AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, May 18, 2011
1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of April 20, 2011 (Pages 2-6)

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
   **Courses**
   CS 260 (CHANGE), CS261 (CHANGE), CS 262 (CHANGE), CS 263 (CHANGE), CS 267 (CHANGE), CS 269 (CHANGE), EDUC340B (CHANGE), EDUC 342 (NEW), EDUC 370 (NEW), EDUC 371 (NEW), EE 217 (NEW), GEN 220 (NEW), MCS 280 (NEW), MGT 288D (NEW), PHYS 294 (NEW)

   **Program Changes:**
   1. Department of Bioengineering Proposed Program Changes Effective Fall 2011 (Pages 7 – 12)
   2. Catalog Changes for Computer Science (Pages 13 – 17)
   3. Microbiology Graduate Program Changes – Addition of MCBL 202 (Pages 18 – 23)

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee
   a. Status Report (Pages 24 – 26)
   b. Graduate Program Reviews for 2011-12
   c. Findings and recommendations for programs reviewed in 2010-2011 [to be distributed]

5. Fellowship Subcommittee Report (Page 27)

6. Old Business
   - Request to modify the cutoff GPA for Fellowships (Page 28)
   - Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures (Pages 29-41)
   - Guidelines for Oral Examinations (Pages 43-44)

7. New Business
Present:

Morris Maduro, Chair  
Daniel Gallie  
Kenneth Barish  
Mohsen El Hafsi  
Yingbo Hua  
Paul E. Green  
Connie Nugent  
M. Vanderwood  
Shizhong Xu  
J. W. Childers, ex officio  
Arash Adami (Graduate Student Representative)  
Jennifer Wright (Graduate Student Representative)

Absent:

Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera  
Iryna M. Ethell  
A. Jaworska  
J.N. Medearis  
Nosung V. Myung  
Deborah Wong

Guests:

Ken Baerenklau, Associate Dean, Graduate Division

Approval of Minutes

The agenda was accepted with the addition of the Givaudan Citrus Variety Collection Endowed Chair as proposed by Dean Thomas Baldwin. The minutes of the March 18, 2011 meeting were adopted with a minor correction to the name of the GSA representative.

Announcements:

Chair of the Graduate Council:

1. Chair Maduro discussed the attendance at Graduate Council and Subcommittee meetings. It is vital to the mission and charge of the graduate council to have regular meetings. It is especially more important towards the end of the year that all members strive to attend.
2. Regarding the letter to the Students Services Fee committee. Dean Childers indicated that he had a response and that the committee is taking up the issues and it will be taken up next year.

3. Increase in tuition has resulted in making the cost of hiring graduate students almost equivalent to that of a post-doc. The problem is that if this becomes the trend, then the UC will be moving away from its mission of using graduate students as part of its research. There is talk of re-incentivize researchers to bring graduate students into their research. One way might be to find a way to return some of the money used to support graduate students back to the PI. Dean Childers indicated that in the College of Engineering when a PI requests to hire a post-doc, he is asked how many graduate students the PI has.

4. Chair Maduro also mentioned that he has been in discussions with his counterparts in CCGA to find out how their external reviews are conducted. He found out that most campuses use 2 external reviewers and some only 1. In light of the budget situation now, he would like the Graduate Council to propose that for the external reviews to be conducted next year, we invite only 2 external reviewers and have 1 other person from our campus serve as another UC reviewer. He talked to the 3 reviewers who were here to review the Hispanic Program and they said that they usually only have two reviewers. GC members discussed the issue and there was some concern that there was a potential for pushback from programs. Cited were issues of equity problems. There already existed a perception that graduate reviews do not provide the Dean with information that the Dean does not already know about. Reducing the numbers has the potential for departments to dismiss the recommendations from the external reviewers. After some deliberation, Chair Maduro indicated that he would like the Council to consider this issue before the selection process for the next round of reviews.

5. Chair Maduro mentioned that there has been difficulty in routing of proposals and documents that in the past went to the Graduate Division. It was agreed that Graduate Council should articulate a transparent policy for routing of documents to Graduate Division and to Graduate Council. It was also suggested that the Graduate Council should consider electronic submission of graduate proposals and programs.

**CCGA Representative:** Chair Maduro indicated that Mike Vanderwood will be CCGA representative for 2011-12. As part of the transition process, Prof. Vanderwood will be attending the May CCGA meeting. CCGA was interested in knowing why on this campus graduate program proposals have to go through a Divisional senate meeting to be voted on. It was agreed that Graduate Council will look at the historical reason for this and report back at the next meeting.

Chair Maduro also mentioned that CCGA is thinking about asking proponents of new programs to obtain their own external reviewers and to pay for them. The idea is that CCGA will take a look at these reviews and if the reviews are good, they do not send them for external reviews.

**Graduate Student Council Representatives:** There was nothing to report.
**Dean of the Graduate Division:** Dean Childers indicated that the Graduate Division awarded $1.8 million to 106 students. Dean Childers also mentioned that 19 students received NSF awards, 17 of whom will be matriculating. The awards include $30,000 in stipend and $10,000 for fees.

Regarding Admissions, Dean Childers indicated that we are currently 13% below what we were last year in April in terms of our Statement of Intent to Register (SIR). Applications for CHASS are up 9%, CNAS is down 21% and COE is down 45%. In terms of our overall admits, we are down by 7%.

