve as a proxy for the instructor if s/he is unavailable to participate fully in resolving the allegations of misconduct.

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the faculty member will assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay 'GD' pending the outcome of the process.

**Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the immediate supervising administrator: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.**

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member is expected to assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.

The Faculty member is encouraged to evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and to note the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

**D. Violations that the instructor believes to be particularly egregious shall be referred directly to the College Academic Integrity Committee in the instructor's College for review.**

**C. Violations that the instructor believes to be particularly egregious shall be referred directly to the School or College Academic Integrity Committee in the instructor's School or College for review.**

Course Drops and Withdrawals 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. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied. The student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course with a grade of "W".

The student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to request a withdrawal from the course with a grade of "W" using Undergraduate Enrollment Adjustment Procedures.
III. Administrative Actions

Research
The Associate Dean for Research, in consultation with the original recipient of the report, will review the description of the academic misconduct and documentation supporting the charge and determine if unethical conduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation following the guidelines outlined in UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the Office of Research Affairs website at [http://www.ora.ucr.edu/ORA/announce/integrit.htm](http://www.ora.ucr.edu/ORA/announce/integrit.htm). In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with existing procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses.

Courses

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, Student Judicial Affairs, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form, will follow up with the student in writing to formally advise the student of the academic sanctions assigned by the instructor as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 15 business days of the review; and communicated to the instructor, college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

Students with a record of previous academic misconduct will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in their College for a formal hearing, with a recommendation that suspension or dismissal be considered.

II. Administrative Actions

Research
The Vice Chancellor for Research, in consultation with the original recipient of the report, will review the description of the academic misconduct and documentation supporting the charge and determine if unethical conduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation following the guidelines outlined in UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the Office of Research Affairs website at [http://www.ora.ucr.edu/ORA/announce/integrit.htm](http://www.ora.ucr.edu/ORA/announce/integrit.htm). In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with existing procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses.

Courses

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, SCAIP, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form, will follow up with the student in writing to formally advise the student of the academic sanctions assigned by the instructor as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the review; and communicated to the instructor, school or college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

Students with a record of previous academic misconduct will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in their School or College for a formal hearing (Review Stage 2) hearing, with a recommendation that suspension or dismissal be considered.
B. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, upon receipt of an Academic Misconduct Referral Form from an instructor, Student Judicial Affairs will notify the student of the University Policy that was allegedly violated; the factual basis for the charges; and the right to be assisted by an advisor of choice or an attorney (at his or her own expense) and ask the student to schedule an Administrative Review. Within 15 working days of the referral of the matter to the SJA, notification will be sent to the student by U.S. mail to the address most recently filed with the Registrar's Office, or to the student's University e-mail address.

Whenever possible an Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

1. Review Stage 1, Administrative Review, process:

The Administrative Review conducted by SCAIP involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If SCAIP deems it necessary, the Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.
The review will:
* explain fully the alleged violation of the Standards of Conduct
* review written materials associated with the alleged misconduct
* give the student and the instructor the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the incident
* address how the student's alleged conduct was judged, why the behavior is unacceptable, the impact of conduct on others in the community, causes and motives of the conduct, and alternatives for balancing personal circumstances with needs and expectations of the community

2. Outcome of the Administrative Review:

If SCAIP determines it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic sanctions recommended by the faculty member as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions will be assigned taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and premeditation of the misconduct.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 15 business days of the review and communicated to the instructor, college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the instructor has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Administrative Review, the instructor shall submit a final grade with the Registrar that is consistent with the decision of SCAIP as to the question of misconduct.

3. Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1.

Academic Integrity Committees, described in Section C function as the appellate bodies for decisions made at Review Stage 1. Section E below more fully explains appeal procedures.
In the event that Student Judicial Affairs receives an allegation of academic misconduct by a student who previously has been charged and found responsible for academic misconduct or encounters a case that is sufficiently complex to require additional consultation, the case will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in the instructor's College, with the request that the case be resolved through a formal hearing.

IV. Academic Integrity Committees

College Academic Integrity Committees
An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each College and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools to:

* hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs
* hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs

In the Spring quarter, the on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE faculty, 4 AGSM faculty, 2 GSOE faculty, 6 CHASS faculty and 6 CNAS faculty to the panels to serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30.

Four to six full-time undergraduate students, and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30.

C. Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by SCAIP for a Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school for a formal hearing.

1. Review Stage 2, College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of School or College to:

* hear cases referred by SCAIP that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or SCAIP
* consider appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by SCAIP

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint four faculty members from BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS to the undergraduate Academic Integrity Committees for each college/school to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. Each committee should include faculty who are available to participate in hearings during the summer months.

In addition, SCAIP will solicit and review applications from interested undergraduate and graduate students and make recommendations to the Associated Students of UCR and Graduate Student Association regarding students to be appointed to serve on each college/school committee for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before SCAIP. (Am 20 February 07)
In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committees will be provided by the office of the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution, the office of the AVC/Dean of Students, and SCAIP.

The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members. (Am 20 February 07)

2. Hearing Panels

SCAIP will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. A quorum of the committee consists of three persons, with at least one faculty member and one student for School or College Committees. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee.

The purpose of an Academic Integrity Committee Hearing is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a hearing is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A hearing is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

The Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee.
designee will serve as a non-voting to facilitate the hearing. The shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony. An Academic Integrity Committee Hearing will normally proceed as follows:

3. Hearing Procedures

A. Committee members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the instructor, the University, and the student.

B. will ask all present at the hearing to introduce themselves for the record. The will invite committee members to disqualify themselves from participation in the hearing if they believe for any reason that they cannot render a just and fair decision and will invite the student to request that a member be disqualified as a result of prior involvement in the case or if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a committee member cannot render a just and fair decision.

