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

1. Approval of Minutes of March 15, 2012 meeting  Page 1-6

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  Page 7
   1. Approval of Courses - The following Courses have to be approved:
      1. BCH 230 (E-Z) Advanced Topics in Biochemistry - Change
      2. CHEM 260 - Organic and Organometallic Methodology and Synthesis – New
      3. CHEM 263 - Analysis and Synthesis at the Chemistry-Biology Interface- New
      4. DNCE 301 - Seminar in Dance Studies Pedagogy and Professional Development - Change
      5. ECON 208 – Natural Resource Economics - Change
      6. EE 215 - Stochastic Processes - Change
      7. ENGL 410 - Seminar in Professional Development - New
      8. ENSC 212 - Natural Resource Economics - New
      9. ENSC 214 - Soil and Water Chemistry Laboratory - Delete
     10. GEO 251V - Advanced Topics in Paleontology - Delete
     11. HIST 215 (E-Z) - Topics in American History - Change
     12. SWSC 214 - Soil and Water Chemistry Laboratory - Delete

   2. Program Changes and Proposals - The following programs need approval:  Page 8 - 61
      1. Proposed Changes from Electrical Engineering Graduate Program
      2. Professional Development Requirements – Hispanic Studies - revised
      3. ETST MA Proposal – Approved pending notification from CCGA that proposal does not need CCGA review
      4. Catalog changes to Computer Science Program - replacing CS297
      5. Proposed changes to Southeast Asian Studies Graduate Program
      6. English protocols for Qualifying Examination II
      8. Proposed Changes to math graduate program

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee:
   b. Update on upcoming reviews
5. Fellowship Subcommittee Report:

6. Old Business:

7. New Business:

1. 2011-12 Graduate Council Annual Report  
2. Graduate Council review procedures  
3. Promotion and review of Designated Emphasis  
4. Conversion of GPAs from 100 scale to 4.0 scale for international graduate applicants
Present:

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE

Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Aaron Jones, (Graduate Student Representative)

Absent:
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Deborah Wong, Music

Approval of Minutes
The agenda and the minutes from the February 16 meeting 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 indicated that the taskforce to review the guidelines for self-supporting programs at UCR met. It was agreed that Dean Childers will get a document together and get the process started.

CCGA Representative: Prof. Mike Vanderwood indicated that CCGA has decided to create their own subcommittee to review self-supporting programs, and there is general agreement that campuses should have their own policies. UCLA’s Anderson School of Management is still considering whether they should become a fully self-supported program. Finally, Prof. Vanderwood mentioned that there are discussions to allow international students to pay domestic fees after one year. They are also looking at completely eliminating the NRT completely.
On another issue, Prof. Vanderwood indicated that the Masters in Accounting from SoBA was changed to MPAcc because CCGA felt this was the appropriate degree as this is the one used by other campuses in the system. The rationale used was that the degree is specifically intended to provide the fifth year of training required by the state of California for those wishing to become CPAs, hence a MA didn’t seem appropriate and UC Davis had an MPAcc designed for precisely the same purpose that was approved last fall.

**Graduate Student Council Representatives:** The graduate student representative Aaron Jones reported that the GSA had $165,000 available for travel grants and that so far, $37,500 had been awarded. He also indicated that a couple of graduate students attended the student lobby day in Sacramento in March and those that went felt that they are getting through to the Regents. Another march is being planned for May 17, 2012 in Sacramento. Finally, Mr. Jones indicated that he had completed the task of appointing a graduate student to all the campus and academic committees.

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

1. Graduate Division had received approximately 5000 applications for admission to graduate school this year and they will probably admit about 1500 of these applicants.
2. Dean Childers met with VP Greenstein on February 28, 2012. They discussed the possibility of having a hybrid program with the newly approved MPAcc in SoBA, where some of the courses are provided on-line. VP Greenstein has funds available to loan to campuses at 0% interest for those interested in starting such distance learning programs.
3. Graduate Division is working on creating a new Research Ethics and Methods course for graduate students. The goal is to help develop additional professional training opportunities that programs and students could utilize.

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

1. **Courses:**
   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 208 (Proseminar in Qualitative Sociology)
   7. SOC 206 (Proseminar in Quantitative Sociology)

2. **Program Changes and Proposals:**
   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
Prof. Nugent, Co-Chair of Courses and Programs Subcommittee, indicated that the Courses and Programs subcommittee also discussed the need for a policy on how to implement professional development requirements. It has become obvious that there is a need to provide at minimum, a basic guideline to help the programs.

**Graduate Program Review Update:**
Subcommittee B Chair Morris Maduro gave an update on the March 5 and 6, 2012 Environmental Science review as well as the recommendations that were made by the External Review Team.

Prof. Connie Nugent who chaired the Biomedical Sciences review that took place on March 12 and 13 indicated that overall it was an excellent team of reviewers and that the review process went very well.

Chair Barish indicated that he had received requests from Anthropology, Art History and Plant Biology to defer the review of their program for an additional year. Chair Barish indicated that he informed the Chairs of these programs that he would discuss the issue with the Graduate Council and then write back to them.

As a result of the two reviews, Chair Barish mentioned that it was necessary to review the quality of the documents that are sent out as part of the review binder. For this, Chair Barish mentioned that he would like to form a subcommittee charged with reviewing the documents. The following people were assigned to the committee: Morris Maduro, Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Connie Nugent, Lynda Bell, Iryna Ethell and Ken Barish.

After some discussions, Council unanimously approved a motion to deny the request to delay the program reviews and Chair Barish will notify the departments of Council’s decision.

**Fellowship Subcommittee Report:**
The Committee reviewed 11 applications – 2 from Engineering, 2 from CNAS and 7 from CHASS. They awarded 10 of these applications at $1,000 each. The deadline for dissertation grants is March 16, 2012. So far they have received 150 applications.

**Old Business:**
The Council voted unanimously to approve the newly revised Academic Integrity Policy for graduate students. It will be sent to the Executive Committees and Educational Policy for approval and then to the spring Division meeting.

**New Business:**
1. Chair Barish informed the Council that the Committee on Educational Policy had developed a substantial revision to Riverside Division Regulations Appendix 7 - http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action= read_bylaws&code=app&section=07) in an effort to try and simplify the process of discontinuation, mergers and splits of undergraduate programs while preserving the campus’ commitment to protecting student access to their planned degree programs as well as ensuring faculty control over curriculum decisions. Currently, Appendix 7 covers the discontinuation, mergers and splits of both the undergraduate and graduate programs. The report and the justification for the change was sent to Courses and Programs, but they did not have time to review it. After some discussions, Council approved the decision to form a taskforce made up of Kenneth Barish, Connie Nugent, Mike Vanderwood, Joe...
Childers and Mohsen El Hafsi to draft guidelines and procedures for the discontinuation, mergers and splits of graduate programs.

2. Council also discussed the process disseminating new and revised policies to the faculty. Council agreed that new policies will be sent out by the Council Analyst to all Program Directors and Program/Graduate Advisors with a copy to the Chairs of the Department.

3. It was also agreed that an email will be sent out to all Program Directors and Program/Graduate Advisors notifying them of the availability of minutes on the Graduate Council website.

4. Graduate Council unanimously approved a request from Dean Childers to approve an exception to policy to allow a student who has a PhD from Vietnam to pursue another Ph.D at UCR.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Connie Nugent, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COURSES AND PROGRAMS SUB COMMITTEE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATTENDANCE SHEET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEETING DATE April 12, 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Mike Vanderwood, GSOE, Chair</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Lynda Bell, History</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Mohsen El Hafsi, SoBA</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Deborah Wong, Music</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUESTS**
17 January 2012

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair, Graduate Council

From: David Herzberger, Chair, Hispanic Studies

Re: Professional Development Requirement for Graduate Students

We propose the following plan to satisfy the professional training requirement for our MA and PhD students.

We currently offer two courses where professional training already occurs to some extent. The catalog description is as follows:

Spanish 220: **Criticism and Critical Documentation.** (4 units). Covers strategies of reading and analysis. Topics may include critical approaches such as formalism, new criticism, structuralism, deconstruction, and new historicism; psychoanalysis; gender studies; performance studies; and cultural studies. Also may include practice in Modern Language Association documentation. Course is repeatable.

Spanish 275: **Seminar in Literary Criticism** (4 units).

We propose to augment the current focus on general methodology and theory in these two courses to include the important areas indicated in the professional training requirement: specifically, we will incorporate into both courses readings and presentations on career and job guidance (including publishing, grant writing, preparation for the job market [from the CV to interview strategies], and ethics). The specific nature of how these various aspects of professionalization will vary slightly according to the instructor, but we have agreed as a faculty that all of us who teach the course will cover the material. Most likely, faculty who are not the instructor of record for the course will participate in some of the class presentations, especially those related to ethics and preparation for the job market.

We will offer one of the two courses mentioned above at least every other year, with more frequent offerings if our graduate cohorts require it.

**Concerning pedagogy:**

1. We already have extensive pedagogical training in language teaching methodology for all of our graduate students (all of our students are funded with TAships during the bulk of their studies). Our TA coordinator offers an intensive orientation program at the
March 19, 2012

To: David Herzberger, Chair
    Hispanic Studies

Fm: Connie Nugent, co-chair
    Courses and Programs subcommittee of Graduate Council

Re: Professional Development of Graduate Students

Graduate Council is returning this proposal to your department for reconsideration. It is clear that the graduate students in your program receive extensive training and practice in pedagogical techniques. However, the bulk of these efforts are not recognized as a course. We would suggest that it would be appropriate to consider assigning course units to the students’ TA training.

With respect to the SPN 220 course, the content addressing professional development was viewed as having an overly heavy emphasis on MLA documentation in the ninth and tenth weeks of the course. The Grad council courses subcommittee would like to see consideration of additional areas that relate directly to professional development. For example, topics such as grant writing, travel abroad for research, using archives, and preparation of the dissertation prospectus could be considered.

We’d like to clarify that the goal is not to create more work for programs, but rather to make sure that graduate students have the opportunities to gain skills in areas appropriate to their career goals. In the future, we hope that the courses being developed by Graduate Division, such as one on research ethics, will help programs meet these needs. Please feel free to contact me by email or phone if you’d like to discuss these issues any further.

Sincerely,

Connie Nugent

Associate Professor of Cell Biology & Neuroscience
2107 Biological Sciences
University of California Riverside
Dear Professor Nugent:

I am writing in response to your memo of 19 March 2012 concerning professional training for our graduate students.

Let me begin with the following: last year we underwent an external evaluation of our graduate program, which I assume you have access to. Our placement rate of graduate students into tenure track positions is 83%, the highest in CHASS. Here is what the review committee said: “The success of the department’s placement record is not a coincidence: it is the result of scholarly training and teaching experience, but also of the specific preparation of graduate students finishing their PhD for the job-market, which begins six or seven months before they go on the job market. Most other comparable departments offer such advice only weeks before job applications are due in the Fall.” And here is what the Graduate Council noted concerning the strong outcomes of our graduate program in its Recommendations and Findings of June 7, 2011: “The Department has ensured the delivery of a professional, academically rigorous and nurturing graduate program in Hispanic literary and cultural studies.”

We believe that we do an excellent job of professional training, and that our students entering the job market reflect this training. But it is not just job preparation that we do—we also provide broad professional training and career preparation for the long-term success of our graduates.

As the Graduate Council requested in their initial rejection of our professional training plan, we have taken specific steps to incorporate topics into our theory course (Spanish 220) that enhance professional and career preparation. I don’t understand why, but the Council seems to see what we have proposed in Spanish 220 as “an overly heavy emphasis on MLA documentation in the ninth and tenth weeks of the course.” However, a fair reading of the syllabus cannot sustain such a view—we cover many topics throughout the quarter that are directly relevant to the field (please note that many of the theoretical topics themselves are part of the professional training), and the last weeks of the course are specifically devoted to a number of topics other than MLA documentation: these include ethics, academic freedom, tenure, promotion, scholarly publishing, job applications and the job search, and career advice. These are topics highly relevant to professional training beyond graduate studies. It should also be noted that there will be some variation in the syllabus for Spanish 220 that reflects the interests of individual faculty members. The order of things may change (e.g., the essays on the topics I note above may be spread out more during the quarter), but the essential content and focus will remain the same.

You also mention specifically that we should include “preparation of the dissertation prospectus:” our students do not do a prospectus, but rather write a “long paper” as part of their doctoral exams, which is approximately 50 to 70 pages, and generally serves as part of the introduction to their dissertation as well as an overview of their research plan. This is explained
in the university catalog under our graduate program. We view this as one of the structural components of our program that enables our students to complete the PhD in an average of 5.2 years, much better than the 8.7 years average in Spanish Studies nationwide. The long paper is initiated in an independent study course with the major adviser, who mentors his/her student through the process.