Regarding Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs), Dean Childers indicated that Office of Finance and Business says it is permissible for students in self-supporting programs to take courses as long as the accounting is done properly. The business plan for SSPs has to be approved by the Office of Academic Planning and Budget.

**Courses and Programs Subcommittee:** Prof. Ken Barish mentioned that 13 courses were approved by the Graduate Council. These were: CMDB 257 (Change), ENTM 201 (Change), ENTM 202 (Change), ENTM 203 (Change), ENTM 262 (Change), GEO 240 (Change), GEO 254 (CHANGE), GEO 257 (CHANGE), MCBL 262 (Change), MCS 280 (new), PHYS (203), SOC 254 (Change), SOC 262 (Change)

The following programs were approved unanimously:

1. Philosophy Graduate Program Changes – Graduate Council approved the changes to the Admissions and course work for the Philosophy Graduate Program as requested by Prof. Andrew Reath.
2. MA in Accounting, Auditing and Assurance, SoBA Graduate Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a Master of Arts in Accounting, Auditing and Assurance degree.
3. Proposed Catalog Changes to Med. General Education Teaching Emphasis – Graduate Council unanimously approved the changes which include (1) requirement that a total of 36 undergraduate and graduate units are required for the M.Ed. and (2) Removal of the statement, “Five of the required courses must be taken during summer session.”

**Graduate Program Review Subcommittee:**

The Status Report was reviewed. Chair Maduro indicated that the following programs will be reviewed in 2011-12.

- Bioengineering Graduate Program (internal)
- Entomology Graduate Program
- English Graduate Program
- Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

The Genetics, Genomics and Bioinformatics Graduate Program and the Anthropology Graduate Program were postponed to 2012-13.
Fellowship Subcommittee Report: There was nothing to report. The subcommittee meets on May 9.

Old Business: MSE Program Changes - Graduate Council by a unanimous vote (11 positive and 0 negative) approved the changes to the Material Science and Engineering Graduate Program proposal with the requirement that the sentence below is removed.

“This exam is not open to the general public but members of the Academic Senate and, unless requested otherwise by the candidate, UCR graduate students may attend.

Policy for Disestablishments: Chair Maduro indicated that Prof. Jose Wudka, the Chair of CEP had requested that Graduate Council review the policy that is being established for disestablishment of units or programs. Chair Maduro indicated that he would like to see that the document contains a description of what the potential loss to the faculty/students would be. It should also include evidence of consultation with Planning and Budget as well as a description of the possible effect on faculty FTE.

New Business: Graduate Council discussed the proposal to disestablish/consolidate the departments within SoBA and unanimously approved the proposal noting that the Executive Committee had also endorsed the proposal. Prof. Maduro will prepare a memo on behalf of the Graduate Council to Chair Gauvain.

Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures: The request to review the proposed changes to Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures was tabled until the May meeting.

Request to modify the cutoff GPA for Fellowships: The Graduate Council discussed the request to modify the cutoff GPA for fellowships. The request came from the Department of Physics and they were requesting that the GPA be lowered from 3.5 to 3.3 because the 3.5 requirement is unrealistic as a financial aid supplement. After a lengthy discussion, the issue was tabled until the next meeting.

Graduate Council discussed and approved the naming of the Givaudan Citrus Variety Collection Endowed Chair in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

Guidelines for oral examinations: This item was tabled until the May meeting.

CEP review of Graduate Programs: Graduate Council unanimously voted to approve CEP’s request that Graduate proposals should not be routinely routed to CEP for comments. However, for combined programs, the practice will continue.

Meeting adjourned 3:15 PM.
Ken Barish, Secretary
### Department of Bioengineering Proposed Program Changes Effective Fall 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Overview</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The interdepartmental graduate program is the umbrella for graduate level research effort associated with the faculty in the Department of Bioengineering as well as other faculty at UCR who have an interest in training graduate students in bioengineering. The program offers graduate instruction leading to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Bioengineering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our interdisciplinary program combines a solid fundamental foundation in biological science and engineering, and aims to equip the students with diverse communication skills and training in the most advanced quantitative bioengineering research so that they can become leaders in their respective fields. The result is a rigorous, but exceptionally interactive and welcoming educational training for Bioengineering graduate students.

The interdepartmental aspect of the program allows students to develop skills related to bioengineering with faculty in a broad range of disciplines. The research vision is to build strength from experts in biochemistry, biophysics, biology and engineering to focus on critical themes that impact bioengineering.

Contributing departments include:
- Bioengineering
- Biochemistry
- Biomedical Sciences
- Botany & Plant Sciences
- Cell Biology & Neuroscience
- Chemistry
- Chemical & Environmental Engineering
- Computer Science
- Electrical Engineering
- Entomology
- Mechanical Engineering
- Physics & Astronomy
- Psychology

The dominant research theme of the interdepartmental graduate program is BioCellular Engineering. BioCellular Engineering envisions the design and implementation of processes that incorporate biomolecular assemblies and cellular structures for the development of advanced technologies. Specifically, these efforts include: cellular control and regulation (signal transduction pathways, regulation of immune system, ...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Overview</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bioengineering Interdepartmental Graduate program (BIG) is the umbrella for graduate level research effort associated with the faculty in the Department of Bioengineering as well as other faculty at UCR who have an interest in training graduate students in bioengineering. The program offers graduate instruction leading to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Bioengineering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our interdisciplinary program combines a solid fundamental foundation in biological science and engineering, and aims to equip the students with diverse communication skills and training in the most advanced quantitative bioengineering research so that they can become leaders in their respective fields. The result is a rigorous, but exceptionally interactive and welcoming educational training for Bioengineering graduate students.