C. The charges shall be read aloud and the student shall be asked to respond to the charges by accepting responsibility, accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or denying responsibility for the alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

D. The faculty member and the student will be given the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct.

E. Committee members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the faculty member, the student, and witnesses.
F. Upon conclusion of this discussion, party will be asked if there is any additional information needed or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

G. All parties will be required to leave the room while the Committee deliberates. After its discussion, the Committee will decide if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violations of University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

H. If the student is found to be responsible for violations of the Policy, the Committee shall be informed of the student's prior record to determine whether the student has been found responsible for previous academic misconduct. Based on this information, the Committee will determine the sanction(s) to be assigned, how and for how long the record of the sanction will be maintained on the student's permanent record, and the conditions that must be met for the record to be removed, if any. In the event that the Committee determines that dismissal is warranted for a graduate student, this determination must be framed as a recommendation and forwarded to the Dean of the Graduate Division for review and approval.

I. Once the Committee has reached a decision on the sanction(s), the Chair will ask the parties involved to return to the room, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within fifteen business days, the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee will mail notification to the student and instructor, and college or division detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the Committee and outlining the appeal process.

A tape recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations, shall be made and retained in Student Judicial Affairs as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for five years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter. The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense.
expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

1. The Academic Integrity Committee for the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences shall address violations associated with Business Administration faculty and undergraduate students as articulated in these procedures. The Academic Integrity Committee for Graduate/Professional Schools shall address alleged violations by credential and graduate students in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, the School of Education, and the School of Management.

Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee

One faculty member and one student from the Academic Integrity Committee in each College will make up a Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will:

* review, on an annual basis, cases addressed through instructors and Student Judicial Affairs; to provide oversight and direction and to ensure that policies and procedures are appropriate and properly applied
* hear appeals of primary/non-appellate decisions and sanctions of a College Academic Integrity Committee

E. Appeals

1. Channels for Appeals

Stage 1 Review decisions made by SCAIP may be appealed through the School or College Academic Integrity Committee in the faculty member’s School or College. Appellate decisions of a School or College Academic Integrity Committee are final.

4. Students may appeal the decision of Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committees in writing to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee.

The Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his designee shall select one faculty member and one student from each Academic Integrity Committee to serve as the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee for undergraduates. The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee also serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for undergraduate students. The Executive Committee will also review, on an annual basis, cases addressed by SCAIP and Academic Integrity Committee actions to provide oversight and direction and to ensure that policies and procedures are appropriate and properly applied.
Primary decisions of a College Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions of the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

Stage 2 Review decisions made by a School or College Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions of the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

2. Criteria for Appeals

Appeals must be based on one or more of the following:

* New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
* Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
* Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny one of the parties a fair hearing
* Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges

3. Appeal Procedures

* The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 14 calendar days after the written decision is made available. Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.
* The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided, but interim action may be taken as determined by the Chair of the hearing. Grades or degrees may be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.
* When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The Committee will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicator or adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicator or
adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

The Committee will make a decision based on the written submissions within fifteen (15) business days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

The Committee may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the faculty member, and Student Judicial Affairs, within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appeal committee is final.

F. Maintenance Of Records

Student Judicial Affairs shall serve as the central location where all written, tape recorded, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept on file. The records will be readily available for review by the Deans and Associate Deans of each College, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained by the Student Judicial Affairs for a period of at least five years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Assistant Provost for Conflict Resolution. When, as a result of a violation of the Standards of Conduct, a student is suspended, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

* The appellate body will make a decision based on the written submissions within 20 calendar days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

* The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the faculty member, SCAIP, and/or the original adjudicating body within 20 calendar days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appellate body is final.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained by the SCAIP for a period of at least seven years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. When a student is suspended as a result of a violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed as a result of a violation of this policy, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.
GRADUATE STUDENTS

1. Requirements and Expectations in Research

To foster intellectual honesty with regard to graduate student research, all academic units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of authorship or credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage.

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of the policies and procedures of the agencies funding research. Relevant policies are posted on the UCR Office of Research website.

2. Allegations of Misconduct in Research

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

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the research misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge. He/she will determine, together with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, if
misconduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation, following the guidelines outlined in the UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the UCR Office of Research website. In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause with respect to research misconduct to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses, as outlined below, beginning with Review Stage 1.

3. Requirements and Expectations in Courses

Instructional personnel responsible for courses (herein referred to as Faculty) are encouraged to include statements addressing academic integrity as part of the syllabus for every course and to educate students about expectations and standards of the course in order that students may not, through ignorance, subject themselves to the charge of academic misconduct. Faculty are further encouraged to inform students of campus resources available for dealing with academic difficulty.

4. Allegations of Misconduct in Courses

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td>• Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the student regarding suspected misconduct and documentation of actions via the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td>• Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 2</td>
<td>• Graduate Academic Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|
4.1 Initiation of Cases

If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. If the discovery is made by a student, teaching assistant, reader, grader or tutor he or she should immediately communicate to the Faculty member in charge of the course, so that the Faculty member in charge can proceed with the investigation.

Whenever possible, communication with the student should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects the student's privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When multiple students are involved, Faculty are encouraged to communicate with each student separately. The Faculty member or the student may request the presence at the consultation meeting of the Ombudsperson.

When an in-person meeting is not possible, the Faculty member may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication should be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 calendar days to respond.
After conferring with the student and/or considering the student's written response, the Faculty member may determine that there has been no misconduct, in which case the Faculty member may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

If the Faculty member determines that it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct, regardless of the student’s intent to engage in misconduct, the case moves to Stage 1 in the review process.

Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., Individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the immediate supervising administrator: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member should assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.

4.1.1 Student Admits Responsibility

If the student admits responsibility for the alleged misconduct, the Faculty member may immediately impose an appropriate academic sanction. The faculty member must document the case and the sanction on the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral form and send the form to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. Faculty members are advised to consult with the Graduate Advisor for the student's program and with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to imposing the academic sanction.

4.1.2 Student Does Not Admit Responsibility

If the student does not admit responsibility but the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct, the Faculty member will refer the case to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs using the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The referral form must include the
student’s name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (including a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course) and the academic actions and disciplinary sanctions recommended by the Faculty member. Faculty members are advised to consult with the Graduate Advisor for the student’s program and with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to recommending sanctions.