You also mention such things as travel abroad for research and the use of archives that might be included on our Spanish 220 syllabus. Please do not try to overlay a template on our program that doesn’t quite fit the nature of our discipline: in our particular discipline, graduate students potentially can travel abroad to all of the countries of Latin America as well as to Spain. These countries have their own cultural identity, their own bureaucracy, their own way of doing things in libraries, hemerotecas, and archives, as well as in the way that they would work to set up relevant interviews with authors and critics; in the latter instance, each country has a different implicit protocol on how these interviews need to be arranged. Most definitely, one size does not fit all. Some of our students use resources abroad, others do not. When a student does go abroad (we have a student dong research in Uruguay right now), we work with that student individually, offering advice, training, and expertise that any one of us might have in relation to that country; sometimes we have had a faculty member (or even another graduate student) work in a particular culture and bureaucracy, but other times we have no one. It makes no sense to generalize for our students how to work in an array of diverse countries and cultures concerning matters that are not able to be generalized. I can assure you that we do this through individual mentoring, which is the most efficacious way of handling it.

Concerning your suggestion that we provide unit credit for pedagogical training: we have discussed this matter extensively over the years, and we specifically do not want to give credit for TA training done by our TA coordinator on a routine basis as part of daily class preparation for TAs. Our students are paid a stipend for their teaching, we train them rigorously for the classroom. I don’t know if you read our proposal closely concerning pedagogy, but beyond the training and class preparation that we give to our TAs on a regular basis (for which we do not want to give credit), we said that we would be requiring Spanish 301, Teaching Spanish at the College Level. Doesn’t this fulfill your request for credit for pedagogical training?

One thing that you mention in your memo that we do not provide for in Spanish 220, training in the writing of grant proposals, is a very good suggestion. We will incorporate that into the course.

You say in your memo that “the goal is not to create more work for programs, but rather to make sure that graduate students have the opportunities to gain skills in areas appropriate to their career goals.” Quite honestly, we firmly believe that we do this—we believe that our proposal in Spanish 220 covers what you have asked for, that our Spanish 301 includes the pedagogical component that you want, and that our students are fully prepared professionally as they leave our program. The record supports this, and we hope that you won’t impose a pre-conceived template on graduate programs when some of the things simply do not fit in the way that you are suggesting.
In brief: I ask you to reconsider your decision not to accept our graduate training proposal. If you wish, our graduate adviser or I will meet with you or the Council to discuss our program. We firmly believe that we provide a high level of professional training and preparation to our graduate students.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

David Herzberger
Professor and Chair
MEMORANDUM

TO: Kenneth Barish
Graduate Council Chair

FROM: Ertem Tuncel
Graduate Advisor, Department of Electrical Engineering

SUBJECT: Request for Program Change

DATE: March 21, 2012

Dear Dr. Barish,

I am writing to request the Graduate Council’s approval to revise the program requirements for the Electrical Engineering Graduate Program. As our program has grown, it has become necessary to adjust the requirements to better address the needs of our students. The proposed changes in the following documents will ensure that our students are challenged by a rigorous curriculum as well as given the individual attention needed to develop a thoughtful and well-crafted PhD dissertation.

The most important change is on the advancement to candidacy. In the attached documents, you will see that our proposed written Preliminary Exam requires a stronger background from the students through “advanced” courses in their specialization areas. Once the preliminary exam has been successfully completed, students will be required to pass the Oral Qualifying Exam as before. In the proposed exam, the students will be asked to choose a research topic, present the state-of-the-art and new research directions they intend to take, and demonstrate a thorough understanding and a potential for doing cutting-edge research. They will also be required to submit a written report in the format of typical electrical engineering conference or journal publications.

We have also added a Dissertation Proposal Exam, typically to be taken at the end of the third year, in which the student must demonstrate substantial knowledge of the chosen research topic, state the progress made towards a solution, and indicate the remaining work to be done. This is also an oral exam accompanied by a written report in the same format as in the Oral Qualifying Exam. The purpose of this exam is to give the student proper feedback along the way to the PhD degree. A realistic timeline for completion of the dissertation will be established at the end of this exam.

These changes are designed to improve the professional writing skills and research skills in our students. We strongly believe that the requirement for our PhD students to articulate their
research ideas both written and orally, and both in the beginning and in the middle of their research, will make them stronger researchers, and put them in a much better position in the job market.

I ask that you examine the proposed revisions and request your approval.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ertem Tuncel
Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor
Department of Electrical Engineering
Current Ph.D. Requirements

Doctoral Degree

The Department of Electrical Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering

Admission
An M.S. or equivalent degree in Electrical Engineering or a related field is normally required. Exceptional applicants may be admitted directly without an M.S. degree. Students with backgrounds in other scientific fields are encouraged to apply. Applicants lacking undergraduate preparation in the above areas may be admitted but must take the appropriate undergraduate courses. Under special circumstances, students who have not completed all undergraduate requirements may be admitted, provided that the deficiencies are corrected within the first year of graduate study. Courses taken for this purpose do not count towards an advanced degree.

Course Work
There is no strict course or unit requirement for the Ph.D. degree. The faculty recommends that the student take a minimum of 36 quarter units of 100- or 200-level course work (excluding EE 297 or EE 299) while in graduate standing as evidence of preparation for the doctoral qualifying examination. The courses may include graduate course work used for the M.S. degree. Students must complete a minimum of six quarters (two years) in residence in the UC with a GPA of 3.00 or better. Students must submit a formal study plan before the end of the second quarter of academic residency. Initially, the plan lists the student’s entire expected program of course work. After passing the preliminary examination, an amended version of the study plan must be submitted to and approved by the student’s doctoral committee. Students must establish a major subject area. A coherent program of approximately 24 units of graduate course work in the major area is recommended. Students may need to take considerably more than the 24 units to prepare for the Ph.D. research. The balance of the courses should lend support to the major field of study while adding breadth to the student’s overall program. These courses may consist of Electrical Engineering courses in an area distinctively different from the major area and/or courses from other campus departments.

Preliminary Examination
The purpose of the preliminary examination is to screen candidates for continuation in the doctoral program. The examination is administered by the graduate program committee and is combined with the M.S. comprehensive examination. Candidates must solve at least five problems in at least three different major areas. No more than three problems may be chosen from the student’s major area of specialization (i.e., communications and signal processing, control and robotics, intelligent systems, nano materials, devices, and circuits; integrated circuits and VLSI system design). Plan II M.S. candidates who took the combined M.S. comprehensive and Ph.D. preliminary examination and successfully passed at the Ph.D. level are given credit for having passed the Ph.D. preliminary examination.

Dissertation Proposal and Oral Qualifying Examination
After passing the preliminary examination, doctoral candidates must prepare and submit a dissertation proposal to their qualifying examination committee before the qualifying examination. The

Proposed Ph.D. Requirements

Doctoral Degree

The Department of Electrical Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering

Admission
An M.S. or equivalent degree in Electrical Engineering or a related field is normally required. Exceptional applicants may be admitted directly without an M.S. degree. Students with backgrounds in other scientific fields are encouraged to apply. Applicants lacking undergraduate preparation in the above areas may be admitted but must take the appropriate undergraduate courses. Under special circumstances, students who have not completed all undergraduate requirements may be admitted, provided that the deficiencies are corrected within the first year of graduate study. Courses taken for this purpose do not count towards an advanced degree.

Course Work
There is no strict course or unit requirement for the Ph.D. degree. The faculty recommends that the student take a minimum of 36 units of 100- or 200-level course work (excluding EE 297 or EE 299) while in graduate standing as evidence of preparation for the doctoral qualifying examination. The courses may include graduate course work used for the M.S. degree. Students must complete a minimum of six quarters (two years) in residence in the UC with a GPA of 3.00 or better. Students must establish a major subject area. A coherent program of approximately 24 units of graduate course work in the major area is recommended. Students may need to take considerably more than the 24 units to prepare for the Ph.D. research. The balance of the courses should lend support to the major field of study while adding breadth to the student’s overall program. These courses may consist of Electrical Engineering courses in an area distinctively different from the major area and/or courses from other campus departments.

Advancement to Candidacy
A student advances to candidacy after he/she has passed the preliminary examination and the oral qualifying examination, as described below.

Preliminary Examination
The purpose of the preliminary examination is to screen candidates for continuation in the doctoral program. The examination is administered by the graduate program committee and is combined with the M.S. comprehensive examination. Students must solve five problems in their major area. Three of these problems must be from the “basic” courses and two must be from the “advanced” courses designated for each subject area. Students will be exempt from problems on basic courses for which they received A or higher, and problems on advanced courses for which they received A or higher. Students who did not pass all five problems at the Ph.D. level in their first trial will be given a second chance within one month of their first attempt. In the second attempt, they will be required to solve problems only from the courses they did not pass at the Ph.D. level in their first attempt. The normative time for taking the preliminary exam is by the end of the student’s third quarter. Plan II M.S. candidates who took the combined M.S. comprehensive and Ph.D. preliminary examination and successfully passed at the Ph.D. level are given credit for having passed the Ph.D. preliminary examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination
After passing the preliminary examination, the students are expected to demonstrate that they have a thorough understanding of their research field, and have
format of the proposal is flexible, but the proposal should clearly indicate the proposed problem under study, demonstrate substantial knowledge of the topic and related issues, state the progress made towards a solution, and indicate the work remaining to be done. The new approaches and methods to be used in the research should also be discussed. An extensive bibliography for the problem under study should be attached to the proposal. The oral qualifying examination focuses on the dissertation problem. It includes considerable depth in the student's area of specialization, as required for a successful completion of the dissertation. The examination is a three-hour session, which begins with the student's presentation of the dissertation topic and is followed with questions and suggestions by the doctoral committee. A doctoral dissertation should be an original and substantial contribution to knowledge in the student's major field. It must demonstrate the student's ability to carry out a program of independent advanced research and to report the results in accordance with standards observed in recognized scientific journals.

Dissertation Examination and Defense: When the doctoral committee determines that a suitable draft of the dissertation has been presented, a dissertation examination and defense for the student is scheduled. The defense consists of a public seminar followed by questions from the committee members and the audience.

Language Requirement: To meet the degree requirements of the Electrical Engineering program, all admitted Ph D students whose native language is not English must take ESL classes until they get a "clear pass" on the TAST or SPEAK test.

Normative Time to Degree: 12 quarters (15 quarters for students without an M S in Electrical Engineering)

Preparation for Careers in Teaching:

All doctoral students are recommended to be employed as teaching assistants for at least three quarters during their graduate career. The department is developing special courses to aid in the learning of effective teaching methods, such as handling discussion/lab sessions and preparing and grading examinations. Contact the Graduate Student Affairs Assistant at the Department of Electrical Engineering, (951) 827-2484, or visit ee.ucr.edu for information on graduate courses.

potential for doing cutting-edge research. For that purpose, students must choose a research topic under the guidance of their faculty major professor and orally present to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department, the state-of-the-art in that topic as well as the new research directions they intend to take. This presentation must be accompanied by a written report, which is written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Electrical Engineering conference or journal publication. The student must complete this requirement in no more than two attempts. The normative time for taking the Oral Qualifying Exam is by the end of the first year.

Dissertation Proposal Examination: After advancement to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Dissertation Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least three senate faculty members with at least two members from the Electrical Engineering department. The student must then prepare a written dissertation proposal that clearly indicates the proposed problem under study, demonstrate substantial knowledge of the topic and related issues, state the progress made towards a solution, and indicate the work remaining to be done. The new approaches and methods to be used in the research should be discussed. An extensive bibliography for the problem under study should also be attached to the proposal. The proposal should promise an original and substantial contribution to knowledge in the student's major field. The student must demonstrate his/her ability to carry out a program of independent advanced research and to report the results in accordance with standards observed in recognized scientific journals.

The Dissertation Proposal Examination consists of an oral presentation of the dissertation proposal by the student, followed by an evaluation of the appropriateness of the research topic and the feasibility of the research plan. A realistic timeline for the completion of the dissertation will also be established. The Doctoral Dissertation Committee administers this exam. The normative time for the Dissertation Proposal Exam is by the end of the third year. It must be taken at least six months prior to the Dissertation Examination.

Language Requirement: To meet the degree requirements of the Electrical Engineering program, all admitted Ph D students whose native language is not English must take ESL classes until they get a "clear pass" on the TAST or SPEAK test.

Normative Time to Degree: 12 quarters (15 quarters for students without an M S in Electrical Engineering)

Preparation for Careers in Teaching:

All doctoral students are recommended to be employed as teaching assistants for at least three quarters during their graduate career. The department is developing special courses to aid in the learning of effective teaching methods, such as handling discussion/lab sessions and preparing and grading examinations. Contact the Graduate Student Affairs Assistant at the Department of Electrical Engineering, (951) 827-2484, or visit ee.ucr.edu for information on graduate courses.
March 22, 2012

To: Ken Barish, Chair
Graduate Council

Fm: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
Ethnic Studies

Dear Graduate Council Chair Ken Barish:

I write to affirm the Department of Ethnic Studies’ unanimous faculty vote (of September 2011) to approve and move forward with the proposed terminal MA program in Ethnic Studies. The full proposal is attached to this correspondence.