The interdepartmental aspect of the program allows students to develop skills related to bioengineering with faculty in a broad range of disciplines. The research vision is to build strength from experts in biochemistry, biophysics, biology and engineering to focus on critical themes that impact bioengineering.

Contributing departments include:
- Bioengineering
- Biochemistry
- Biomedical Sciences
- Botany & Plant Sciences
- Cell Biology & Neuroscience
- Chemistry
- Chemical & Environmental Engineering
- Computer Science
- Electrical Engineering
- Entomology
- Mechanical Engineering
- Physics & Astronomy
- Psychology

The dominant research themes of BIG are advanced techniques development, bioimaging, biophysics of cellular systems, biomaterials, drug design and delivery, tissue engineering, cellular control and regulation, and computational modeling of biological systems.
metabolic controls, intracellular biosensors); mathematical and in-silico computational modeling (transport and kinetics of reactive species in organelles, biomolecules and biomolecular interactions, analysis of neural systems); and macromolecular, supramolecular, and membrane biophysics.

Other research areas include: high-throughput screening systems, structural bioinformatics, microfluidics, charge transfer in biological and biomimetic systems, immunophysics, auditory bioengineering, molecular mechanisms of platelets activation, fatty acid contributions to obesity and diabetes, brain imaging, and bioseparations.

Please visit the UCR website to determine the research emphasis of the various participating faculty. The research efforts of faculty in the Department of Bioengineering can be found at www.bioeng.ucr.edu.

Combined B.S. + M.S. Five-Year Program

The college offers a combined B.S. + M.S. program in Bioengineering designed to lead to a Bachelor of Science degree as well as a Master of Science degree in five years. Applicants for this program must have a high school GPA above 3.6, a combined SAT Reasoning score above 1950 (or ACT plus Writing equivalent), complete the Entry Level Writing Requirement before matriculation, and have sufficient mathematics preparation to enroll in calculus in their first quarter as freshmen. Interested students who are entering their junior year should check with their academic advisor for information on eligibility and other details.

Admission

In addition to the following requirements, all applicants must meet the general requirements as set forth in this catalog under the Graduate Studies section. Applicants will need to have completed
coursework in chemistry, physics, math, biochemistry and biology, and engineering. Students without an undergraduate engineering degree should have excellent training in mathematics and the physical sciences. Specific recommendations for students without an undergraduate engineering degree are:

- Two years of mathematics (equivalent UCR course = Math 9A-C, Math 10A,B)
- One year of physics (equivalent UCR course = Phys 2 A-C with lab)
- One year of inorganic chemistry including lab (equivalent UCR course = Chem 1A-C)
- One year of organic chemistry including lab (equivalent UCR course = Chem 112 A-C).
- One course in biochemistry (equivalent UCR course = BCH 100 or BCH 110A or B or C).
- One course in molecular biology (equivalent UCR course = BCH 110C or Biol 107).

Students with strong academic records may be admitted with limited coursework deficiencies, provided that these are satisfied by appropriate coursework taken during the first two years of graduate study.

**Language Requirement** All International students whose first language is not English must satisfactorily complete the SPEAK test. Students may be admitted to either the Master's or the Ph.D. program.

Students in the Master's program may petition for admission into the Ph.D. program.

**Masters Program**
The M.S. program is ideal for professionals seeking greater depth in several areas of bioengineering. The degree requires a minimum of 36 quarter credits and may be completed in three to four academic quarters of full-time study. Both thesis and non-thesis options are offered for the degree program (Plan I, Thesis and Plan II, Comprehensive Examination).
Student must request permission to pursue an M.S. in Bioengineering while simultaneously pursuing a Ph.D. in a program other than Bioengineering.

**Normative Time to Degree**
Two years.

**Plan I (Thesis)**
In addition to the following requirements, all applicants must meet the requirements for Plan I as set forth in this catalog under the Graduate Studies section Master’s Degree Plan I (Thesis).

**Course Requirements** Students must satisfy the core course requirements (see Core Courses). Students enroll in the interdepartmental colloquium series in Bioengineering each quarter it is offered.

**Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)**
This plan is designed primarily for students who do not intend to pursue a Ph.D. in Bioengineering.

In addition to the following requirements, all applicants must meet the requirements for Plan II as set forth in this catalog under the Graduate Studies section Master’s Degree Plan II (Comprehensive Examination).

**Course Requirements** Students must satisfy the core course requirements (see Core Courses). Students must enroll in BIEN 286, Colloquium in Bioengineering each quarter it is offered.

The comprehensive examination is prepared and administered by the Graduate Examination Committee. The student is allowed to choose between an oral and a written examination. The examination covers a broad range of topics chosen from upper division undergraduate courses and graduate courses taken by M.S. students.

Subsequent to the examination, the Graduate Examination Committee issues a passing or failing grade. Students who fail in the first attempt may retake the examination at the next opportunity.
scheduled comprehensive examination period. No more than two attempts to pass the exam are allowed.