The Faculty member also will evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and note the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will notify the student of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline that was allegedly violated, the factual basis for the charges, and the plan to conduct an Initial [Administrative] Review of the case. The student will be advised that the Initial [Administrative] Review is intended as a thorough exposition of all related facts and written materials associated with the alleged misconduct, and that it is not intended as an adversarial criminal or civil legal proceeding. The student will also be informed of his or her right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice. Such written notification will occur within 20 calendar days of the receipt of the referral by the Associate Dean and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

A student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. 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. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will
be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course in accordance with campus regulations.

4.2 Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review

The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If the Associate Dean deems it necessary, a joint meeting will be scheduled at a time when both the Faculty member and the student can attend. If the Faculty member is unavailable for a timely Initial [Administrative] Review, the immediate supervising administrator will be asked to serve in place of the Faculty member.

4.2.1 Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review

If the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs determines that it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic actions recommended by the Faculty member, as well as any disciplinary sanctions imposed by the University, will be assigned.

The determination shall be forwarded by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the Initial [Administrative] Review; notice will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address and communicated to the Faculty member and to the dean of the college/school in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the Faculty member has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Initial [Administrative] Review, he or she shall submit a final grade to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs as to the question of misconduct.
Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs for a Stage 2 review by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

4.3 Review Stage 2: Complex Cases and Appeals from Stage 1

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex or egregious to require additional consultation by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1. Appellate decisions at Review Stage 2 are final.

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint faculty to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31, and will appoint one faculty member from the GAIC to serve as chair. The GAIC will consist of at least one member from each school and at least two members from each college and should include faculty who are available to participate in hearing during the summer months.

In addition, the Graduate Division will solicit and review applications from interested graduate students and make recommendations to the Graduate Student Association of UCR regarding students to be appointed to serve on the GAIC for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before the Graduate Division, GAIC, or Graduate Council.

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committee will be provided by the Graduate Division.
4.3.1 Hearing Panels

For each Stage 2 case, the chair of the GAIC will schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

The Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs or designee will serve as a non-voting member of the hearing panel. The chair of the hearing panel shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony.

4.3.2 Hearing Procedures

1. Preparation: Prior to the hearing, panel members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the Faculty member, the University, and the student.

2. Introductory comments: At the beginning of the hearing, the chair will ask any panel members to disqualify themselves from participation if they believe that they cannot render a just and fair decision, and will permit the student to request that a member be disqualified if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a panel member cannot render a just and fair decision. If a student or Faculty member of the hearing panel is disqualified, another member will be appointed to fill the same role, if needed for a quorum. The chair will read aloud the charges of academic misconduct, and the student will be asked to respond to the charges by (a) accepting responsibility, (b) accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or (c)
denying responsibility for the alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

3. Presentation of accounts: The Faculty member and the student will be given the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and to present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct. Hearing panel members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the Faculty member, the student, and witnesses. Each party will then be asked if there is additional information needed, or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

4. Deliberation: The hearing panel will deliberate in private to decide, by a majority vote, if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violation of University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

5. Determination of sanctions: If the student is found to be responsible for violations of policies, the hearing panel shall be informed of the student’s prior record of academic misconduct. Based on this information and the recommendation of the faculty member, the committee will determine the disciplinary sanctions to be assigned, how and for how long the record of the sanctions will be maintained on the student’s permanent record, and the conditions that must be met for the record to be removed, if any.

6. Notification of decision: Once the
hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will send written notification to the student, the Faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.

7. Records: An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained by the Graduate Division as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for seven years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter (see Section 6 below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

4.4 Review Stage 3: Appeals from Stage 2 and Annual Assessment of Cases

Review Stage 3 is reserved for appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2, and for annual assessment of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2. For each Stage 3 case, the Chair of the Graduate Council or designee shall select a 3-5 member subcommittee of the Graduate Council to
serve as an appeal panel. Each Stage 3 hearing will be conducted according to the Hearing Procedures described above in Section 4.3.2.

The Graduate Council additionally conducts annual assessments of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2 for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

5. Appeals

Decisions of the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs may be appealed to the GAIC. Appellate decisions by the GAIC are final. Primary decisions of the GAIC may be appealed to the Graduate Council. Appellate decisions by the Graduate Council are final. In any decision that includes a sanction of dismissal of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter.

5.1 Criteria for Appeals

Appeals must be based on one or more of the following:

- New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
- Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
- Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny one of the parties a fair hearing
- Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges

5.2 Appeal Procedures

1. The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 10 calendar days after the written decision is made available.

2. Appeals must be authored and signed
by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.

3. The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided. Grades or degrees will be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

4. When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal within 10 calendar days and will be given an opportunity to submit a written statement for consideration within 20 calendar days.

5. The appellate body will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

6. The appellate body will make a decision based on the written submissions within 20 calendar days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

7. The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the Faculty member, and the original adjudicating body within 20 calendar days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of
the appellate body is final.

6. **Maintenance of Records**

Graduate Division shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept on file. The records will be readily available for review by the Deans and Associate Deans of each College or School, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution, in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained for a period of at least seven years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. When a student is suspended as a result of a violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

Comparing Undergraduate and Graduate Procedures

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review of incidents covered here. The steps are the same for undergraduate students and graduate students, with the exception that different investigation bodies will participate in the reviews.

[Please insert table here, all new text]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsible Body:</strong> Undergraduate Students</th>
<th><strong>Responsible Body:</strong> Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Initiation of Cases**  
• Faculty member’s suspicion of misconduct in a course, communication with student, and determination of outcome  
• Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1 | Faculty member | Faculty member |
| **Review Stage 1**  
• Administrative Review | Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP] | Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division] |
| **Review Stage 2**  
• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct  
• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1 | Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs]  
Hearing panels constituted from the AICs | Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]  
Hearing panels constituted from the GAIC |
| **Review Stage 3**  
• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 & 2  
• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 | Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee | Graduate Council |
JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed changes to the policy on academic integrity will:

- move responsibility for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by graduate students from the Academic Integrity Committees of the Colleges and Schools to the Graduate Division and Graduate Council. Enabling changes have been made to the undergraduate portion of the document to indicate separate processes for undergraduate and graduate academic misconduct investigations and hearings. The rationales for these changes are as follows:
  
  (a) The current process for Graduate students is sometimes varied as it is not clearly detailed, and the penalties are not always consistent or appropriate. The revised policy introduces an academic integrity policy designed specifically for graduate students.