The Department of Ethnic Studies will offer this terminal MA degree in the interdisciplinary field of Ethnic Studies. The MA degree program is designed for students whose goal is to complete the MA as their ultimate objective. While completion of the MA degree does not lead to automatic admission into the PhD program, successful students may be encouraged to apply to the Ethnic Studies PhD program at UCR or to similar programs at peer campuses. The MA program is designed for students who wish to enhance their existing scholarly training and enhance their professional qualifications, or who hope to prepare themselves for admission into a relevant PhD program.

I have attached the email from Gabrielle Brewer, sent 12/5/11, denoting the Executive Committee’s approval of the program.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Rodríguez
Chair, Ethnic Studies
Ethnic Studies PhD Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Ethnic Studies offers M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in the interdisciplinary field of Ethnic Studies. The M.A. degree is awarded as part of a student’s required progress towards the Ph.D. degree. Students proceed through the graduate program from coursework to exams to fieldwork and writing the dissertation. The graduate program prepares students for teaching and research careers in the private and public sector.</td>
<td>The Department of Ethnic Studies offers M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in the interdisciplinary field of Ethnic Studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Degree**

**Admission** Students are admitted for the fall quarter of each academic year only. The basic requirement for admission into the Ph.D. Program is a bachelor's degree or its equivalent from an accredited institution with a major in any subject field.

Admission to the graduate program is based on the following criteria:

1. Prior academic performance, especially in undergraduate or graduate classes in Ethnic Studies or related fields.
2. Performance on the Graduate Record Examination.
3. Letters of recommendation from at least three persons familiar with an applicant’s potential for achieving academic success.

**Admission** For the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, students are admitted for the fall quarter of each academic year only. The basic requirement for admission into the programs is a bachelor's degree or its equivalent from an accredited institution with a major in any subject field.

Admission to the graduate program is based on the following criteria:

1. Prior academic performance, especially in undergraduate or graduate classes in Ethnic Studies or related fields.
2. Performance on the Graduate Record Examination.
3. Letters of recommendation from at least three persons familiar with an applicant’s potential for achieving academic success.
excellence. Two of the letters must be from professors in the applicant’s major subject.

4. Compatibility between applicant’s areas of interest and department’s research and teaching emphases.

5. Quality of the writing sample. Applicants must submit a scholarly paper not to exceed 15-double spaced pages, such as a term paper, section of a thesis, or published work.

6. Completed application and materials (including transcripts) required from Graduate Division.

The Ethnic Studies website at http://ethnicstudies.ucr.edu/ provides more details on the Ph.D. Program, degree requirements, and application procedures. General Graduate Division university requirements are available on the Graduate Division website at www.graduatedivision.ucr.edu and in the Graduate Studies section of this catalog.

Master’s Degree

The M.A. degree program is designed for students whose goal is to complete the M.A. as their ultimate objective. While completion of the M.A. degree does not lead to automatic admission into the Ph.D. program, successful students may be encouraged to apply to the Ethnic Studies Ph.D. program at UCR or to similar programs at peer campuses. The M.A. program is designed for students who wish to enhance their existing scholarly training and enhance their professional qualifications, or who hope to prepare themselves for admission into a relevant Ph.D. program.
Coursework  All students must complete the M.A. core curriculum. The minimum course unit requirement for completion of the M.A. is 36.

Course Requirements  The core Ethnic Studies M.A. graduate curriculum consists of two theory courses (ETST 200 and 201), and one methodology course (ETST 203). The remainder of each M.A. student’s specific curricular program is structured in consultation with his or her assigned faculty mentor. The candidate must complete a minimum of 36 units of course work with a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or better, which include the three core courses and at least 24 additional units in 200-series courses. At least 12 of these 24 additional units must be in Ethnic Studies. These courses cannot include ETST 297 or 299. Eight (8) units of 100-series courses may be counted toward the unit requirement with the permission of the graduate advisor.

M.A. Completion

Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)

Graduate students are required to successfully complete a Written M.A. Examination by the end of their second year. The exam will test the student’s knowledge of the methodological and theoretical foundations of the field of Ethnic Studies and will cover material from the required core courses as well as courses in the student’s area(s) of specialization. This exam is evaluated by a faculty committee of the candidate’s choosing. If the student passes this exam, the committee will recommend awarding of the M.A. degree in Ethnic Studies.

Normative Time to Degree: Six quarters.
Coursework All students, including those who have a master’s degree at the time of admission, must complete the basic core curriculum.

Course requirements The core Ethnic Studies graduate curriculum consists of two theory courses (ETST 200 and 201), one methodology course (ETST 203), and a graduate proseminar on professionalization (ETST 405). Where appropriate, students are encouraged to take an additional course in methodology (quantitative or qualitative), in addition to ETST 203. Students are also required to enroll in and attend the Ethnic Studies Colloquium during each quarter of the first two years of graduate work.

During the second year students will begin to select courses that are relevant to one or more of the following areas of specialization:

Area I: Theories of Race and Power
Area II: Cultural Politics and Production
Area III: The State, Law, and Social Transformation

Students are also encouraged to supplement regular curricular offerings by initiating individual or small-group reading courses with appropriate Ethnic Studies faculty (ETST 290’s etc.) or with cooperating

Doctoral Degree

The Department of Ethnic Studies offers the Ph.D. degree in the interdisciplinary field of Ethnic Studies. Students proceed through the graduate program from coursework to exams to fieldwork and writing the dissertation. The Ph.D. program prepares students for teaching and research careers in the private and public sector.

Coursework All students, including those who have a master’s degree at the time of admission, must complete the basic core curriculum.

Course requirements The core Ethnic Studies graduate curriculum consists of two theory courses (ETST 200 and 201), one methodology course (ETST 203), and a graduate proseminar on professionalization (ETST 405). Where appropriate, students are encouraged to take an additional course in methodology (quantitative or qualitative), in addition to ETST 203. Students are also required to enroll in and attend the Ethnic Studies Colloquium during each quarter of the first two years of graduate work.

During the second year students will begin to select courses that are relevant to one or more of the following areas of specialization:

Area I: Theories of Race and Power
Area II: Cultural Politics and Production
Area III: The State, Law, and Social Transformation

Students are also encouraged to supplement regular curricular offerings by initiating individual or small-group reading courses with appropriate Ethnic Studies faculty (ETST 290’s etc.) or with cooperating
faculty in other CHASS departments.

First-year core requirements:

ETST 200  (Fall) History of Ideas in Ethnic Studies
ETST 201 (Winter) Contemporary Theories in Ethnic Studies
ETST 203 (Spring) Methods in Ethnic Studies
ETST 289  (Fall, Winter, Spring) Departmental Colloquium

Second-year core requirements:

ETST 405 (Fall) Graduate Proseminar on Professionalization
ETST 289 (Fall, Winter, Spring) Departmental Colloquium

Research and Teaching Requirements
A student’s program must include at least one academic quarter of supervised research through enrollment in ETST 297 and/or by working as a research assistant. The equivalent of at least one academic quarter of college classroom teaching is also required of all students.

Grades
A student must complete courses in the core curriculum and the specialization areas with a grade of “B” or better in each course.

Ph.D. Written and Oral Qualifying Examinations

Written Qualifying Examination
Graduate students are required to successfully complete a Written Qualifying Examination by the end of the winter quarter of their second year. The exam will test the student’s knowledge of the methodological and theoretical foundations of the field of Ethnic Studies and will cover
material from the required core courses as well as courses in the student’s area(s) of specialization. This exam is evaluated by a faculty committee. If the student passes this exam, the committee will recommend awarding of the M.A. degree in Ethnic Studies. If the M.A. is awarded, or if the student already has an M.A. in Ethnic Studies, the faculty then votes on whether or not the student should continue in the Ph.D. program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Qualifying Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must compose, in consultation with a committee consisting of three-to-four faculty members, three written field statements that pertain to theoretical, methodological, and substantive foci related to the preparation of their dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students are required to successfully complete an Oral Qualifying Examination by the end of the winter quarter of their third year in which the student must display mastery over his/her three fields. If the oral exam is passed, the student will advance to candidacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Prospectus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate must also submit, no later than the fall quarter of their fourth year, a written prospectus outlining the topic, thesis, methods, resources, and timeline for the completion of the dissertation. The candidate must hold a Prospectus Meeting with Dissertation Committee members for final approval of the dissertation prospectus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Language Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no formal language requirement. However, in certain research areas a language requirement may be required if it is deemed necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the language is germane to the student's research. In those cases where foreign language is required, competency can be established either by presenting evidence of satisfactory completion of the UCR Language Placement Exam, or by means of a translation test administered by the Graduate Affairs Committee.

### Dissertation and Presentation

Doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy will research and write a dissertation under the guidance of a Dissertation Committee. The dissertation should focus on a specific aspect of the candidate’s fields of study, and must conform to the format prescribed by the Graduate Council. After the Dissertation Committee approves the completed dissertation, the candidate must formally present his/her dissertation as part of the Departmental Colloquium series.

**Normative time to degree:** The normative time for completion of the Ph.D. degree is six years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That the language is germane to the student's research. In those cases where foreign language is required, competency can be established either by presenting evidence of satisfactory completion of the UCR Language Placement Exam, or by means of a translation test administered by the Graduate Affairs Committee.</th>
<th>That the language is germane to the student's research. In those cases where foreign language is required, competency can be established either by presenting evidence of satisfactory completion of the UCR Language Placement Exam, or by means of a translation test administered by the Graduate Affairs Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation and Presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dissertation and Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy will research and write a dissertation under the guidance of a Dissertation Committee. The dissertation should focus on a specific aspect of the candidate’s fields of study, and must conform to the format prescribed by the Graduate Council. After the Dissertation Committee approves the completed dissertation, the candidate must formally present his/her dissertation as part of the Departmental Colloquium series.</td>
<td>Doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy will research and write a dissertation under the guidance of a Dissertation Committee. The dissertation should focus on a specific aspect of the candidate’s fields of study, and must conform to the format prescribed by the Graduate Council. After the Dissertation Committee approves the completed dissertation, the candidate must formally present his/her dissertation as part of the Departmental Colloquium series.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Normative time to degree:** The normative time for completion of the Ph.D. degree is six years.
December 2, 2012

TO: CHASS Undergraduate Executive Committee  
FROM: Kevin Esterling, Chair  
RE: Ethnic Studies - MA

The Executive Committee reviewed the Ethnic Studies – MA and is in support of the proposed changes.

Kevin Esterling  
Chair of CHASS Executive Committee
March 8, 2012

TO: Dr. Morris Maduro  
Chair, Graduate Council

FR: Dr. Laxmi Bhuyan  
Computer Science & Engineering

RE: Requested Catalog Updates for 2012-13

Dear Dr. Maduro:

The attached requested catalog changes were voted on and approved by the Computer Science faculty on February 8, 2012. The following is a justification for the changes.

The Graduate Division modified the purpose/designation for Directed Studies courses so that it no longer pertains directly to the MS program in CSE. Therefore, it is being replaced by CS 297 (Directed Research) to fulfill this requirement, as it does for MS thesis option students.

Thank you.
PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER SCIENCE GRADUATE REQUIREMENTS

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
Master’s Degree (heading)
Graduate Program

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

Satisfactory Completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time-residence graduate students. Petitions for an attendance waiver in a specific quarter will be granted on a case-by-case basis. Students not waived from course attendance must enroll in CS 287 each quarter and receive a grade of “S.”

Course Requirements 48 quarter units of graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses are required. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course. For students interested in interdisciplinary research, individual study programs can be approved.

1. Core Requirement (8 units). Choose one course from two of the three Core Areas listed above, with no grade lower than B-.
2. Breadth Requirement (8 units). Two approved breadth courses chosen in such a way that together the core and breadth courses cover four different Major Specialty Areas (A to G).
3. Electives. (32 units)
   a. Project Option. A student pursuing the M.S. degree, non-thesis option, may include up to 4 units of Directed Studies (CS 290) towards the elective requirement. Of the remaining 28 units, at least 12 units must be approved graduate lecture courses. The remaining 16 units may include additional approved graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269, and up to 12 units of approved undergraduate technical electives.

PROPOSED:
Master’s Degree (heading)
Graduate Program

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

Satisfactory Completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time-residence graduate students. Petitions for an attendance waiver in a specific quarter will be granted on a case-by-case basis. Students not waived from course attendance must enroll in CS 287 each quarter and receive a grade of “S.”

Course Requirements 48 quarter units of graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses are required. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course. For students interested in interdisciplinary research, individual study programs can be approved.

1. Core Requirement (8 units). Choose one course from two of the three Core Areas listed above, with no grade lower than B-.
2. Breadth Requirement (8 units). Two approved breadth courses chosen in such a way that together the core and breadth courses cover four different Major Specialty Areas (A to G).
3. Electives. (32 units)
   a. Project Option. A student pursuing the M.S. degree, non-thesis option, may include up to 4 units of Directed Research (CS 297) towards the elective requirement. Of the remaining 28 units, at least 12 units must be approved graduate lecture courses. The remaining 16 units may include additional approved graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269, and up to 12 units of approved undergraduate technical electives.
**b. Thesis Option.** A student pursuing the M.S. degree, thesis option, may include up to 12 units of graduate research (CS 297 or CS 299) towards the elective unit requirement. Of the remaining 20 units, at least 4 units must be approved graduate lecture courses. The remaining 16 units may include additional approved graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives.