The M.S. Comprehensive Examination may be held at the end of any quarters throughout the year. The committee to administer the M.S. Comprehensive Examination is selected by the Graduate Advisor and approved by the Graduate Program Committee.

Doctoral Program
The Ph.D. program is heavily integrated with research activities and is intended for well-qualified individuals who wish to pursue leadership careers in academic or industrial research. The Ph.D. program requires approximately three years of full-time study beyond the master’s degree. In consultation with a faculty advisor, Ph.D. students plan their program of study. The doctoral dissertation is based on original research in the field of specialization. An M.S. degree is not a prerequisite for entering the Ph.D. program.

The doctoral program includes a teaching requirement, an oral and written qualifying examination, and a dissertation.

Normative Time to Degree
Five years.

Course Requirements
Students must satisfy the core course requirements (see Core Courses). Students will enroll in the interdepartmental colloquium series in Bioengineering each quarter it is offered.

Written Qualifying Examination
Students in the Ph.D. program must pass a written qualifying examination that covers the fields of engineering and biology that relate to the student’s dissertation project.

Oral Qualifying Examination
Following successful completion of the written examination, candidates for the doctoral degree must pass an oral examination, normally within three quarters of the date of their written exam.
The oral examination is scheduled only after the candidate has written a proposal detailing the rationale, specific aims and approaches to be undertaken for her/his dissertation research.

**Dissertation** A written dissertation is completed by each student. Candidates for the degree of Ph.D. may be required to defend the dissertation in a public, oral presentation at a time announced to members of the University community.

**Core Courses** All Bioengineering graduate students are required to take at least three courses from the following six Bioengineering courses. Other courses may be substituted but must be approved by the bioengineering graduate advisor. Students from non-engineering backgrounds are also required to take BIEN 268 in addition to the courses stipulated here.

**Bioengineering Core**
1. BIEN 220 - Chemical Genomics Design Studio
2. BIEN 223 - Engineering Analysis of Physiological Systems
3. BIEN 224 - Cellular and Molecular Engineering
4. BIEN 249 - Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology
5. BIEN 264 - Dynamics of Biological Systems
6. BIEN 268 - Bioengineering Experimentation and Analysis

Other required courses:
1. One bioscience class chosen from: BCH 210, BCH 211, BCH 212, BIOL/CMDB 200, BIOL/CMDB 201, BIOL 203, BIOL 221/MCBL 221/PLPA 226, or, with consent of instructor, BMSC 229, BMSC 230, BMSC 231, BMSC 232, BMSC 234, and BMSC 235.

The oral examination is scheduled only after the candidate has written a proposal detailing the rationale, specific aims and approaches to be undertaken for her/his dissertation research.

**Dissertation** A written dissertation is completed by each student. Candidates for the degree of Ph.D. may be required to defend the dissertation in a public, oral presentation at a time announced to members of the University community.

**Core Courses** All BIG graduate students are required to take at least three courses from the following six Bioengineering courses. Other courses may be substituted but must be approved by the Bioengineering Graduate Advisor. Students from non-engineering backgrounds are also required to take BIEN 264 as one of their core course requirements.

**Bioengineering Core**
1. BIEN 223 - Engineering Analysis of Physiological Systems
2. BIEN 224 - Cellular and Molecular Engineering
3. BIEN 245 – Optical Methods in Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering
4. BIEN 249 - Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology
5. BIEN 264 - Biotransport Phenomena
6. BIEN 270 – Transport with Reactions in Biological Systems

Other required courses:
1. One bioscience class chosen from: BCH 210, BCH 211, BCH 212, BIOL/CMDB 200, BIOL/CMDB 201, BIOL 203, BIOL 221/MCBL 221/PLPA 226, or, with consent of instructor, BMSC 229, BMSC 230, BMSC 231, BMSC 232, BMSC 234, and BMSC 235.
2. Other courses may be substituted but must be approved by the Bioengineering Graduate Advisor.

3. BIEN 286 - Colloquium in Bioengineering
This course is required every quarter in which it is offered.

Additional courses may be required by the Advisory Committee depending on the student's background and fields of interest.

M.S. and Ph.D. students must complete the course requirements for the programs within their first year of residence.

Course Descriptions All Bioengineering courses are listed and described under Bioengineering.

2. Other courses may be substituted but must be approved by the Bioengineering Graduate Advisor.

3. BIEN 286 - Colloquium in Bioengineering
This course is required every quarter in which it is offered.

Additional courses may be required by the Advisory Committee depending on the student's background and fields of interest.

M.S. and Ph.D. students are expected to complete the course requirements for the programs within their first year of residence.

Course Descriptions All Bioengineering courses are listed and described under Bioengineering.

**Justification:**

We would like to make minor changes to some of the verbiage with regards to the “Interdepartmental Graduate Program” and replace it with the actual program name BIG (Bioengineering Interdepartmental Graduate program). We have also modified our research areas to remain consistent with our current research efforts and ever growing areas of research expertise. Other language was updated to make requirements more clear to students.

BIEN 220 and BIEN 268 have been removed from the core course requirements as newer courses have been put on the books that provide a better foundation for Bioengineering graduate students. BIEN 245 and BIEN 270 are the courses that have been added. In addition, BIEN 264 (Biotransport Phenomena) has been added as a requirement as one of the core courses for all non-engineering students in order to provide them with a stronger foundation.
April 14, 2011

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 March 16, 2011. The following is a justification for the changes.