  (b) Graduate students should be held to different (higher) standards than undergraduate students, but we have seen graduate cases adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies.

  (c) The current process seriously limits the ability of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council to oversee graduate academic integrity. Currently, the Graduate Dean may only modify a conduct decision if it is a recommendation for dismissal and the Graduate Council has no role. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the current policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office. The proposed policy moves responsibility to the Graduate Dean’s office, makes the Graduate Council the final appellate body, and gives the Graduate Council oversight of the process through the annual review of cases.

  (d) There have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has not happened very often, we think it is inappropriate. The proposed policy eliminates such situations.

  (e) Student Conduct has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Although they work hard to adjudicate cases efficiently, both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing them to focus on the undergraduate cases.

- add definitions of student academic misconduct to the body of the policy. These are currently provided in an auxiliary document. These proposed changes highlight the definitions for students.

- tie deadlines for actions and reporting at various stages in resolution of academic integrity cases to calendar days rather than business days, which will clarify deadlines and ease their calculation. Often these changes also extend the number of days allowed (e.g., a change from 15 business days to 20 calendar days). The longer timeframe is required to allow for follow up communications or interviews that may need to occur with the student(s) involved, course faculty and possible witnesses, depending on the complexity of the case. A similar change was made for non-academic cases several years ago based on an Audit & Advisory Services review and recommendation that our policy accurately reflect our practice.

- clarify that the policy refers to academic integrity issues arising among students. Faculty academic integrity issues are addressed elsewhere, including the UCR Office of Research Policy.
and Procedures for Responding To Allegations of Research Misconduct (Policy#: 529-900), Appendix 5 to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Riverside Division (i.e., APM-015 and APM-016), and APM-190 Appendix B

- strengthen the articulation of the appeal process to ensure that only the faculty-led Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee may modify the decisions of the School or College Academic Integrity Committees.

- update the names of relevant administrative units, including the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (formerly Student Judicial Affairs) and the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution (formerly the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution). Revisions reflect technological changes at the University, primarily the expanded use of e-mail and digital audio recording in lieu of mail delivered by post or audio tape.

- provide readers with more subject headings to clarify the process of review.

The original policy was developed by Committee on Educational Policy in active consultation with the Assistant Vice Chancellor & Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct. These Student Affairs colleagues are interested and available to participate in discussion of proposed revision.

**APPROVALS:**

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

Reviewed by the Executive Council:
Sources for definitions

Cheating; UCB, http://campuslife.berkeley.edu/conduct/integrity/definition

Fabrication; From research policy http://or.ucr.edu/about/policies-ucr.aspx Effective 11/1/06, and current UCR definitions document

Plagiarism; From research policy http://or.ucr.edu/about/policies-ucr.aspx

Facilitating; UCSC, http://undergraduate.ucsc.edu/acd_integrity/definitions.html


Interference; compiled from current UCR definitions document

Failure to comply; current UCR definitions document

Retaliation; current UCR definitions document
Proposed Changes to
Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside:
Policies for Graduate Students and Post Doctoral Researchers

University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, Section 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline states,
"Chancellors may impose discipline for the commission or attempted commission (including aiding or abetting in the commission or attempted commission) of the following types of violations by students...:

102.1 All forms of academic misconduct including but not limited to cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, or facilitating academic dishonesty.

102.2 Other forms of dishonesty including but not limited to fabricating information, furnishing false information, or reporting a false emergency to the University."

1. Requirements and Expectations in Research

To foster intellectual honesty with regard to graduate student research, all academic units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of authorship or credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage.

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of the policies and procedures of the agencies funding research. Relevant policies are posted on the UCR Office of Research website.

2. Allegations of Misconduct in Research

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

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the academic research misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge.
He/she will determine, together with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in the Graduate Division, if misconduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation, following the guidelines outlined in the UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the UCR Office of Research website. In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause with respect to research misconduct to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses, as outlined below, beginning with Review Stage 1.

3. Requirements and Expectations in Courses

Instructional personnel responsible for courses (herein referred to as Faculty) are encouraged to include statements addressing academic integrity as part of the syllabus for every course and to educate students about expectations and standards of the course in order that students may not, through ignorance, subject themselves to the charge of academic misconduct. Faculty are further encouraged to inform students of campus resources available for dealing with academic difficulty.

4. Allegations of Misconduct in Courses

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation of Cases</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the student regarding suspected misconduct and documentation of actions via the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Initiation of Cases
If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the Associate Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution/Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. If the discovery is made by a student, teaching assistant, reader, grader or tutor he or she should immediately communicate to the Faculty member in charge of the course, so that the Faculty member in charge can proceed with the investigation.

Whenever possible, communication with the student should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects the student’s privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When multiple students are involved, Faculty are encouraged to communicate with each student separately. The Faculty member or the student may request the presence at the consultation meeting of the Ombudsperson.

When an in-person meeting is not possible, the Faculty member may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication should be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 calendar days to respond.

After conferring with the student and/or considering the student’s written response, the Faculty member may determine that there has been no misconduct, in which case the Faculty member may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

If the Faculty member determines that it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct, regardless of the student’s intent to engage in misconduct, the case moves to Stage 1 in the review process.

Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., Individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the immediate supervising administrator: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member should assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.
4.1.1 Student Admits Responsibility

If the student admits responsibility for the alleged misconduct, the Faculty member may immediately impose an appropriate academic sanction. The faculty member must document the case and the sanction on the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral form and send the form to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. Faculty members are advised to consult with their Graduate Program Advisor for the student's program and with the Graduate Division Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to imposing the academic sanction.