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

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

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

The normative time for the completion of a M.S. in CS is 2 years.

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

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

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

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

The normative time for the completion of a M.S. in CS is 2 years.
JUSTIFICATION:

The Graduate Division modified the purpose/designation for Directed Studies courses so that it no longer pertains directly to the MS program in CSE. Therefore, it is being replaced by CS 297 (Directed Research) to fulfill this requirement, as it does for MS thesis option students.

APPROVALS:

Approved by the Computer Science and Engineering Department: 2/8/12
Approved by the BCOE Executive Committee:
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy:
To be adopted:

Proposed Changes to Southeast Asian Studies Major

PRESENT:
Mariam Beevi Lam, Ph.D., Director
Program Office, INTS 3114
(951) 827-1394; seatrip.ucr.edu

Committee in Charge
Hendrik M.J. Maier, Ph.D. (Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages)
Mariam Beevi Lam, Ph.D. (Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages)
René T.A. Lysloff, Ph.D. (Music)
Sally A. Ness, Ph.D. (Anthropology)
Deborah A. Wong, Ph.D. (Music)

PROPOSED:
Mariam Beevi Lam, Ph.D., Director
Program Office, INTS 3114
(951) 660-3365; seatrip.ucr.edu

Committee in Charge
Muhamad Ali, Ph.D. (Religious Studies)
David Biggs, Ph.D. (History)
Lan Duong, Ph.D. (Media & Cultural Studies)
Weihsin Gui, Ph.D. (English)
Tamara Ho, Ph.D. (Women's Studies)
Mariam Beevi Lam, Ph.D. (Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages)
René T.A. Lysloff, Ph.D. (Music)
Hendrik M.J. Maier, Ph.D. (Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages)
Sally A. Ness, Ph.D. (Anthropology)
Christina Schwenkel, Ph.D. (Anthropology)
Yukki Tajima, Ph.D. (Political Science)
Deborah A. Wong, Ph.D. (Music)

Graduate Program

The Master's Program in Southeast Asian Studies is an interdepartmental program centered on the study of the arts and cultures of Southeast Asia and its diasporas. To understand Southeast Asia as a region, students need to make sense of and engage with its diverse expressive forms of culture (including visual arts, literature, and performance) which are crucial in building and maintaining individual as well as group identity both within and across national or ethnic boundaries.

This program is designed for students with a strong interest in Southeast Asia, including those already admitted or enrolled in another graduate program. Students can be concurrently enrolled in both the Southeast Asian
Studies M.A. program and another graduate degree program.

**Admission** All applicants must fulfill the standard admission requirements as established by the Graduate Division. Additionally, applicants must submit a Statement of Purpose to indicate a serious interest in Southeast Asian Studies (or a specific country or area in this region) as well as a writing sample (such as a past term paper or course essay) to demonstrate basic skills of scholarship.

**Foreign Language** Students must acquire (or increase) a distinct level of proficiency in at least one language relevant to Southeast Asian Studies prior to beginning research for the thesis and no later than the fifth quarter in the program. The required proficiency can be demonstrated by way of an exam or by completing one year of course work with a “B” or better. International students from Southeast Asia may use their native language to fulfill this requirement.

**Course Work** All students are required to pass the Proseminar in Southeast Asian Studies (SEAS 200) with a “B” or better. Additionally, students must pass (with a “B” or better) four of the following six seminar courses:

- SEAS 201 Southeast Asian performance
- SEAS 202 Southeast Asian religions
- SEAS 203 Southeast Asian cultures
- SEAS 204 History of Southeast Asia
- SEAS 205 Literatures of Southeast Asia
- SEAS 206 Media in Southeast Asia

In addition, students can select four other graduate seminars or approved upper division undergraduate courses in accordance with their main field of interest and after approval by the Graduate Advisor and the student's Thesis Committee. A total of 48 units of coursework, including thesis, are required for the degree in Southeast Asian Studies.

Students concurrently enrolled in another graduate program may, when appropriate, include units earned in that program toward the 48 units of the M.A. in Southeast Asian Studies.
However, there must be at least 36 units uniquely applied to the Southeast Asian Studies degree.

**Plan I (Thesis)** Students enrolled in the Southeast Asian Studies Graduate Program (for the terminal M.A.) must submit an essay (thesis) of 30-40 pages reflecting original research, written under the supervision of a member of the program who also functions as the chair of their Thesis Committee. At the beginning of the second year students should write a research proposal outlining their research project. Approximately ten pages in length this proposal should describe the aims of the research and provide a broader theoretical framework. After this is approved students begin to conduct individual research in the field or in the library. Students must enroll in a minimum of 8 units of thesis study under the supervision of a Southeast Asian Studies faculty. Before filing the thesis with the Graduate Division students must pass a formal oral examination.

**Plan II (Comprehensive Exam)** Students concurrently enrolled in another degree program requiring an M.A. thesis may (with the approval of the Southeast Asian Studies faculty) be awarded the M.A. degree by passing a comprehensive examination.

**University Requirements** All master's students must be enrolled for at least three quarters to fulfill the University residency requirement and must hold at least a 3.00 GPA in all upper division and graduate level course work related to the degree. A minimum of 48 units must be completed of which 36 must be graduate level (200 level) or approved upper division undergraduate (100 level) and apply only to the M.A. in Southeast Asian Studies.

**Normative Time to Degree** Two years

**Lower-Division Courses**

| SEAS 047. Introduction to Southeast Asian History (4) |  |

**University Requirements**

All master's students must be enrolled for at least three quarters to fulfill the University residency requirement and must hold at least a 3.00 GPA in all upper division and graduate level course work related to the degree. A minimum of 40 units must be completed of which 36 must be graduate level (200 level) or approved upper division undergraduate (100 level) and apply only to the M.A. in Southeast Asian Studies.

**Normative Time to Degree** Two years

**Lower-Division Courses**

| AST 049/HIST 046/SEAS 047, AST 062/CPLT 062/SEAS 062, AST 063/CPLT 063/SEAS 063 |  |
Lecture, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours. Introduces major themes and events in Southeast Asian history. Covers from prehistory to contemporary events in the region. Develops basic historical approaches to understanding contemporary trends, such as the spread of world religions, regional differences and connections, trading patterns, cultural forms, and historically important sites. Cross-listed with AST 049 and HIST 046

AST 049/HIST 046/SEAS 047, Introduction to Southeast Asian History
AST 062/CPLT 062/SEAS 062, Introduction to Southeast Asian Literature
AST 063/CPLT 063/SEAS 063, Reading Southeast Asian Stories
AST 064/MCS 049/SEAS 064/VNM 064, Introduction to Vietnamese and Diasporic Film Culture
AST 065/SEAS 065, Introduction to Southeast Asian Cultures

Upper-Division Courses

SEAS 145. Buddhism in Southeast Asia (4) Lecture, 3 hours; outside research, 3 hours. Prerequisite(s): RLST 106 or consent of instructor. Explores various texts, magical practices, forms of meditation, rituals, and beliefs of ancient and modern Buddhism, focusing on the ways in which they are transformed by nuns, monks, and the laity in Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and California. Cross-listed with RLST 145


ANTH 136/SEAS 136, Anthropological Perspectives on Gender in Southeast Asia

AST 126/HIST 185/SEAS 185, Southeast Asia, Prehistory to 1800

AST 129/HIST 186/SEAS 186, Modern Southeast Asia, 1800 to Present
AST 160/HIST 184/SEAS 184/VNM 184, The Vietnam Wars

AST 161/SEAS 161, Translating Modern Southeast Asian Texts

AST 162/HIST 187/SEAS 182/VNM 162, Vietnamese Literary History

AST 163/CPLT 163/SEAS 163, Nationalism and the Novel

AST 164/SEAS 164/VNM 164, Vietnamese American Culture

AST 166/CPLT 166/SEAS 166/VNM 166, Vietnam and the Philippines

AST 167/CPLT 167/SEAS 167, Postcolonial Literature and Criticism in Southeast Asia and South Asia

AST 187/MCS 167/SEAS 177, Vietnamese and Overseas Vietnamese Cinema

AST 189/HIST 189/SEAS 189/VNM 189, Encountering Vietnam

ETST 137/SEAS 137, The Vietnamese Americans: The Refugee and Immigrant Experience

ETST 143A/SEAS 143A, Critical Filipino(a) Studies: Histories and Legacies of U.S. Conquest, Colonialism, and Empire

ETST 143B/SEAS 143B, Critical Filipino(a) Studies: Interrogating the Filipino American Present

MCS 123/SEAS 175/WMST 124, Asian American Women: Writing the Self in Literature and Film

MCS 142/SEAS 172/WMST 122, Gender in Southeast Asian Diasporic Literature and Film

RLST 145/SEAS 145, Buddhism in Southeast Asia

RLST 149/SEAS 149, Southeast Asian Religions

RLST 150/SEAS 150, Islam in Southeast Asia
Graduate Courses

SEAS 200. Topics in Southeast Asian Studies (4)
Seminar, 3 hours; written work, 2 hours; term paper, 1 hour. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. An introduction to the world of Southeast Asia and the scholarly discussions about it, with an emphasis on cultural aspects, embedded in their historical context. Materials are in English. Course is repeatable as content changes to a maximum of 12 units. Cross-listed with CPLT 200.

SEAS 202. Southeast Asian Religions (4) Seminar, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Discusses different and dynamic aspects of religion in various Southeast Asian countries, including Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and the Philippines. Explores contextualized readings featuring historical, anthropological, literary, and other disciplinary perspectives on this diverse region. May be taken Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC) with consent of instructor and graduate advisor. Course is repeatable as topic changes up to 8 units.

SEAS 203. Southeast Asian Cultures (4) Seminar, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Surveys ethnographic literature on Southeast Asian cultures, with an emphasis on contemporary research. Covers anthropological approaches to the study of text, ritual, and performance practices; intercultural dynamics; the impact of colonialism and nationalism on traditional cultures; and globalization. May be taken Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC) with consent of instructor and graduate advisor. Cross-listed with ANTH 203.

SEAS 204. Approaches to Southeast Asian History (4) Seminar, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Introduces students to central historical problems, historiographical debates, materials, and theoretical approaches in Southeast Asian history. Readings each week focus on a different theme. Course is repeatable to a maximum of 8 units. Crosslisted with HIST 242.
SEAS 205. Literature of Southeast Asia (4)
Seminar, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours.
Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Explores themes and theories related to understanding literature and literary culture in Southeast Asia, insisting that the space of literature reaches beyond the text to include all disciplines. Students critically read, engage in, and question discourses of nationhood, identity, loss, mourning, history, and memoir. Course is repeatable as content changes to a maximum of 12 units. Crosslisted with CPLT 205.

SEAS 206. Southeast Asian Diasporic Literature and Film (4)
Seminar, 3 hours; extra reading, 3 hours.
Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Explores the contemporary works by Southeast Asian immigrants within the United States and France. Emphasizes the concept that the dynamic production of culture is a negotiation of power and an expression of resistance. Provides an interdisciplinary framework by utilizing historical as well as theoretical works to contextualize the cultural productions. May be taken Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC) with consent of instructor and graduate advisor. Course is repeatable as content changes to a maximum of 12 units.

SEAS 243A. Seminar in Southeast Asian History (4)
Seminar, 3 hours; outside research, 3 hours.
Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor. Discusses Southeast Asian topics from regional, comparative, and local perspectives. May be undertaken as a one- or two-quarter course (HIST 243A/SEAS 243A, HIST 243B/SEAS 243B). Graded In Progress (IP) until the last quarter is completed, at which time a final grade is assigned. After completing both HIST 243A/SEAS 243A and HIST 243B/SEAS 243B, students may repeat the sequence once for credit; total credit for each course may not exceed 8 units. Cross-listed with HIST 243A.

SEAS 243B. Seminar in Southeast Asian History (4)
Seminar, 3 hours; outside research, 3 hours.
Prerequisite(s): graduate standing or consent of instructor; HIST 243A/SEAS 243A. Discusses Southeast Asian topics from regional, comparative, and local perspectives. Students produce a substantial research paper that continues their work from HIST 243A/SEAS 243A. May be undertaken as a
one or two-quarter course (HIST 243A/SEAS 243A, HIST 243B/SEAS 243B). After completing both HIST 243A/SEAS 243A and HIST 243B/SEAS 243B, students may repeat the sequence once for credit, total credit for each course may not exceed 8 units. Crosslisted with HIST 243B.

**SEAS 290. Directed Studies (1-6)** Individual study, 3-18 hours. Prerequisite(s): consent of instructor and graduate advisor. Directed study to meet special curricular needs. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable.

**SEAS 292. Concurrent Analytical Studies in Southeast Asian Studies (1-4)** Individual study, 3-12 hours. Prerequisite(s): graduate standing; consent of instructor and graduate advisor. Taken concurrently with a 100-series course, but on an individual basis. Devoted to research, criticism, and written work at the graduate level related to the 100-series course. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable.