Currently all of the available electives in the seminar series (any CSE graduate course numbered 260 – 269) are listed individually in the Ph.D. Electives (number 4) section. We are removing excess text and matching the format of this particular sentence to the existing sentence fragment in the MS thesis option description, “up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269” to make the format and text more consistent between the two programs.

Thank you.
PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER SCIENCE GRADUATE REQUIREMENTS

PRESENT:
Doctoral Degree

The department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course.

Units obtained in CS 270, CS 287, CS 290, CS 297, CS 298, CS 299, CS 301, and CS 302 cannot be counted in any course work category.

1. Core Requirement (12 units). Choose three courses from at least two of the three Core Areas described above, with no grade lower than B- and an overall core course GPA of at least 3.2.

PROPOSED:
Doctoral Degree

The department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course.

Units obtained in CS 270, CS 287, CS 290, CS 297, CS 298, CS 299, CS 301, and CS 302 cannot be counted in any course work category.

1. Core Requirement (12 units). Choose three courses from at least two of the three Core Areas described above, with no grade lower than B- and an overall core course GPA of at least 3.2.
2. Depth Requirement (8 units). Choose two courses listed above under the same Major Area (A to G). This requirement ensures that Ph.D. students, early on in their careers, acquire some depth of knowledge in a particular research area.

3. Breadth Requirement (12 units). Choose three courses from at least two different Major Areas (A to G) outside the student’s depth area. No course that is listed in the student’s depth area can be used to fulfill the breadth requirement, even if it is cross-listed in another area. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted towards the breadth requirement.

4. Electives (12 units). The remaining courses can be selected from additional CS graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260, CS 261, CS 262, CS 263, CS 267, CS 269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted as an elective.

Milestones The Department has established three milestones to mark progress towards the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science: advancement to candidacy, presentation of the dissertation proposal, and final oral examination. A Ph.D. student must also satisfy all applicable Graduate Division requirements for each milestone.

Milestone I: Advancement to Candidacy. A student advances to candidacy after he/she has completed all of the Ph.D. course requirements described above, and passed the combined written and oral qualifying examinations, as described below. These two exams are intended to verify three components of the student’s preparation for Ph.D. research: (1) breadth of comprehension sufficient to enable Computer Science research in areas beyond the topic(s) of the research exam and dissertation; (2) ability to perform critical study, analysis and writing in a focused area; and (3) demonstrated research experience or ability to do research.

4. Electives (12 units). The remaining courses can be selected from additional CS graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260–269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted as an elective.

Milestones The Department has established three milestones to mark progress towards the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science: advancement to candidacy, presentation of the dissertation proposal, and final oral examination. A Ph.D. student must also satisfy all applicable Graduate Division requirements for each milestone.

Milestone I: Advancement to Candidacy. A student advances to candidacy after he/she has completed all of the Ph.D. course requirements described above, and passed the combined written and oral qualifying examinations, as described below. These two exams are intended to verify three components of the student’s preparation for Ph.D. research: (1) breadth of comprehension sufficient to enable Computer Science research in areas beyond the topic(s) of the research exam and dissertation; (2) ability to perform critical study, analysis and writing in a focused area; and (3) demonstrated research experience or ability to do research.
The Written Qualifying Examination. The written qualifying examination consists of a written report summarizing the oral presentation to be given at the oral qualifying examination. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication, and must be submitted to the Qualifying Committee for approval at least one week prior to the oral qualifying examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination. The student is expected to demonstrate research aptitude by undertaking a research study on some topic (typically a problem from student’s chosen research specialty that may be a promising area in which to conduct the dissertation research), under the guidance of his or her faculty major professor. The research must be presented orally to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department. The committee evaluates the merits of the work and the student’s aptitude for research. The work must represent significant progress towards original and publishable research. 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 second year.

Dissertation Committee. After advancing to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Examination Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least four senate faculty members with at least three members belonging to the CSE department.

The Written Qualifying Examination. The written qualifying examination consists of a written report summarizing the oral presentation to be given at the oral qualifying examination. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication, and must be submitted to the Qualifying Committee for approval at least one week prior to the oral qualifying examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination. The student is expected to demonstrate research aptitude by undertaking a research study on some topic (typically a problem from student’s chosen research specialty that may be a promising area in which to conduct the dissertation research), under the guidance of his or her faculty major professor. The research must be presented orally to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department. The committee evaluates the merits of the work and the student’s aptitude for research. The work must represent significant progress towards original and publishable research. 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 second year.

Dissertation Committee. After advancing to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Examination Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least four senate faculty members with at least three members belonging to the CSE department.
Milestone II: Dissertation Proposal

Examination After advancement to candidacy, the student prepares a dissertation proposal that describes the dissertation topic, summarizes the relevant background literature, and presents a comprehensive research plan for the doctoral dissertation. The Dissertation Proposal Examination evaluates appropriateness of the research topic and the feasibility of the research plan. It also establishes a realistic timeline for the completion of the Dissertation. The Dissertation Committee administers this exam. The normative time for the Dissertation Proposal Exam is by the end of the third year. The Dissertation Proposal exam must be taken at least six months prior to the Final Doctoral Examination.