4.1.2 Student Does Not Admit Responsibility

If the student does not admit responsibility but the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct, the Faculty member will refer the case to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs using the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The referral form must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (including a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course) and the academic actions and disciplinary administrative sanctions recommended by the Faculty member. Faculty members are advised to consult with their Graduate Program Advisor for the student's program and with the Graduate Division Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to recommending sanctions.

The Faculty member also will evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and note the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will notify the student of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline that was allegedly violated, the factual basis for the charges, and the plan to conduct an Initial [Administrative] Review of the case. The student will be advised that the Initial [Administrative] Review is intended as a thorough exposition of all related facts and written materials associated with the alleged misconduct, and that it is not intended as an adversarial criminal or civil legal proceeding. The student will also be informed of his or her right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice. Such written notification will occur within 20 calendar days of the receipt of the referral by the Associate Dean and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

A student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. A student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from
4.2 Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review

The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If the Associate Dean deems it necessary, a joint meeting will be scheduled at a time when both the Faculty member and the student can attend. If the Faculty member is unavailable for a timely Initial [Administrative] Review, the immediate supervising administrator will be asked to serve in place of the Faculty member.

4.2.1 Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review

If the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs determines that it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic actions recommended by the Faculty member, as well as any administrative disciplinary sanctions imposed by the University, will be assigned.

The determination shall be forwarded by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the Initial [Administrative] Review; notice will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address and communicated to the Faculty member and to the dean of the college/school in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the Faculty member has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Initial [Administrative] Review, he or she shall submit a final grade to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs as to the question of misconduct.

Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs for a Stage 2 review by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

A student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. 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. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied.
grade will be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course in accordance with campus regulations.

4.3 Review Stage 2: Complex Cases and Appeals from Stage 1

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex or egregious to require additional consultation by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1. Appellate decisions at Review Stage 2 are final.

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint faculty to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31, and will appoint one faculty member from the GAIC to serve as chair. The GAIC will consist of at least one member from each school and at least two members from each college and should include faculty who are available to participate in hearing during the summer months.

In addition, the Graduate Division will solicit and review applications from interested graduate students and make recommendations to the Graduate Student Association of UCR regarding students to be appointed to serve on the GAIC for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before the Graduate Division, GAIC, or Graduate Council.

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committee will be provided by the Graduate Division.

4.3.1 Hearing Panels

For each Stage 2 case, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, in consultation with the chair of the GAIC, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

The Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel. The chair of the hearing panel shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony.

4.3.2 Hearing Procedures
1. Preparation: Prior to the hearing, panel members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the Faculty member, the University, and the student.

2. Introductory comments: At the beginning of the hearing, the chair will ask any panel members to disqualify themselves from participation if they believe that they cannot render a just and fair decision, and will permit the student to request that a member be disqualified if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a panel member cannot render a just and fair decision. If a student or Faculty member of the hearing panel is disqualified, another member will be appointed to fill the same role, if needed for a quorum. The chair will read aloud the charges of academic misconduct, and the student will be asked to respond to the charges by (a) accepting responsibility, (b) accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or (c) denying responsibility for the alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

3. Presentation of accounts: The Faculty member and the student will be given the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and to present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct. Hearing panel members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the Faculty member, the student, and witnesses. Each party will then be asked if there is additional information needed, or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

4. Deliberation: The hearing panel will deliberate in private to decide, by a majority vote, if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violation of University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

5. Determination of sanctions: If the student is found to be responsible for violations of policies, the hearing panel shall be informed of the student’s prior record of academic misconduct. Based on this information and the recommendation of the faculty member, the committee will determine the disciplinary sanctions to be assigned, how and for how long the record of the sanctions will be maintained on the student’s permanent record, and the conditions that must be met for the record to be removed, if any.

6. Notification of decision: Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will send written notification to the student, the Faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the
college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.

7. Records: An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained by the Graduate Division as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for seven years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter (see Section 6 below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

4.4 Review Stage 3: Appeals from Stage 2 and Annual Assessment of Cases

Review Stage 3 is reserved for appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2, and for annual assessment of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2. For each Stage 3 case, the Chair of the Graduate Council or designee shall select a 3-5 member subcommittee of the Graduate Council to serve as an appeal panel. Each Stage 3 hearing will be conducted according to the Hearing Procedures described above in Section 4.3.2.

The Graduate Council additionally conducts annual assessments of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2 for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

5. Appeals

Decisions of the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs may be appealed to the GAIC. Appellate decisions by the GAIC are final. Primary decisions of the GAIC may be appealed to the Graduate Council. Appellate decisions by the Graduate Council are final. In any decision that includes a sanction of dismissal of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter.

5.1 Criteria for Appeals

Appeals must be based on one or more of the following:

- New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
- Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
• Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny one of the parties a fair hearing
• Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges

5.2 Appeal Procedures

1. The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 10 calendar days after the written decision is made available.

2. Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.

3. The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided. Grades or degrees will be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

4. When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal as soon it has been received by the appropriate appellate body and will be given an opportunity to submit a written statement for consideration during the appeal process within 20 calendar days.

5. The appellate body will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

6. The appellate body will make a decision based on the written submissions within 20 calendar days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

7. The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the Faculty member, and the original adjudicating body within 20 calendar days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appellate body is final.

6. Maintenance of Records

Graduate Division shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept on file. The records
will be readily available for review by the Deans and Associate Deans of each College or School, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution, in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained for a period of at least seven years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. When a student is suspended as a result of a violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed policy moves responsibility for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by graduate students from the Academic Integrity Committees of the Colleges and Schools (i.e., SCAIP) to the Graduate Division and Graduate Council. Enabling changes have been made to the existing academic integrity policy to indicate separate processes for undergraduate and graduate academic misconduct investigations and hearings.

The rationales for these changes are as follows:

- The current process for Graduate students is sometimes varied as it is not clearly detailed, and the penalties are not always consistent or appropriate. The revised policy introduces an academic integrity policy designed specifically for graduate students.

- Graduate students should be held to different (higher) standards than undergraduate students, but we have seen graduate cases adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies.