**SEAS 297. Directed Research (1-6)** Outside research, 3-18 hours. Prerequisite(s): consent of instructor; graduate standing. Individualized research under the sponsorship of specific faculty members. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable to a maximum of 12 units.

**SEAS 299. Research for the Thesis (1-12)** Thesis, 3-36 hours. Prerequisite(s): consent of thesis director. Research and preparation for the thesis. Graded Satisfactory (S) or No Credit (NC). Course is repeatable.

**JUSTIFICATION:**

We voted to reduce the number of Thesis units (currently 8) to "4 Thesis units or Independent Study units." This brings the total units down to more comparable MA programs on campus, and avoids duplication of work by our students.

**APPROVALS:**

Effective Date: Fall 2012
Approved by the faculty committee of the Southeast Asian Studies Minor: February 3, 2012
Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences: Enter date here
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: Enter date here
March 9, 2012

After nearly a review of research, formulation, and review, the English Department has recently approved a revision to our protocols for Qualifying Examination II (the doctoral qualifying examination).

After speaking with Joe Childers, I understand that this proposal needs to be approved by the Graduate Council in order to be implemented by the Department and to be entered into the catalog. Dr. Childers asked me to send you the proposal.

I'm attaching a PDF of the proposal, below.

Can we put this on the agenda for an upcoming Graduate Council meeting?

Thank you,

James Tobias
English
Qualifying Examination II: Proposed Portfolio Description

Approved by Subcommittee for Qualifying Examination II Procedures, 6/2011
Approved by Graduate Committee (with minor revisions) 11/30/11
Approved by the English Department Faculty (1/23/12)

I. Proposed portfolio-style examination for Qualifying Examination II.

Proposal: Replace the current “timed-writing” component of Qualifying Examination II (the doctoral qualifying examination) with a portfolio component to be prepared and submitted in advance. In turn, format the oral component of Qualifying Examination II to emphasize the candidate’s presentation of the portfolio, coverage areas, and dissertation prospectus.

Goals: Qualifying Examination II should produce evaluations of doctoral candidates’ abilities across four domains: 1) research ability; 2) areas mastery; 3) a concrete plan for the dissertation; and 4) preparedness for pedagogical activities like syllabus creation and course planning; and in accordance with professional standards and procedures in place at peer institutions.

Proposal Background: In spring quarter 2011 an English Department subcommittee review of 1) faculty perspectives on our current examination protocols; 2) a survey conducted of examination procedures at peer institutions determined by consulting NRC rankings; and 3) considerations of specific instances of portfolio-based qualifying examinations currently in use. On these bases, we proposed to replace the timed-writing component of Qualifying Examination II with a portfolio component (as described below). We believe that a portfolio-style examination will allow the department to evaluate the four dimensions of candidate expertise given above in ways that are up-to-date with institutional and professional standards in the fields of graduate education represented by the department with rigor, consistency, fairness, and clarity in terms of current standards for professional training as well as contemporary institutional and professional expectations.

Additional Merits: The portfolio-based qualifying examination will ensure rigor and thoroughness in candidate professionalization, and will do so while providing greater clarity to doctoral candidates about degree requirements and contemporary expectations for research scholars. The portfolio component prepared and submitted in advance of oral examination will allow rigor across four domains of mastery to be assessed in multiple and complementary ways. These four domains include: the professional quality and long-term academic potential of the candidate’s ongoing research; their mastery of recognized disciplines, subdisciplines, subfields, or other study areas; dissertation planning in the form of a preliminary prospectus; and pedagogical preparedness. Evaluated in the oral portion of Qualifying Examination II, the examination portfolio will better allow examination committees to correlate examination expectations, preparation, and
performance in the four domains. Successful examinees will thus demonstrate not only advanced field mastery (as has been the primary objective of Qualifying Examination II until now), but in addition to coverage mastery, the ability to perform publishable research, present clear and incisive oral summaries of their research, present an advanced plan for dissertation research and writing, and present effective teaching strategies. Formalizing these learning outcomes as degree qualifications will best prepare candidates for the contemporary range of professional activities expected of doctoral candidates as they compete for professional positions.

For examinees, the benefits of more closely correlating scholarly ability, professional performance, and degree requirements in Qualifying Examination II also include demystifying the examination process by making the requirements of the examination accord with contemporary and emergent professional demands on the humanities scholar.

Finally, this examination procedure better supports the process by which students move from the stage of declaring examination areas through Qualifying Examination II to prospectus and finally to the dissertation. Given the pressures of funding and normative time, we feel that providing an examination process that closely supports this professional development trajectory is imperative.

Overall, we believe that replacing the timed-writing examination component with a portfolio examination component will allow examination committees, and the department more broadly, to best support, recognize, and value the most significant innovations in literary, cultural, and media research, the most impressive demonstrations of areas mastery, and the greatest professional potential that we can help candidates develop. These are significant benefits both for the department and for our doctoral examinees.

II. Proposed portfolio component for Qualifying Examination II: Contents

Contents: Our doctoral portfolios would include five items: 1) an introduction; 2) a presentation of research; 3) two coverage lists; 4) a tentative dissertation prospectus; and 5) three proposed syllabi.

1. An introduction to the Qualifying Examination II portfolio:
   i. 2000 word description of the candidate’s portfolio as demonstration of a research project, and with regards to professional development as a scholar, future ambitions for research, and professionalization goals.

2. Presentation of Research
   i. A statement of the research topic, including abstract and bibliography (60 – 80 works); AND
ii. a presentation of research in the form of ONE of the following (directed by advisor of the research topic, who is likely also the chair of the examination committee in most cases):

1. a 25-page scholarly article in source citation format, of publishable quality addressing the research topic, submitted with the portfolio. This is the default format.
2. OR, a demonstration or other scholarly presentation of the research topic, to be accompanied by visual, auditory, or other multimodal materials; described in a 25-page paper in source citation format submitted with the portfolio. The standard for evaluation is that of a professional quality presentation of research in the manner of a job talk; this option should be justified by the choice and character of the visual, auditory, or other data included, with attention to the reflexivity, formal or material specificity, performativity, historicity, or other critical value assigned to the work, as clarified in the presentation.
3. OR, a demonstration of research on the research topic presenting an innovative use of digital or digitized materials in some non-trivial interactive format, such as an innovative digital presentation of bibliographic research in the form of a navigable database, etc.; a critical research essay in a non-trivial interactive format (that is, not a “slideshow” presentation, which might be acceptable, based on the quality and character of the materials, for item 2 preceding, but is not the intent of the research project described here); etc.; and to be described in a 25-page paper in source-citation format documenting the research project presented.

Presentations of research will be evaluated on the basis of methodological innovation, critical rigor, and the quality and professionalism evident in the presentation format(s).

3. Demonstration of Areas Coverage

Candidates will be examined in two coverage areas in addition to the area engaged in the demonstration of research. Although the presentation of research also demonstrates coverage in important ways, the two coverage areas here are to be evaluated similarly to “major” and “minor” area examinations typical in other doctoral programs. The two coverage areas should be coordinated to minimize unnecessary overlap with one another and with the research topic; and to allow high-level disciplinary or sub-, inter- or transdisciplinary engagements to be evaluated clearly in the oral exam on the basis of recognized areas of scholarly research and publishing. Candidates will submit the following coverage documents in the portfolio:
a. reading list #1 (40 – 50 works covering a primary research field), accompanied by 3 – 5 questions prepared in consultation with the advisor of this area.
b. reading list #2 (35 – 45 works covering a secondary research field), accompanied by 3 questions prepared in consultation with the advisor of this area.

4. Preliminary dissertation prospectus

The description of a preliminary dissertation prospectus is to be a revision of the tentative dissertation topic described in the previously filed areas petition, updated based on work undertaken for the demonstration of research and the two coverage areas. This document is not an entirely new piece of writing, but rather presents work on the prospectus in a preliminary fashion, based on the earlier areas petition, and with the aim of revising the dissertation project proposal. This component thus provides greater continuity between the time areas petitions are filed and until the time the dissertation prospectus is approved (90 days after successfully completing Qualifying Examination II). Evaluating this document as a component of the oral examination may also help clarify problems in the research presentation or the coverage examinations. This component is to be advised by the dissertation committee chair, who in most cases is also the qualifying examination committee chair.

The length of the preliminary dissertation prospectus should be the same as the actual prospectus, 8 – 15 pages. (GC 11/30/11)

5. Pedagogy

Candidates will include three proposed syllabi:
   a. a syllabi for a general or survey lower-division course based on one of the coverage areas and, when appropriate, the research topic
   b. a syllabi for a general or survey upper-division course based on one of the coverage areas and, when appropriate, the research topic
   c. a syllabi for a specialized upper-division course based on the research topic

Up to two professionalization documents distinct from course syllabi may be substituted for two of the three required syllabus documents, pending approval of the examination committee chair. Such documents may include, but may not be limited to, a two-page statement of teaching philosophy, a research essay or narrative describing proposed research plans in support of fellowship or other research funding application, a publishable review of current research in the candidate’s fields, a translation into English of material relevant to the candidate’s fields, a complete planning document indicating archival, pedagogical, or presentational design of research materials relevant to the candidate’s fields, etc. (GC 11/30/11)
III. Proposed oral component for Qualifying Examination II

Candidates submit their portfolios two weeks in advance of the three-hour oral examination. Oral examinations are scheduled for three hours, with actual length to be determined at the discretion of committee chair and members.

All oral examinations begin with a presentation of research. Candidates present either: 1) a 20-25 minute conference-style presentation, presenting in a shorter, verbal form, the methods and results of the publishable article; or 2) a 20–25 minute talk, in the form of a research presentation, including the additional visual, auditory, audiovisual, or interactive materials prepared for the research project. The presentation is followed by a question and answer session on the presentation and on the written research it represents. Because a written document of the complete work will be submitted in advance, the oral examination presentation is to be more extemporaneous; students may work from notes in their oral presentation, for example, but should not simply *read* a text aloud.

Examination of areas coverage, discussion of the dissertation prospectus, and discussion of the proposed syllabi follow the discussion of the research presentation. During the examination of areas coverage, examiners move from the prepared questions to other questions or topics of discussion, as appropriate.

Additional notes for student examination preparation: students may find it useful to produce annotated bibliographies for the research topic and coverage areas but do not need to submit these documents as part of the portfolio.

IV. Administrative concerns related to introducing a new examination style

We will use the current examination procedure for all students who enter the program until the third quarter after a new examination procedure is approved. If the new procedure is approved, students who still have significant preparation time may switch to the new procedure. We estimate at least three quarters would be necessary to produce a portfolio for the new procedure.

We will have to make some minor revisions to the areas petition form for the new procedure. That process remains more or less the same: three areas; three advisors including an examination committee chair; and the choice to have the examination chair be distinct from the research topic (formerly “special topic”) advisor. What’s different is primarily that 1) the research topic (formerly the special topic) is more prominent than before, and 2) the “coverage areas” appear more as “major” and “minor” areas of expertise rather than equivalent areas of expertise. We have indicated fewer works being required for these lists than for the research topic; these suggestions reflect requirements of comparably-ranked graduate programs which specify major and minor coverage areas. One issue, though, is that this proposal makes specific that these lists will be shorter than the corresponding areas
in our current format. The expectation, though, is a demonstration of greater detail in the oral examination, not a lightening of the demand to demonstrate expertise in an area. We suggest that the guidelines for length of areas lists be made comparable for both examination formats in the transition to a new standard.

Students admitted under the new catalog requirements examine under those requirements. At time of declaring or revising areas, candidates admitted under older catalog requirements indicate, on the Areas Petition form, their intent to examine under the portfolio or the timed-writing procedures. (GC 11/30/11)

We may revise qualifying examination I (the MA examination) based on observations made as we introduce the new Qualifying Examination II procedure, based on comparisons and adjustments arising in its introduction.
April 2, 2012

TO: KENNETH BARISH, CHAIR  
    GRADUATE COUNCIL

FR: MARTIN JOHNSON, CHAIR  
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: NEW FIVE YEAR COMPUTER ENGINEERING BS PLUS COMPUTER SCIENCE MS PROGRAM

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the above referenced proposal and supports this proposal with no further comments.
April 4, 2012

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: UMAR MOHIDEEN, CHAIR  
PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: Proposal for a new five-year Computer-Engineering BS + Computer-Science MS program

The committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the proposal for a new five-year Computer-Engineering BS + Computer-Science MS program and approved the proposal. The proposal will require almost no additional fiscal resources as the undergraduate component is already in place and the addition of the MS section will help in recruiting more students.
Selwyna Ehlers

From: Linda Scott <gdivls@ucr.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 3:40 PM
To: Selwyna Ehlers
Subject: Re: Proposal for a new five-year Computer Engineering BS + CS MS program

This looks fine.

Linda

On Feb 22, 2012, at 2:00 PM, Selwyna Ehlers wrote:

Dear All:

Attached is a proposal for a new Five-year Computer Engineering BS + MS program in the College of Engineering.

Please respond to me no later than March 9, 2012.

Thanks.