Milestone III: Final Doctoral Examination The student is required to write a dissertation in accordance with the Graduate Division requirements and may be required to defend it in a public oral final doctoral examination to the Dissertation Committee. After a satisfactory performance on the final doctoral examination, the Dissertation Committee recommends granting the Ph.D. degree. The student's research and the dissertation must both meet the highest standards of originality and scholarship.

The normative time for the completion of a Ph.D. in Computer Science is five years.

Milestone II: Dissertation Proposal

Examination After advancement to candidacy, the student prepares a dissertation proposal that describes the dissertation topic, summarizes the relevant background literature, and presents a comprehensive research plan for the doctoral dissertation. The Dissertation Proposal Examination evaluates appropriateness of the research topic and the feasibility of the research plan. It also establishes a realistic timeline for the completion of the Dissertation. The Dissertation Committee administers this exam. The normative time for the Dissertation Proposal Exam is by the end of the third year. The Dissertation Proposal exam must be taken at least six months prior to the Final Doctoral Examination.

Milestone III: Final Doctoral Examination The student is required to write a dissertation in accordance with the Graduate Division requirements and may be required to defend it in a public oral final doctoral examination to the Dissertation Committee. After a satisfactory performance on the final doctoral examination, the Dissertation Committee recommends granting the Ph.D. degree. The student's research and the dissertation must both meet the highest standards of originality and scholarship.

The normative time for the completion of a Ph.D. in Computer Science is five years.

JUSTIFICATION:

We are removing excess text and matching the format of this particular sentence to the existing sentence in the MS thesis option description, “up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269”. Number 4, Electives, is the only change request in this document.

APPROVALS:

Computer Science and Engineering Department: March 16, 2011
May 12, 2011

To: Dr. Morris Maduro, Chair
   Graduate Council

From: Dr. Katherine Borkovich, Director
      Microbiology Graduate Program

RE: Addition of MCBL 202 to the Microbiology Graduate Program
    Requirements

On November 23, 2010 the Microbiology Graduate Program faculty voted to add the
new course MCBL 202 to the list of courses approved to complete the degree
requirements for the M.S. and Ph.D. in Microbiology. We are requesting approval of
this change to the graduate program by Graduate Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAM</th>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Graduate Program in Microbiology is an interdisciplinary program with participating
colleges of Biology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Chemical and
Environmental Engineering, Chemistry,
Entomology, Environmental Sciences, Plant
Pathology and Microbiology, and the Division
of Biomedical Sciences. Faculty research
interests are concentrated in several
disciplines in the areas of basic and applied
microbiology. These disciplines include the
following:

- Animal Pathogens and Animal-Microbe Interactions
- Environmental Microbiology
- Microbial Ecology and Evolution
- Plant Pathogens and Plant-Microbe Interactions

Admission For admission into the graduate program in Microbiology, a student must have
a B.A. or B.S. degree from an accredited institution and an academic record that
satisfies the minimum admission standards established by the UCR Graduate Division. In
addition, all applicants must submit results of the GRE General Test (verbal, quantitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAM</th>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Graduate Program in Microbiology is an interdisciplinary program with participating
colleges of Biology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Chemical and
Environmental Engineering, Chemistry,
Entomology, Environmental Sciences, Plant
Pathology and Microbiology, and the Division
of Biomedical Sciences. Faculty research
interests are concentrated in several
disciplines in the areas of basic and applied
microbiology. These disciplines include the
following:

- Animal Pathogens and Animal-Microbe Interactions
- Environmental Microbiology
- Microbial Ecology and Evolution
- Plant Pathogens and Plant-Microbe Interactions

Admission For admission into the graduate program in Microbiology, a student must have
a B.A. or B.S. degree from an accredited institution and an academic record that
satisfies the minimum admission standards established by the UCR Graduate Division. In
addition, all applicants must submit results of the GRE General Test (verbal, quantitative
and analytical) at the time of application.

Although no specific undergraduate degree specialization is required, applicants should have an adequate background in the physical and biological sciences, including the following or equivalent courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 001A, CHEM 001B, CHEM 001C</td>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 112A, CHEM 112B, CHEM 112C</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCH 110A, BCH 110B</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 009A, MATH 009B</td>
<td>Calculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 100A or STAT 120A</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 102</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 121A/MCBL 121A, BIOL 121L/MCBL 121L</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 107A or BCH 110C</td>
<td>Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is intended to represent the minimum background required for students wishing to pursue a graduate degree in Microbiology. Additional course work and laboratory experience in microbiology, biochemistry or genetics is highly desirable. However, upon the recommendation of the graduate advisory committee, occasionally a student may be admitted into the graduate program with one or more course work deficiencies; such students must satisfy these course work deficiencies usually within the first and no later than within the second year of graduate study.

**Course Work** The program is designed to prepare students for teaching and research careers in colleges and universities, as well as basic and applied research in private, industrial and government laboratories. To attain this goal, a three-tiered curriculum has been designed whereby students are expected...
to complete the following:

1. A core sequence of classes in microbiology:  
   MCBL 201 (Microbial Physiology),  
   BIOL 221/MCBL 221 (Microbial Genetics), and MCBL 211/SWSC 211  
   (Microbial Ecology)

2. A selection of elective courses in  
   microbiology and other relevant fields  
   chosen in consultation with the  
   student's major professor and the  
   advisory committee in order to develop  
   depth in particular areas of  
   specialization

3. Research training in specific areas of  
   microbiology  
   The program stresses the importance of  
   innovative and independent laboratory  
   research as the major component of the  
   student's education.