- The current process seriously limits the ability of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council to oversee graduate academic integrity. Currently, the Graduate Dean may only modify a conduct decision if it is a recommendation.
for dismissal. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the current policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office. The proposed policy moves responsibility to the Graduate Dean’s office, makes the Graduate Council the final appellate body, and gives the Graduate Council oversight of the process through the annual review of cases.

- There have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has not happened very often, we think it is inappropriate. The proposed policy eliminates such situations.

- Student Conduct has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Although they work hard to adjudicate cases efficiently, both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing them to focus on the undergraduate cases.

There are several rationales for this policy change. First, SCAIP has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Therefore both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing SCAIP to focus on the undergraduate cases. SCAIP is supportive of this new workload allocation. Second, there have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has happened infrequently, the Graduate Council finds it to be inappropriate. Under the proposed policy, such situations will be avoided. Third, the Graduate Council believes that graduate students should be held to different (higher) academic integrity standards than undergraduate students, but some graduate cases have been adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. This may be due to the “anchoring effect” created by the vast majority of conduct cases being undergraduate cases. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies. Fourth, the current policy limits the ability of the Graduate Dean, who is ultimately responsible for graduate academic affairs, to oversee graduate academic integrity. The current policy provides very little scope for the Graduate Dean to modify a conduct decision unless it is a recommendation for dismissal. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the current policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office.
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FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: CEP POLICY/PROCEDURE FOR DISCONTINUATIONS, MERGERS, Splits OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Attached for your review is a new policy from Committee on Educational Policy regarding the policy/procedure for discontinuations, mergers, splits of undergraduate programs at UCR. I am also attaching the current regulation that was approved in 1980.

Please return your comments to me by April 2, 2012.
PREAMBLE

The ultimate decision to recommend the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of an academic program resides with the Academic Senate of the campus and that of a unit resides with the Chancellor. In the context of these procedures, a program is defined as a course of study leading to a degree, and a unit is a school, college, department, or division within a department, school, or college. If such a decision is to be judicious it can be made only after consultation with, and upon the advice of, the faculty, the students, the Chairperson of the program and/or the Chairperson of the academic unit in which the program is housed, the Executive Committee and the Dean of the college or school that administers the program, and the appropriate committees of the Academic Senate. If transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of a graduate program or unit is under consideration, the Graduate Dean, in addition to the foregoing agencies, should be consulted.

PROCEDURES FOR TRANSFER, CONSOLIDATION, DISESTABLISHMENT, OR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM, OR UNIT

Regardless of the origin of the initial recommendation for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance, the Senate feels that deliberations by, and consultation with, the abovementioned agencies of the campus must occur prior to the final decision by the Academic Senate in the case of programs or by the Chancellor in the case of units. To assure that such consultation has taken place, the following procedures are established.

Some units may administer more than one program (e.g., a graduate and an undergraduate program in one department; a program in a specific language and the program in Comparative Literature in the Department of Literatures and Languages). On the other hand, some programs may be the joint responsibility of more than one unit, e.g., a program under the responsibility of an interdepartmental committee.

1 A proposal for the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of a program or unit may originate with a department, program or group; with the Dean of the college or school to which the department, program or group is administratively attached; or with the Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate Council. A proposal for the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of a unit may also originate with an appropriate vice Chancellor. If the unit or program being considered for transfer, consolidation or termination is unique in the University, or if its closure would have systemwide or intersegmental effects, the President shall be consulted early in the process.

2 If the request for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance originates with a department, program, or group, it shall be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy, the Graduate Council, and the Committees on Academic Personnel and Planning and Budget.
3 If the proposal for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance originates with the Dean of the college or school or with a vice Chancellor, it shall be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy, the Graduate Council, and the Committees on Academic Personnel and Planning and Budget, but only after consultation with the department, program or group under consideration and with the Executive Committee of the college or school. The Executive Committee may refer the recommendation to the Faculty of the College or school, for its advice, if the committee deems it necessary or advisable. Responses of these agencies of the school or college shall be appended to the Dean's or vice Chancellor's letter of transmission to committees of the Academic Senate.

4 If the proposal for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance arises with the Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate Council, the department, program or group, the Dean of the college or school, and the Executive Committee of the college or school must all be given the opportunity to review the proposal, make comments, and present relevant materials before any final recommendation is made by the Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate Council.

5 Senate committees reviewing the proposal shall consult, early in the deliberations, with the Chairperson, Faculty and students of the program or unit under review, and with the Dean and the Executive Committee of the college or school to which the program or unit is administratively attached, if deemed necessary. Consultation shall also take place with Faculty and students of related departments, programs or groups that would be affected by a decision to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue. The recommendations of the Committees on Academic Personnel and Planning and Budget shall be sought. Consultation between the Committee on Educational Policy, the Graduate Council and the Committees on Academic Personnel and Planning and Budget shall be maintained throughout the review process.

a) A Special Review Committee, normally consisting of individuals from other campuses or institutions, will be appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate in consultation with the Administration, the Executive Committee of the college or school and the program/department concerned. The charge to the Committee shall be developed by the Dean and the Executive Vice Chancellor and shall be subject to the review of the Advisory Committee. A review will be promptly carried out by the Special Review Committee.

b) The report of the Special Review Committee, together with the file and other documentation will be assessed by the Committees on Educational Policy, Academic Personnel, and Planning and Budget, and by the Graduate Council in cases of review of graduate programs. This assessment is to be carried out in consultation with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor, the President (if required by Systemwide procedures) and other interested individuals and groups, including the program/department being reviewed.

c) The Executive Vice Chancellor shall submit the report of the Special Committee to his/her Student Committee on Budget and Academic Planning for its review and recommendation.

d) The results of Senate committee deliberations will be transmitted to the Advisory Committee which shall submit its recommendations to the Division for action and the Executive Vice Chancellor shall provide as information to the item any comments from the Student Committee on Budget and Academic Planning.
Faculty shall retain the right, at all times during deliberations, to advise the Executive Committee of their college or school, or the committees of the Academic Senate, on the proposal.