S

From: Neal Young [mailto:neal@neal.young.name] On Behalf Of Neal Young
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2012 10:49 AM
To: Kenneth Barish; Selwyna Ehlers
Cc: Amy Ricks; Laxmi N. Bhuyan; Morris Maduro; Leah T Haimo
Subject: proposal for a new five-year Computer Engineering BS + CS MS program

Ken, Selwyna,

The Computer Science and Engineering department (CSE) is proposing a new five-year Computer Engineering BS + CS MS program.

The proposal has been approved by the CSE department and the Engineering College Executive committee. As I understand it, the next step is for Graduate Council to vote on the proposal. Leah Haimo suggested that I should email the proposal to you two, and ask you to please take it to Graduate Council (and Graduate Division, as appropriate).

I should note that last year I met with with Morris Maduro (as a representative of grad council) and Leah Haimo (as a representative of grad division) to get their informal feedback on the proposal.

The attachment below contains the proposal, including the formal cover letter.
Separately, the CSE department is also proposing to revise their existing five-year CS BS + CS MS program. I sent that proposal in my previous email earlier today. The proposal here is based directly on that one, so we ask that you consider this one just after you consider that one.

Thanks,

--Neal Young (CSE undergrad advisor)

<CE+CS.pdf><senate guidelines.pdf>

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

951-827-3387
linda.scott1@ucr.edu
gdivis@ucr.edu
January 31, 2012

TO:  Dr. Kenneth Barish  
     Chair, Graduate Council

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


Dear Dr. Barish:

The CSE department would like to propose a new five-year BS+MS program, with a BS in Computer Engineering (CE) and an MS in Computer Science (CS).

Currently no CE BS + CS MS (CE+CS) program exists at UCR. The only current five-year program with a CS MS is the CS BS + CS MS (CS+CS).

The remainder of this letter includes the full text of the proposed CE+CS program document.

This CE+CS program document is based directly on the (separately) proposed revision of the CS+CS program document, so we request that you please consider this CE+CS proposal just after considering the CS+CS proposal. Since the two program documents are essentially the same, we are assuming that any questions that arise about one proposal will also apply to the other. Thus, we hope that the documentation provided for the CS+CS proposed revision will suffice to answer any questions about this CE+CS proposal.

The only textual differences between the CE+CS and CS+CS program documents are appropriate program name changes and course substitutions. To make the differences clear, in the CE+CS document presented here, parts that differ from the proposed CS+CS revision are underlined like this and marked in the margin with an arrow (as shown to the right). Of course the underlining and arrows are not part of the program document per se.

Note that the core undergraduate CS courses are required by the CE BS; these courses are sufficient preparation for entry into the CS MS.

The proposal was approved by the department (CSE) in October 12, 2011.

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

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.
PROPOSAL FOR A

Computer-Engineering 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-Engineering 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:¹

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-Engineering 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.

¹Online 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 BS portion of the program will be administered as part of the undergraduate Computer-Engineering program. The MS portion 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. Based on current levels of participation in the CS BS + CS MS program, over the 2012-2015 period, we expect from 3-6 students to participate at the MS level per year.

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 Engineering 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 department 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 Computer-Engineering 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 Computer-Engineering BS program. To maintain preliminary admission status, the student must remain an undergraduate Computer-Engineering or Computer-Science 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 Computer-Engineering or Computer-Science 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 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 Computer-Engineering BS + Computer-Science 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/CompE_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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Course Code (Units)</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>CS 204 (4)</td>
<td>Advanced Computer Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 218 (4)</td>
<td>Design and Analysis of Algorithms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 235 (4)</td>
<td>Data Mining Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>CS 203A (4)</td>
<td>Advanced Computer Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 207 (4)</td>
<td>Advanced Programming Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 262 (4)</td>
<td>Algorithms and Data Structure (Seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>CS 201 (4)</td>
<td>Compiler Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 205 (4)</td>
<td>Artificial Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS 213 (4)</td>
<td>Parallel Processing Architectures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Combined B.S. + M.S. Five-Year Program The college offers a combined five-year B.S. + M.S. program, designed to allow successful UCR Computer-Engineering B.S. graduates to complete the Master of Science degree in Computer Science in one year, by allowing up to 12 credits of coursework taken as a UCR undergraduate to be counted towards the 32-unit elective requirements of the M.S. (The courses that can be double-counted are those that are eligible to be counted as technical electives in the B.S. requirements.) A student may apply at the start of their senior year by submitting an application to the Computer-Science M.S. program, provided that at the end of junior year, the student was a UCR Computer-Engineering B.S. student with cumulative GPA at least 3.4 and had completed the following courses with no grade less than a B- and average grade at least 3.2: CS 100, 120A, 120B, 161. The application to the M.S. program must include at least two recommendation letters from UCR Academic Senate faculty members (at least one, and preferably both, CSE faculty). Submission of GRE scores with the application is recommended but not required. Matriculation into the combined program occurs in the Fall term following senior year, provided: (a) the M.S. application is accepted, (b) throughout senior year, the student is a Computer-Engineering B.S. major with cumulative GPA 3.4 or higher, (c) by the end of senior year, the student completes the Computer-Engineering B.S. degree requirements.

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

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 for other five-year programs by the Admissions Office and the Engineering Student Academic Affairs Office. At the MS level, the college and program 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 for existing five-year programs 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.

---

2Unless the school chooses to use it increase enrollment levels.
Establishment of Combined Programs at UCR

Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee

The main charge to the Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) was to set a framework for establishing Combined five-year Programs (CP) for Bachelor/Master studies at UCR. The AHC was jointly formed by the Committee on Educational Policy and Graduate Council, with two representatives designated from each Committee. In this memo, AHC members outline possible incentives that can establish CPs as viable educational tools for both prospective “CP-students” and UCR units.

The two main questions addressed by the members of the AHC were:
- Can the CPs lead to a Masters degree in 5 years without any compromise of educational standards?
- Can the CPs streamline the educational process, compared to separate Bachelors and Masters programs?

The members of AHC believe that both questions can be answered in the affirmative and suggest the following framework:

1. Each program at UCR can tentatively admit incoming students to a CP at the beginning of their Bachelors studies. Admission criteria to the CP must be established by each program and then approved by the Graduate Council. In general, these criteria should exceed the normal admission requirements set by the specific program.

2. Admitted students maintain their tentative enrollment in the CP if their cumulative GPA exceeds some level X. If students fail to maintain the level X standard, they are disenrolled from the CP but are eligible to re-enroll if their cumulative GPA subsequently exceeds this level X for three consecutive quarters. The same condition would be applied to all new enrollments requested after freshman entry, including transfer students.

The specific level X is to be determined by each Program and then approved by the Graduate Council. We suggest that all programs at UCR set this level X at 3.3 or above.

3. By their request, the students tentatively enrolled and in good standing in their CP programs become unconditionally enrolled at the start of the first quarter in which their past record shows accumulation of 135 units towards their Bachelors degree.

4. CP-students must fulfill all the requirements set for their Bachelor programs at UCR without any modifications. In particular, the CP students must meet the specific program requirements set for the number of total units and for units within the major. CP students would automatically become Masters students after receiving a Bachelors degree.

5. For each CP student, up to 12 upper division units from within their undergraduate major can be double-counted towards the Masters degree. This number of units is further limited as follows.
   a. Each CP can establish its own minimum threshold and double count upper division major units taken in excess of this threshold toward both the Bachelors and the Masters degree, with a limit of 12 undergraduate units to be so double-counted. Generally, the allowable
range for setting the minimum threshold is 0 to 11 units below the total number of units required within the major for that Bachelors degree.

b. Double-counting begins at the minimum threshold. Therefore, the maximum double counting of 12 units can be granted only if a student exceeds the unit requirements within the major for the program. The amount of double counting allowed is correspondingly reduced if the requirements within the major are not exceeded.

Examples: A certain program requires a total of 80 units within the major for the Bachelors degree and sets its minimum threshold for double counting at 72 units. Students in the CP can begin double counting after they complete 72 units within the major. Student A in the program completes the minimum of 80 units within the major for the Bachelors and can double count 8 units. Student B in the program completes 82 units within the major for the Bachelors and can double count 10 units. Student C in the program completes 84 units within the major for the Bachelors and can double count 12 units. Student D in the program completes 90 units within the major for the Bachelors but can still double count only 12 units.

c. Each Program can also specify that only a subset of the upper-division courses in the major are eligible for double-counting, or it can set its minimum threshold for double counting to be some level above the total number of units within the major required for the Bachelors degree in the program, or it can limit the maximum number of units that can be double counted to be some number less than 12.

6. The undergraduate courses double counted for the Masters degree may not be applied in any manner to reduce the following requirements:

   a. for Plan I programs, the 24 units of required graduate-level courses
   b. for Plan II programs, the 18 units of required graduate-level courses.

7. Excepted as described above in numbers #1 - #6, all rules and regulations that apply to graduate students apply to CP students.

The above framework can be justified by the following analysis:

- Many undergraduate programs at UCR have their own unit requirements, which substantially exceed the minimum number of 180 units set at the campus level. As a result, UCR graduates admitted to Masters programs often have done more undergraduate coursework within their major than their peers admitted from other institutions with lower unit requirements.

- Some Masters programs at UCR currently include up to 12 units of undergraduate coursework within the same major. This work may be particularly important for non-UCR students, due to a different structure or amount of the undergraduate course work required by the other institutions. In most cases, however, this work has already been done by the former UCR undergraduates. This is the main rationale for allowing CP-students to double count up to 12 undergraduate units and thereby streamline their Masters studies.

The AHC concludes that CPs will prove beneficial for both incoming students and UCR programs due to the following reasons:
• CPs 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.

• CP 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.

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: April 6, 2007
March 20, 2012

Dear Professor Barish,

The Department of Mathematics would like to change the degree requirements for Masters and Doctoral degrees to enable students to specialize in the area of applied mathematics. Please find attached the proposed degree requirements to replace the current degree requirements.

The main changes are in the degree requirements for MS in Applied Mathematics. It is not possible for students to fulfill the current requirements since most of the exams are not being offered. We propose to change the requirements to one that is similar to the current MA/MS in Mathematics. The only change for MA/MS in Mathematics is to drop the specific mention of MATH 131, 132, 151A, and 151B since many students routinely petition to replace these courses with other upper division courses or graduate core courses. The only change for PhD in Mathematics is to allow students to use MATH 207 or any other future new core sequence as one of the four core sequences which they have to pass. MATH 207 is a new course sequence that was approved.

A faculty meeting was held on November 3, 2011 to discuss the changes. The faculty has voted to approve the change.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Wee Liang Gan
Graduate Advisor
Department of Mathematics
Graduate Programs

The Department of Mathematics offers the M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in Mathematics.

Admission

Domestic applicants must supply GRE General Test scores (verbal, quantitative, and analytical).

M.A. or M.S. in Mathematics

General university requirements are listed in the Graduate Studies section of this catalog. Specific requirements are as follows:

1. Completion of two of the following sequences: MATH 201A, MATH 201B, MATH 201C; MATH 205A, MATH 205B, MATH 205C; MATH 209A, MATH 209B, MATH 209C; or MATH 210A, MATH 210B, with a grade of "C" or better in each course and a GPA of 3.00 in each chosen sequence.
2. As a substitute for one or more course sequences in (1), passing a Ph.D. qualifying examination fulfills the course requirement of the corresponding sequence.
3. Taking 36 units of courses approved by the Mathematics Graduate Committee, of which at least 18 must be from courses numbered between 200 and 210.
4. Completion of the courses MATH 131, MATH 132, MATH 151A, and MATH 151B, or their equivalents.

M.S. in Mathematics (Applied)

General university requirements are listed in the Graduate Studies section of this catalog. Specific requirements are as follows:

1. Completion of two sequences of courses numbered between 206 and 209 with a grade of "C" or better in each course and a GPA of at least 3.00 in each chosen sequence.
2. As a substitute for one or more course sequences in (1), passing a Ph.D. qualifying examination fulfills the course requirement of the corresponding sequence.
3. Taking 36 units of courses numbered between 110 and 189, or between 200 and 210, approved by the Mathematics Graduate Committee, of which at least 18 must be from courses numbered between 200 and 210.
4. Completion of the courses MATH 131, MATH 132, MATH 151A, and MATH 151B, or their equivalents.

The requirements of 1 and 2 above constitute the comprehensive final examination requirement for the degree.
Doctoral Degree
The Department of Mathematics offers the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics.
Specific requirements are as follows:

1. Passing the introductory courses in algebra (MATH 201A, MATH 201B, MATH 201C), complex analysis (MATH 210A, MATH 210B), real analysis (MATH 209A, MATH 209B, MATH 209C), and topology/differentiable manifolds (MATH 205A, MATH 205B, MATH 205C).
2. Passing at least three of the four qualifying examinations in algebra, complex analysis, real analysis and topology/differentiable manifolds with a grade of "A." The fourth of the above qualifying examinations must be passed with a grade of "B" or better; a student is allowed to take the qualifying examination at most twice in each area.
3. Completing four quarter-courses in mathematics numbered between 211 and 259.

Normative Time to Degree: 15 quarters.