In addition to the above course work, students  
must attend one seminar per week each  
quarter in programs collaborating with  
Microbiology. Students are also required to  
present one seminar each year. These  
seminars can be either on the student's thesis  
research or related topics and can be  
presented in any of several program student  
seminar series.

Upon entering the program, a student advisory  
committee is appointed for each student to  
help plan a program of study. The committee  
consists of the student's major professor, who  
serves as chair, and two other professors from  
the program with expertise in the student's  
area of interest. Graduate students must meet  
at least annually with their advisory committee  
to plan their courses; however, students are  
couraged to meet with their committee more  
often. Minutes of the meeting, prepared by the  
chair, are approved by the rest of the  
committee and then placed in the student's  
file. In addition, prior to advancement to  
candidacy, students present the advisory  
committee with a written summary of their  
research progress and plans at the beginning  
of each academic year.

to complete the following:

4. A core sequence of classes in microbiology:  
   MCBL 201 (Functional Diversity of  
   Prokaryotes) or MCBL 202 (Microbial  
   Pathogenesis and Physiology), BIOL  
   221/MCBL 221 (Microbial Genetics), and  
   MCBL 211/SWSC 211 (Microbial Ecology)

5. A selection of elective courses in  
   microbiology and other relevant fields  
   chosen in consultation with the  
   student's major professor and the  
   advisory committee in order to develop  
   depth in particular areas of  
   specialization

6. Research training in specific areas of  
   microbiology  
   The program stresses the importance of  
   innovative and independent laboratory  
   research as the major component of the  
   student's education.

In addition to the above course work, students  
must attend one seminar per week each  
quarter in programs collaborating with  
Microbiology. Students are also required to  
present one seminar each year. These  
seminars can be either on the student's thesis  
research or related topics and can be  
presented in any of several program student  
seminar series.

Upon entering the program, a student advisory  
committee is appointed for each student to  
help plan a program of study. The committee  
consists of the student's major professor, who  
serves as chair, and two other professors from  
the program with expertise in the student's  
area of interest. Graduate students must meet  
at least annually with their advisory committee  
to plan their courses; however, students are  
couraged to meet with their committee more  
often. Minutes of the meeting, prepared by the  
chair, are approved by the rest of the  
committee and then placed in the student's  
file. In addition, prior to advancement to  
candidacy, students present the advisory  
committee with a written summary of their  
research progress and plans at the beginning
Master's Degree

M.S. students must fulfill the requirements for Plan I (Thesis) of the Graduate Council. They must complete the core series of courses and three additional graduate level courses chosen in consultation with the student advisory committee. Plan I requires 36 units, of which 24 must be in graduate level courses. No more than 6 units of MCBL 290 level courses may be used to satisfy this unit requirement. The student must also submit an acceptable research thesis. The M.S. thesis committee, consisting of three members, which may be the same as the student advisory committee, is nominated by the graduate advisor after consultation with the student. The committee, once approved by the graduate dean, becomes responsible for the student's academic guidance and evaluation. The master's degree is conferred at the end of the academic quarter in which all requirements have been satisfied.

**Normative Time to Degree** 6 quarters

**Doctoral Degree**

Ph.D. students must meet all requirements of the Graduate Council. Students satisfactorily complete the core class requirements and a program of courses approved by the student advisory committee. The Ph.D. degree is awarded upon passing the preliminary and qualifying examinations and demonstrating an ability to carry out original research by preparing and submitting an acceptable dissertation.

Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program are expected to become actively engaged in a research project no later than the end of their first year, and research progress is monitored by the student's advisory committee until the student advances to candidacy and a dissertation committee is appointed.

**Preliminary Examination** The preliminary examination, consisting of a written,
comprehensive examination is based on general microbiology and required material in the student's area of specialization. If a student fails this examination, the advisory committee recommends either additional course work in specific areas of weakness, transfer to a terminal M.S. degree program, or withdrawal from the program. The preliminary examination may only be repeated once and must be passed for the student to continue in the Ph.D. program. The preliminary examination is normally taken in the spring quarter of the second year.

**Oral Qualifying Examination**
After completion of the preliminary examination, the qualifying committee is established, and the oral qualifying examination is normally taken no later than the eighth quarter (year three) of academic work, not counting summer quarters.

A qualifying committee is nominated by the graduate advisory committee and submitted to the graduate dean for approval. Suggestions of potential members of the qualifying committee may be submitted to the advisory committee by the student and the student's major professor. The qualifying committee is composed of five faculty members: three with expertise in the area of specialization in microbiology, one representing a different area from microbiology, and one outside member. The student's major professor may not serve on the qualifying committee. Prior to the oral qualifying examination, the student submits a written dissertation research proposal to the members of the qualifying committee. The oral examination covers the student's area of specialization and research field and must be passed for the student to continue in the program. Upon successful completion of the qualifying examination, the student is advanced to candidacy. The qualifying examination may be repeated only once.