In all cases the deliberations of the Committee on Educational Policy and/or the Graduate Council shall be in consultation with the Chancellor and the appropriate vice Chancellors.*

* Under the present administrative organization of the campus, the appropriate vice Chancellors would be the Executive Vice Chancellor. The proposed wording is intentionally non-specific to allow for possible future changes in designated titles.

If, after the foregoing review, a recommendation for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance is reached by the Committee on Educational Policy, for undergraduate programs or units, or by the Graduate Council, for graduate programs or units, or for an entire program, the Advisory Committee shall present the recommendation to the Division for its action. Concurrence or dissent, and the arguments therefore, shall be presented at the same time, by the Graduate Council, for undergraduate programs or units, and by the Committee on Educational Policy, for graduate programs or units.**

**The Committee on Educational Policy should have the opportunity to comment on the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of graduate programs or units, and the Graduate Council on the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of undergraduate programs or units.

After completion of the foregoing procedures, the results of the consultation on units and the results of any final decisions on programs shall be reported by the Division to the Chancellor. If the decision is to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue a program, it shall be reported to the Systemwide Administration as prescribed universitywide. If the decision is to recommend the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of a unit or the disestablishment of a degree, the recommendation shall be made to the Systemwide Administration as prescribed universitywide.

No programs or units shall be transferred, consolidated, disestablished, or discontinued until the enrolled students can be accommodated in a fashion that will assure completion of the degree. Arrangements shall be made for the orderly and appropriate accommodations of academic and staff employees whose positions are affected by a decision to disestablish or discontinue or to transfer to another campus or to combine with another program or programs on a different campus. These arrangements shall be in accordance with existing personnel policies to the extent that they are adequate for each specific decision. Where existing policies are not adequate, supplemental policies shall be developed by the Systemwide Administration through appropriate consultation with the Academic Senate. Until such policies are adopted, historical precedent and established practice shall supplement existing personnel policies. Under no circumstances shall the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment or discontinuance of a program or unit result in the termination of a tenured Faculty member from the University of California.

The campus will report any transfers, consolidations and discontinuances annually on its Academic Program Inventory.
5/3/89: Editorial corrections were made with reference to Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations and vice Chancellor designations by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.
February 15, 2012

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: MARTIN JOHNSON, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: CEP POLICY/PROCEDURE FOR DISCONTINUATIONS, MERGERS, SPLITS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

In response to concerns raised by the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction, the Committee on Educational Policy has revised the proposed policy for discontinuations, mergers, and splits of undergraduate programs. In their November 1 memorandum, Rules & Jurisdiction expressed three concerns:

- The indeterminacy of “consensus” over these changes,
- The articulations of deadlines for actions with no specified enforcement or penalty, and
- The intended involvement of the Executive Council in decision-making on these changes, potentially outside the intent of Senate Bylaw 8.5.2.

CEP approved the following changes:

- We solicit the reporting of votes for proposed changes, rather than solicit consensus. This will allow CEP, School/College Executive Committees, and the Chair of the Division to learn more about support and opposition to proposals.
- The proposed deadlines for action have been removed.
- References to the Senate Executive Council have been replaced with the referral of these matter to the Chair of the Division.
Preamble

A dynamic educational institution such as UCR requires transparent procedures for modifying its educational programs. Such procedures, however, do not currently exist for the discontinuance, merging or splitting of undergraduate programs. In view of this, the Executive Council has charged the Committee on Educational Policy with the creation of such procedures; the present document is the result of this charge. The proposed regulations are intended as an extension of Senate Bylaw 10 that provides "Procedures for approval of New Undergraduate Curricula and Changes in Undergraduate Curricula"\(^1\)

The Compendium\(^2\) addresses the issue of transfer, consolidation or discontinuance or disestablishment (TCDD) of programs, but treats graduate and undergraduate programs differently. For graduate programs the document provides a detailed procedure (section IV.B), while for undergraduate programs the procedure is left to the campuses (section IV.A), except in the special case of the discontinuance of an undergraduate program resulting in the elimination of a degree title in the campus\(^3\); The procedures described below do not apply to this case and the campus must instead follow the process described in section IV.A of the compendium.

Whenever curricular changes of the types considered here are envisaged, there is a serious concern that, aside from their educational implications, such proposals might entail the loss of faculty lines, or even the termination of employed tenured faculty. This last possibility is the more worrisome since it cannot be forbidden by the Senate\(^4\). The procedures below are designed to allow as thorough a discussion as possible, paying particular attention to insuring that all affected faculty will have a voice in the actions being considered. It is to be hoped that any negative effects on the faculty body and the educational excellence of the institution can be

\(^{1}\)://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=d&section=10
\(^{3}\)This point is not clearly stated in section IV.A of the Compendium, but it is clarified in section II.C
\(^{4}\)The regulations are notoriously vague when presenting the conditions under which tenured faculty might be dismissed from the University, except in case of incompetence (covered in detail in the Academic Personnel Manual APM-075,://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-075.pdf). The only guideline is contained in the Regent's Standing Order 103.9 (://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/bylaws/so1039.html; repeated in the Academic Personnel Manual APM – 130 – 0 a.,://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-130.pdf), that states "...The termination of a continuous tenure appointment or the termination of the appointment of any other member of the faculty before the expiration of the appointee's contract shall be only for good cause, after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate, except as otherwise provided in a Memorandum of Understanding for faculty who are not members of the Academic Senate."
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prevented or mitigated through this consultative process, especially in the cases where such actions might be proposed as a result of budgetary or other non-educational exigencies.

When a program is merged, split or discontinued, it is also assumed that the reassignment of teaching duties will be handled by the department(s) involved and, if need be, the corresponding dean(s). The process described below also allows for the Committee on Faculty Welfare to become involved whenever pertinent.

Introduction

Any member of the Academic Senate can propose the merger of two or more majors into a new one, the splitting of an existing major into one or more new ones, or the discontinuance of an existing major.

Such a proposal must contain evidence that the proposed action was fully discussed with all the faculty members participating in the program(s) being affected, and will be first reviewed by the executive committee(s) of the college(s)/school(s) housing the affected program(s). This (these) committee(s) will evaluate the merits of the proposal and will determine whether the proposed changes will (i) result in a reduction of the academic and/or research opportunities for students, or (ii) whether the changes amount to a reorganization of teaching and research programs and opportunities.