The requirements of 1 and 2 above constitute the comprehensive final examination requirement for the degree.

MATH 146A, MATH 149A, or their equivalent. Also, MATH 165A is recommended, but not required.

Doctoral Degree
The Department of Mathematics offers the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics.
Specific requirements are as follows:

1. Passing four sequences numbered between 200 and 210. the introductory courses in algebra (MATH 201A, MATH 201B, MATH 201C), complex analysis (MATH 210A, MATH 210B), real analysis (MATH 209A, MATH 209B, MATH 209C), and topology/differentiable manifolds (MATH 205A, MATH 205B, MATH 205C).
2. For each of the four chosen sequences in (1), a qualifying examination must be taken. Three of them must be passed with a grade of "A" and one with a grade of "B" or better. A student is allowed to take the qualifying examination at most twice for each sequence.
3. Completing four quarter-courses in mathematics numbered between 211 and 259.

Normative Time to Degree: 15 quarters.
# ORDER OF REVIEWS FOR YEAR 2011/12 - 2014/15

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (May-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History (Feb-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; Bioinformatics (Jan-2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (May-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology (Apr-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (May-05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (Jan-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science (May-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (May-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (Apr-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences (Feb-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (May-06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management (MA/PhD - 2009/10) - Internal review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering - (MS/PhD - Fall 2010) - Internal review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Dance; Experimental Choreography (Mar-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (May-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Statistics/Statistics (Mar-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (Nov-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Stat/Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution, Ecology &amp; Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ Toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Water Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2011/12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (internal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be received and placed on file:

The Graduate Council met nine times during the period June 2011 through April 30, 2012. The Administrative Committee of the Council met 4 times during this same period. Complete records of Council activity are on file in the Office of the Academic Senate.

The Courses and Programs Subcommittee made recommendations and the Council acted on 124 Courses; 32 new courses, 36 changes in existing courses and 56 deletions. In addition, the Graduate Council also approved the following Extension Courses on behalf of the Division:

The following Extension Courses have to be approved:
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

The following requests for changes in requirements for graduate programs were reviewed and approved: Biochemistry, Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Creative Writing, Dance, Electrical Engineering, English, Ethnic Studies, Graduate School of Education, Hispanic Studies, Mathematics and South East Asian Studies.

Since the last report, the Graduate Council Fellowship Subcommittee has awarded Dissertation and Master's Thesis Research Grants amounting to $20,440.00.

The Graduate Council concluded its regularly scheduled review of the graduate programs in: Economics, Religious Studies, South East Asian Studies and Music. Graduate Council also discussed the response from the CMDB Graduate Program and agreed to close the review but to add a sentence in the closeout letter that an internal review will be conducted in one year. The following program reviews were reviewed in FY 11-12 – Entomology, Environmental Sciences, Biomedical Sciences, English and Bioengineering.

Additionally, the following actions were taken by the Graduate Council:

- At its first meeting of the academic year, the Council adopted a statement regarding possible conflicts of interest by its members. (Sept. 2011)
- The Graduate Council reviewed its charge and discussed the possibility of forming a subcommittee to review the charges to bring them up to date. Chair Barish established a 3-man taskforce to review the Graduate Council Bylaws and make changes for discussion by the entire
Graduate Council. The members of the taskforce were: Ken Barish, Mike Vanderwood and Morris Maduro. (Sept. 2011)

- The Graduate Council discussed the revised procedures for proposal submission and program changes (Sept. 2011)
- The Graduate Council discussed and clarified the allowable content for 290 courses. At this meeting it was unanimously agreed that code 290 would be used for instruction and 297 for research. (Sept. 2011)
- The Graduate Council discussed and approved GR1.6 Professional Development Requirements for Graduate Students. (Sept. 2011)
- The Graduate Council considered and responded to request from Systemwide to review SR 610 (residency) proposal (Oct. 2011)
- The Graduate Council at its meeting on January 19, 2012, discussed the issue of requests from students to review their candidacy exams and approved the following policy to be included in the Graduate student and graduate advisor handbooks.

  Programs shall make every effort to review the results of candidacy exams when formally requested by students. Requests for review should be made within one month.

- The Graduate Council at its meeting January 19, 2012, discussed the issue of cooperative extension specialists as sole graduate advisors and agreed to send out a clarification memo that indicated that the policy includes CE/ OP specialists, and agreed to retain the need to approve each case through Graduate Division on an ad hoc basis.

- The Graduate Council at its meeting on February 16, 2012, 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 of 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 Graduate Council at its meeting March 15, 2012, discussed the issue of self-supporting graduate degree programs and the need to create a similar policy for UCR. An Ad hoc Committee was established to write the policy composed of Dean J. Childers, Connie Nugent, Mike Vanderwood, a representative from Planning and Budget and Matt Hull, Associate Vice Chancellor, Resource Management and Analysis.

- The Graduate Council at its meeting March 15, 2012, approved a new version of the Academic Integrity policy for graduate students. The new version was drafted by an Ad Hoc Committee.
• The Graduate Council at its meeting March 15, 2012 discussed the CEP policy for CEP Policy/Procedure for Discontinuations, Mergers, for Undergraduate Programs. Council approved a taskforce composed of Chair Barish, Connie Nugent, Mike Vanderwood, Joe Childers and Mohsen El Hafsi to draft guidelines and procedures for the discontinuation, mergers and splits of graduate programs. Council also discussed the process of disseminating new and revised policies to the faculty. Council agreed that new policies will be sent out by the Council Analyst to all Program Directors and Program/Graduate Advisors with a copy to the Chairs of the Department. It was also agreed that an email will be sent out to all Program Directors and Program/Graduate Advisors notifying them of the availability of minutes on the Graduate Council website.

New Graduate Programs:
The Graduate Council approved the following new Graduate Programs:

- Proposal for a new five-year Computer-Engineering BS + Computer-Science MS program

The Graduate Council approved the following program changes:

- Biochemistry. Proposed addition to Graduate Program requirements for MS students regarding comprehensive written exams. (9/29/2011)

- GSOE. Proposed revisions to PHD Education, Higher Education Administration and Policy area group curriculum. Changes will reduce doctoral students’ course numbers and give greater focus to dissertation research preparation. The changes will reduce the total number of 4 unit courses by 2. Deleted EDUC 248M and EDUC 248S from the core. (10/20/2011)

- Ethnic Studies. Extending the Qualifying Written Exams deadline to the end of spring quarter of the second year of study. (10/20/2011)

- English. Proposed changes to Designated Emphasis in Book, Archive and Manuscript Studies to read: Three (3) courses (12 units) selected from the list below or from another course with relevant content as approved by the DE Chairs. (11/17/2011)

- GSOE. (1) Revisions to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. Degree Eliminated the requirement of one of the four approved University Extension Certificate programs as a requirement for admission to the Diversity and Equity M.Ed degree, but still allowing applicants to receive credit for up to 9 units towards the unit requirement for the degree. (2) Changed the requirement that applicants have a teaching credential to be admitted to the degree (3) Changed the overall unit requirements from 37 to a minimum of 36 units. (12/8/2011)

- GSOE. Revision to the Autism M.Ed. Degree -Eliminates the required University Extension course (EDU X450.05), while still allowing this course and one additional approved course to contribute to the total 3 units required for this degree. (12/8/2011)
• Biochemistry. Added language to the normative time to degree to allow students who change from MS to PhD to reset their normative time to degree. (12/8/2011)

• Biochemistry. Proposed addition to graduate program requirements for MS students that they take BCH210, BCH211 and BCH212 to improve the rigor of the MS degree in biochemistry without increasing units required for the degree. (2/16/2012)

• Dance. Approved the proposed additions to the dance curriculum to satisfy the requirement for professional development requirements for graduate students in Critical Dance Studies Program and the MFA in Experimental Choreography Program. These changes include requiring students to complete Dance 301 and giving the students options to take Dance 14 and Dance 280. (3/15/2012)

• Creative Writing. Program Changes for Creative Writing Low Residency-Palm Desert include professional development requirements for Low Residency MFA students. These changes include reducing the thesis units from 8 to 7 and creating a new stand-alone course. (3/15/2012)

• Computer Science and Engineering. Proposed revision of the program document for the five-year BS+MS program in Computer Science. The changes included: Allowing double-counting of up to twelve instead of 8 units; Addition of junior-year course and GPA requirements that students must meet in order to continue to the MS portion; Dropping the mention of an Honors requirement; Removing the requirement for a summer internship; Resolving the inconsistencies, and details of the processes and requirements for transitioning from the BS to the MS program: Rewrite of the Catalog Entry. (3/15/2012)

• Chemical and Environmental Engineering. Programmatic changes to address new professional development requirement for graduate students. These changes include designating two sessions of CEE 286 to use for professional development content, hosting weekly fellowship/grant writing workshops each fall quarter to assist students in grant writing and instituting a one hour appointment slot for all visiting speakers to meet with MS and PhD students. (3/15/2012)

• English. Proposal to replace the current timed-writing component of the qualifying examination II with a portfolio component to be prepared and submitted in advance. (April, 19, 2012)

• South East Asian Studies. Proposal to reduce the number of thesis units - currently 8 to 4 to bring down the total units to more comparable programs on campus. (April, 19, 2012)

• Computer Science and Engineering. Proposal to add CS297 - directed research to the core requirements in computer science. (April, 19, 2012)

• Electrical Engineering. Proposal to revise the program requirements for the graduate program which will require students to choose a research topic, present the state-of-the-art and new research directions they intent to take, and demonstrate a thorough understanding and a potential
for doing cutting-edge research. The proposal also added a dissertation proposal exam. (April, 19, 2012)

- Mathematics: Proposed Changes to Math graduate Program changing the requirements to one that is similar to the MA/MS in Mathematics. For the MA, drop the mention of Math 131, 132, 151A and 151B and for Ph.D., allow students to use Math 207. (April, 19, 2012)

- ETST MA Proposal which added a terminal MA to the Ethnic Studies Graduate Program (April 19, 2012)

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Deborah Wong, Music
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Aaron Jones, (Graduate Student Representative)
GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES
University of California, Riverside
2010-2011 2012-2013

I. Overview

Reviews of graduate programs are conducted by the Graduate Council, usually with the aid of extramural review teams. The process has the approval of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. The primary aim of the review process is to help improve graduate programs or, if necessary, to close programs found to be undesirably weak.

The Graduate Council determines the sequence and schedule of reviews. The sequence of upcoming reviews is discussed at least annually and can be altered by action of the Council. Normally, six to eight programs are scheduled for review each year. This pattern typically yields a 7-9 year cycle between reviews.

II. Preparation for Council Review

The graduate program is notified approximately 6-12 months prior to the scheduled review. At the time of this notification the program is asked to prepare the following information regarding its program for submission to the Graduate Council and to outside reviewers.

1. A concise report based on self-study of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council. The report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the site visit interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. Thus, your own presentation of your program will be available to everyone who receives the review report and recommendations. The report should be five to fifteen single-spaced pages depending on the size and complexity of the program. [guidelines attached]

2. A brief (approx. 2-5 pages) statement concerning the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council.

3. List of faculty members by rank including department affiliation and participation in other graduate programs.

4. Brief biographies for faculty members, including grant and individual fellowship support in the period since the department/program’s last review. [sample format attached]
4. A page listing links to website materials available to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).

5. Placement data for all Ph.D. degrees awarded since the last review, arranged by date of award of degree, listing dissertation director, first position and current position [sample format attached].

6. The WASC learning outcomes for graduate study that has already been prepared recently by your department/program.

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

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

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

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

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

The Graduate Division provides:

132. Admissions profiles, enrollment data, degrees awarded (and time to degree), dropout rate, and historical statistics including fraction of UCR undergraduates and international students admitted to each program.

13. Summary of financial support provided all graduate students for last two years.

14. A report on grant information for all faculty.

15. Catalogue copy of all graduate courses taught by the program.
The program, with the help of the Graduate Council and Graduate Division, should summarize the data to make it most useful for the external review team. Items 1-15 are sent to the program before dissemination to anyone else so that any differences concerning the statistics can be resolved.

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

III. Composition of Extramural Review Team

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

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

--- An extramural team will be used to assist in the review. Please provide me with a list of at least 15 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other UC campuses and the rest from other places throughout the U.S. This list will be vetted by chairs of comparable programs at other UC campuses prior to inviting a three-member review panel. The panel will consist of at least one, but no more than two, reviewers from different UC campuses. Accordingly, please divide the list of names into three sections that
make sense for how your department/program is organized, and Graduate Council will make every effort to select one reviewer from each section. The names of potential reviewers should be solicited from your entire faculty, and the list should be approved by the faculty, in part to assure that there are no conflicts of interest.

The Graduate Council asks to be assured in writing that the proposed extramural reviewers can carry out a neutral review. The Council is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty and potential reviewers: (1) personal friendships; (2) reviewer and UCR faculty member have been in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) cooperative research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these relationships applies to a potential reviewer, the individual should be eliminated or the Graduate Council should be informed of the facts of the relationship.

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Extramural Review Team Visit and Report

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

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

When the Team report is received, the honoraria are sent. The Team report is reviewed by the Graduate Council for matters of confidentiality, and the report (redacted if necessary) is sent to the Program with a three week response deadline for preliminary comment about factual inaccuracies and misperceptions.
V. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

**VI. Summary of Confidentiality**

Graduate Program Reviews are treated as confidential until officially closed for two reasons. First, confidentiality protects the program under review by ensuring that the program has a chance to respond to the extramural team report and correct errors of fact and potential misconceptions before it circulates. Second, confidentiality protects faculty governance of academic programs by ensuring that reviews are carried out in an atmosphere free of undue pressure from on or off campus.

Below is a summary of who has access to the external report and findings and recommendations at what stage of the review process:

- **External report**: GC subcommittee, Department/program

- **Dept. Preliminary Response plus external report**: GC subcommittee, Department/program, Chancellor, EVC & Provost, College Dean, and Graduate Dean

- **Findings and Recommendations plus external report plus Dept. Response**: Grad. Council, Department/program, Chancellor, EVC & Provost, College Dean, and Graduate Dean

- **The closed file including all of the above plus correspondence between GC and Dept./Program leading to the conclusion of the process**: All parties listed above, closed review no longer confidential.

The internal review documents (item detailed in Section II of this document) remain confidential, except for the department self-summary, which will be attached to the external report.
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Appendix I – Self-Study Report Guidelines

The Self-Study Report should be concise document detailing the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council. The report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the site visit interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. The report should be five to fifteen single-spaced pages depending on the size and complexity of the program. Summary tables and graphs should be included where appropriate.

Sections:

A. Process. Begin your report with a short summary of the consultation, preparation, and review process used in the construction the review document. What was the involvement of faculty, students, and staff in this process? What meetings were held, what surveys were conducted, who prepared the document, who reviewed the final product, etc.? A discussion of dissenting views about the self-study report by the faculty (if any) should be included in its final draft.

B. Overview. In this section, provide an overview of your academic program. You might begin by providing a brief introduction to your program or department so that a non-specialist can obtain an idea of what you are trying to accomplish. As appropriate, give specific data about your program, referring to the institutional and Senate data we have provided whenever possible. Include a data summary reporting number of faculty, faculty rank, and number of graduate students. This section should include appropriate academic items, such as the size and diversity of the faculty, as well as your academic staffing priorities for the future, and your use of non-ladder faculty. It should also briefly address non-academic support items, including the number and type of administrative and service staff, and their effectiveness in furthering your academic mission. You should include your outreach and recruitment efforts to maintain student and faculty diversity. You should introduce the review team to the research of your faculty, commenting on major research thrusts, areas where you are particularly strong, areas that need to be strengthened and current research support as well as other possibilities for support. Faculty teaching activities may be discussed, including such items as formal classroom teaching, seminars, advising, thesis/dissertation supervision, teaching load, and evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Describe your current activities, accomplishments and future plans to foster faculty equity with regard to gender and ethnicity in the areas of hiring, advancement, retention, and workload distribution (e.g., teaching, service, and administration). You should comment on the resources available to your program. A brief discussion concerning the physical plant available to your

1 Text largely taken from UCLA’s Review Policy Manual, which can be found at http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/MANUALRevJuly292011.pdf
program should also be included. This would include a statement concerning the adequacy of faculty, staff, and student office space, equipment, laboratories, computers, etc. available to your program.

C. Graduate Program. Provide a summary of the goals, rationale, and structure of your graduate degree programs, namely: What is it that you currently do, what do you do well, what areas need to be strengthened, and what changes do you anticipate in the future? You should discuss the quality (including GPA and GRE statistics) and depth of your applicant pool, career goals and opportunities for graduates, the intrinsic importance of your fields of study, and the prospects for intramural and extramural funding. You should also include a description of your admissions process, including the number of applications, admits, and SIRs. Where relevant, include a discussion of enrollment by specialty, recruitment of graduate students, ratio of domestic to international students, ratio of out-of-state to in-state domestic students, and student diversity. You may receive or request documents from the Graduate Division and/or Graduate Council that provide national-level comparative data. It will be important to integrate comparisons whenever possible in the following areas: learning objectives for graduate education, average time to candidacy and to degree, attrition, and on any other metrics that the department/program would like to include. Academic advising structure and graduate student participation in departmental or unit affairs are also topics for inclusion in this section. Comment on the resources available to your program (including both to your unit and to the graduate program within it) to help you fulfill your research and teaching responsibilities. Appropriate items here might include the general departmental operational budget and all instructional and research assistance support (TAs, intramural and extramural GSRs, training grants, any other fellowship funding for graduate students, including successful extramural grant applications). If appropriate for your discipline, include number and funding sources for postdoctoral fellow and discuss how they are integral to your graduate program.

D. Comparison to the Previous Reviews. Identify how your program now compares to the program at the time of the previous review. When there are continuing important strengths or weaknesses, analyze their causes and, for weaknesses, suggest how to remedy them. If the previously recommended approaches to addressing these weaknesses did not work, suggest why. If they were not tried, explain why. When there have been changes from then to now for better (or worse), analyze their causes and, as needed, suggest a future course of action. This section should be short, addressing important strengths and weaknesses, not necessarily covering every recommendation from the previous review. Here would be the time to discuss how the department/program would benefit from more attention to specific programmatic needs by administrators (not limited only to discussion of increasing size of the faculty).

F. Miscellaneous. In this section, you should feel free to articulate anything else you feel is appropriate and important for the review team to know. For example,
you might want to discuss your faculty’s participation in other interdepartmental
degree programs, any particular successes or problems you have had in dealing
with the administration above your department or with the Academic Senate, any
special circumstances associated with professional degree programs, or how
budget cuts have affected your teaching and research. Any comments you might
have on the statistical data supplied to could be added here if they have not been
made earlier. In short, this last section is a catch-all for any information you feel
doesn't fit in the earlier sections, but nonetheless is important background for the
review team to have.
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DEPARTMENT OF [OR PROGRAM IN] XXXXXXXXXXXX, FACULTY INFORMATION
BRIEF BIO-SKETCH
[should be limited to 2 pages PLUS appendix for significant extramural grant info]

NAME:

POSITION TITLE:

YEAR AND RANK OF APPOINTMENT AT UCR:

JOINT OR COLLABORATING APPOINTMENTS IN OTHER PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENTS,
OR CENTERS:

HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED, INSTITUTION, YEAR EARNED:

POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING:

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
RESEARCH:
GRADUATE TRAINING AND TEACHING:

NUMBER OF PH.D. [OR MASTER’S] STUDENTS SUPERVISED IN THE PAST TEN YEARS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS SUPERVISED*</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students who have completed their degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students supervised in other graduate programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*In fields where the highest degree granted is a master’s (e.g., MFA in Creative Writing),
please change this table as appropriate]

TOTAL NUMBER OF PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS: XX

FIVE MOST IMPORTANT PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS: [FULL CITATIONS; order
might change depending on the special conventions of the field; most prominent should be first]

BOOKS
CO-EDITED OR CO-WRITTEN BOOKS
JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS
OTHER

SELECTED AWARDS AND HONORS OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS:
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS AND SELECTED MAJOR COMMITTEE WORK OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS, INCLUDING DATES OF SERVICE:

FOR FIELDS IN WHICH EXTRAMURAL GRANTS COMPRIS E A SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITY THAT CANNOT BE ADEQUATELY COVERED IN “AWARDS AND HONORS” ABOVE, PLEASE APPEND INFORMATION ON:

1. Current Research Grants
2. Research Grants completed in the last ten years
3. Pending Grant applications

PLEASE INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IN YOUR EXPLANATIONS OF GRANT ACTIVITY:

- Title of project
- Faculty member role
- Agency
- Dates of project
- Average award amount / year
- % effort
February ---

---, Chair (or program director)
Dept. of ---

The --- graduate program (in your department) is scheduled for review by the Graduate Council during the academic year 2012/13. Your program was last reviewed by an extramural review team during ----. Enclosed is a description of the review process.

An extramural team will be used to assist in the review. Please provide me with a list of at least 15 names of distinguished potential extramural reviewers, some from other UC campuses and the rest from other places throughout the U.S. This list will be vetted by chairs of comparable programs at other UC campuses prior to inviting a three-member review panel. The panel will consist of at least one, but no more than two, reviewers from different UC campuses. Accordingly, please divide the list of names into three sections that make sense for how your department/program is organized, and Graduate Council will make every effort to select one reviewer from each section. The names of potential reviewers should be solicited from your entire faculty, and the list should be approved by the faculty, in part to assure that there are no conflicts of interest.

The Graduate Council asks to be assured in writing that the proposed extramural reviewers can carry out a neutral review. The Council is specifically concerned with the following relationships with members of your faculty and potential reviewers: (1) personal friendships; (2) reviewer and UCR faculty member have been in the same graduate or postdoctoral program at the same time; (3) graduate research advisors or post-doctoral mentors; and (4) cooperative research efforts or joint textbook writing. If any of these relationships applies to a potential reviewer, the individual should be eliminated or the Graduate Council should be informed of the facts of the relationship.

Please let me have your list of extramural nominees by ---.

The visiting team will have access to information provided by the Graduate Division, the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis, and your program, as requested below. Questionnaires will be sent to all faculty members, including yourself, as well as to current graduate students and to those who have received Ph.D. degrees since the last review. Data provided by other sources will be sent to you for correction before being sent to the reviewers (except for responses to questionnaires, which are strictly confidential). The program, with the help of the Graduate Council and Graduate Division,
should summarize the data to make it most useful for the external review team. It should also be used as input to the report you provide the external reviewers, which is detailed below. For your reference, I have appended the list of questions that the extramural team is asked to address.

Would you, as department chair (or program director), in consultation with other faculty as you deem desirable, provide the following items. All items should be sent electronically.

1. A concise report based on self-study of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, long-range goals, major changes since last review, and anything the program wishes to bring to the attention of the visiting team or the Graduate Council. The report is the vehicle by which the review team will first understand the philosophy, goals, and scope of your program and thus, in turn, provide constructive and accurate feedback to you. It will comprise a major portion of the basis for the site visit interviews. It will also become an appendix to the report and recommendations arising from the review. Thus, your own presentation of your program will be available to everyone who receives the review report and recommendations. The report should be five to fifteen single-spaced pages depending on the size and complexity of the program – guidelines enclosed.

2. List of faculty members by rank including department affiliation and participation in other graduate programs.

3. Brief biographies for faculty members, including grant and individual fellowship support in the period since the department/program’s last review – sample format enclosed.

4. A page listing links to website materials available to graduate students (handbook, program descriptions, procedures statement, recruiting items, etc.).

5. Placement data for all Ph.D. degrees awarded since the last review, arranged by date of award of degree, listing dissertation director, first position and current position – sample format enclosed.

6. The WASC learning outcomes for graduate study that has already been prepared recently by your department/program.

We will need the final versions of all these documents within four to six months, but members of Graduate Council will work with the department/program over the spring quarter to set up a specific timetable for interaction with us and completion of these documents.

Kenneth N. Barish, Chair
Graduate Council

KNB/se

Enclosures

cc: Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Rabenstein
Dean ---
Dr. --- Graduate Advisor, ---
--- MSO, ---
---, Graduate Assistant,
The following questions are designed to aid your review of the graduate program in (program) they are not meant to restrict the scope of your inquiry. You are free to disregard them if you prefer to do so. The program has seen these questions.

QUESTIONS FOR EXTRAMURAL REVIEW OF (program) GRADUATE PROGRAM

1. What is the quality of the program with respect to the following:
   a. Overall reputation.
   b. Faculty research.
   c. Faculty teaching.
   d. Students in the program.
   e. Placement and reputation of program graduates.

2. Does the graduate program present a coherent program of study for students? Is it adequate in scope and depth to insure education appropriate for the Ph.D.?

3. Is the faculty quality and quantity adequate for a strong graduate program?
   a. Areas that should (must) be strengthened or added?
   b. Areas that should (must) be de-emphasized or removed?
   c. Where should the next appointment (resources permitting) be made?

4. Has the program done reasonable planning for the future? If so, is it planning for appropriate future changes? If not, what do you suggest?

5. What would be needed for this program (or some component) to achieve true national distinction giving due consideration to present UCR faculty resources compared to those available at top ranked programs elsewhere?

6. Are the admission mechanisms and standards appropriate for a quality Ph.D. program in Economics? Are they applied fairly?

7. Do students receive appropriate supervision, e.g., do fair and appropriate evaluations of graduate students occur at proper times, is there sufficient counseling, are students treated fairly with regard to assignment of TAs, GSRs, thesis advisers, etc.? Are annual reviews of graduate students accomplished appropriate with due notice of the results being given to the students?

8. Do problems of physical facilities, research equipment, or aids to scholarship exist?

9. Is there sufficient interaction between the program and any campus programs with which it should interact?

10. Are the times to degree appropriate for a (program) Ph.D.?

11. How does the program conceptualize diversity? Is the program working to increase diversity? If this program is working to increase diversity, how is it trying to do so?