Actions of the first type will be referred as discontinuance of the program; actions of the second type will be referred to as program mergers or splits (respectively).

No programs or units shall be discontinued, merged or split until the enrolled students can be accommodated in a fashion that will assure completion of the degree. Arrangements shall be made for the orderly and appropriate accommodation of affected academic and staff employees, whose welfare should be a primary consideration. These arrangements shall be in accordance with existing personnel policies to the extent that they are adequate for each specific case; where existing policies are not adequate, supplemental policies shall be developed by the Administration in consultation with the Senate whenever appropriate. Until such policies are adopted, historical precedent and established practice shall supplement existing personnel policies. Under no circumstances shall a program be discontinued, merged or split without the full approval of the academic Senate through the processes described below.

The approval processes of proposals for discontinuance are detailed in item A below; the corresponding process for program mergers or splits is described in item B.

A. Discontinuance of programs

1. The request for discontinuance of an undergraduate program should be first considered by the relevant College/School Executive Committee(s) irrespective of the originator of the request. This request must contain clear evidence that the proposed action was discussed with all of the faculty members involved in the affected program(s). The request must report a
vote, tallied by affected program(s), indicating the number of votes for or against the proposal, as well as abstentions and unavailable faculty. A summary of anticipated positive and negative outcomes should be included; this could include effects on departmental resources, staffing or faculty, in both the program being discontinued and other related programs, as well as possible effects at the level of the campus and/or UC system. The documentation may also involve minority or individual opinions that modify or go counter to the request. The executive committee(s) shall be also diligent in eliciting comments from the participants in any other affected department(s)/program(s).

2. If approved by the College/School Executive Committee(s), the proposal shall be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), including all supporting documentation from the affected departments and programs. A letter from the Dean(s) of the affected colleges addressing the proposed changes should be obtained by the Executive Committee(s) and forwarded to CEP.

3. The CEP will review the proposal. If deemed necessary, comments will be requested from any other committee whose charge overlaps with the proposed actions. CEP may request additional comments from the deans of the colleges/schools affected, but the CEP will not delegate approval or review authority to these parties or any other administrative unit.

4. The CEP will vote on the issue. In cases where a majority of CEP members do not support the proposal, the Committee will request that the Chair of the Division, in consultation with the College/School Executive Committee(s) and the affected programs, convene a Special External Review Panel to examine the merits of the proposal. This Panel shall consist of two individuals from other campuses or institutions, one of whom shall be a member of the UC Senate. The Charge for this panel shall be drafted by the CEP and forwarded to the Chair of the Division, who shall then determine the details of the visit (including the length of the review and the honoraria for the Panel participants) in consultation with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education.

5. If a majority of CEP members support the proposal, it shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Division to circulate to the relevant Senate Committees whose advice might inform the eventual decision of the Division. If deemed necessary, the Chair of the Division may also refer the proposal back to CEP. The CEP decision will also be forwarded to the affected program(s) and to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, eliciting comments from all these parties. In addition, the CEP may request comments from the EVC/P and/or the Chancellor.

6. The CEP, upon receipt of the comments from the involved parties, will draft a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Chair of the Division requesting final
comments; as a result of these, further review by CEP may be necessary. Upon final approval from CEP, the Committee’s final recommendation shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Division for a vote at the next meeting of the Division; notifications to the VPUE, the EVC/P and the Chancellor will also be issued. The Division agenda shall include the full documentary evidence followed in the above process.

7. After completion of the foregoing procedures, the results shall be reported by the Division to the Chancellor. If the decision is to discontinue the program, it shall be reported to the System-wide Administration.

8. The campus will report any program discontinuance decisions annually on its Academic Program Inventory

B. Program mergers or splits

1. The request for undergraduate program merger or splits shall be first examined by the appropriate College/School Executive Committee(s). This request must contain clear evidence that the proposed action was discussed with all the faculty members involved in the affected program(s). The request must report a vote, tallied by affected program(s), indicating the number of votes for or against the proposal, as well as abstentions and unavailable faculty. A summary of anticipated positive and negative outcomes should be included. This could include effects on departmental resources, staffing or faculty, in both the program being discontinued and other related programs, as well as possible effects at the level of the campus and/or UC system. The documentation may also involve minority or individual opinions that modify or go counter to the request. The executive committee(s) shall be also diligent in eliciting comments from the participants in any other affected department(s)/program(s).

2. The college/school Executive Committee(s) will determine whether the proposed changes are meritorious, and determine the associated educational and research advantages. If approved, the proposal, together with the supporting documentation form the College(s) will be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and to the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) for a thorough examination. A letter from the Dean(s) of the affected College(s) addressing the proposed changes should be obtained by the College Executive Committee(s) and forwarded to CEP and P&B. CEP will provide an independent evaluation of whether the proposed changes constitute a reorganization that will result in no diminution of the educational and research opportunities for the students. P&B will provide an independent assessment of the resource implications of the proposal.

3. Either P&B or CEP can request additional clarification from the College/School Executive Committee(s) and/or from the program(s) affected. In case the proposed changes require additional resources, P&B and/or CEP may request the College(s)/School(s) obtain commitments from the Deans as a condition for approval.
4. If approved by CEP and P&B, the proposal together with all supporting documentation will be forwarded to the Chair of the Division to circulate to the relevant Senate Committees whose comments might inform the eventual decision of the Division. Comments and recommendations from other committees shall be forwarded to the CEP for a final recommendation.

5. The final CEP recommendation shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Division for a vote at the next meeting of the Division; notifications to the VPUE, the EVC/P and the Chancellor will also be issued. The Division agenda shall include the full documentary evidence followed in the above process.

6. After completion of the foregoing procedures, the results shall be reported by the Division to the Chancellor. If the decision is in favor of merging or splitting, it shall be reported to the System-wide Administration.

7. The campus will report any program mergers or splits annually on its Academic Program Inventory.
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