**Dissertation and Final Oral Examination**
The dissertation committee is nominated by the graduate advisor for approval by the graduate dean (upon successful completion of

**Preliminary Examination**
The preliminary examination, consisting of a written, comprehensive examination is based on general microbiology and required material in the student's area of specialization. If a student fails this examination, the advisory committee recommends either additional course work in specific areas of weakness, transfer to a terminal M.S. degree program, or withdrawal from the program. The preliminary examination may only be repeated once and must be passed for the student to continue in the Ph.D. program. The preliminary examination is normally taken in the spring quarter of the second year.

**Oral Qualifying Examination**
After completion of the preliminary examination, the qualifying committee is established, and the oral qualifying examination is normally taken no later than the eighth quarter (year three) of academic work, not counting summer quarters.

A qualifying committee is nominated by the graduate advisory committee and submitted to the graduate dean for approval. Suggestions of potential members of the qualifying committee may be submitted to the advisory committee by the student and the student's major professor. The qualifying committee is composed of five faculty members: three with expertise in the area of specialization in microbiology, one representing a different area from microbiology, and one outside member. The student's major professor may not serve on the qualifying committee. Prior to the oral qualifying examination, the student submits a written dissertation research proposal to the members of the qualifying committee. The oral examination covers the student's area of specialization and research field and must be passed for the student to continue in the program. Upon successful completion of the qualifying examination, the student is advanced to candidacy. The qualifying examination may be repeated only once.

**Dissertation and Final Oral Examination**
The dissertation committee is nominated by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Requirement</td>
<td>One quarter of teaching experience is required, which may be satisfied by serving as a teaching assistant in any of the microbiology courses listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Time to Degree</td>
<td>15 quarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

The new course MCBL 202 covers topics in both Microbial Pathogenesis and Microbial Physiology. This makes it equally appropriate to satisfy a core course requirement as MCBL 201 Functional Diversity of Prokaryotes. The combination of MCBL 202 with Microbial Genetics (BIOL221/MCBL 221) and Microbial Ecology (MCBL211/SWSC211) provides a well-rounded core curriculum for the Graduate Program in Microbiology.
### UCR GRADUATE COUNCIL - ORDER OF REVIEWS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

#### STATUS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT RECEIVED</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. DUE</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R RECVD</th>
<th>FINAL RESP. SENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing</td>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
<td>May 21, 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>1/25/2010</td>
<td>4/15/2010</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/24/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Feb 7-8, 2011</td>
<td>3/30/2011</td>
<td>5/2/2011</td>
<td>5/2/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Internal)</td>
<td>February 14, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Stud (Internal)</td>
<td>March 7, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td>May 25, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2011/12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics and Bioinfo</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5/16/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-96</td>
<td>Dec-96</td>
<td>Feb-05</td>
<td>Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1965/1966</td>
<td>Apr-83</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Feb-93</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>*IR 1-99</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>Feb-87</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Oct-95</td>
<td>Apr-96</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
<td>Dec-80</td>
<td>Apr-82</td>
<td>Apr-88</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>May-96</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/2007</td>
<td>Apr-86</td>
<td>Dec-87</td>
<td>Feb-91</td>
<td>Jun-92</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Nov-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
<td>Apr-84</td>
<td>May-85</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jun-91</td>
<td>Nov-98</td>
<td>Nov-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Fall-82</td>
<td>May-89</td>
<td>Dec-90</td>
<td>*IR 11-97</td>
<td>Mar-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>Nov-85</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Dec-91</td>
<td>Nov-92</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1966/1967</td>
<td>May-85</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Jun-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>Jan-88</td>
<td>Dec-90</td>
<td>May-97</td>
<td>Apr-99</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Review Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Review Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>Nov-86</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-92</td>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Oct-01</td>
<td>May-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution, Ecology &amp; Org.</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>Apr-84</td>
<td>Dec-85</td>
<td>May-90</td>
<td>Nov-91</td>
<td>Apr-97</td>
<td>Jul-98</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Dec-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-81</td>
<td>Nov-82</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Jun-90</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jun-96</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Mar-82</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Feb-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-80</td>
<td>Jun-82</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>May-95</td>
<td>Jan-96</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>May-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Mar-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ Toxicology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>Apr-93</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; Bio</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jan-03</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>May-81</td>
<td>Feb-83</td>
<td>Mar-88</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jan-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Feb-82</td>
<td>Dec-82</td>
<td>Jan-88</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1981/1994</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Apr-92</td>
<td>May-93</td>
<td>*IR 6-02</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 5-01</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
The Graduate Council's Fellowship Subcommittee met on Monday, May 9, 2011 to review the Spring 2011 competition of Dissertation and Master's Thesis Research Grants. Thirty-four Dissertation Research grants were submitted. Twenty-two proposals were partially funded, and twelve proposals were denied. Four Master's Thesis Research grants were submitted. Two proposals were partially funded, and two proposals were denied.

The total requests amounted to $31,712.96. The total awards given amounted to $15,600.00.
Re: Request to modify the cutoff GPA for Fellowships

Dear Prof. Maduro:

The Department of Physics and Astronomy would like to request that the GPA cutoff for fellowship be lowered from the present 3.5 to 3.3. The rule requiring a GPA of 3.5 for fellowships was set in 1979-80, when the graduate student funding mechanisms and recruiting models were completely different. Our present drive to recruit many non-California residents requires that we fund their Non Resident Tuition through fellowships. Also the higher profile of UCR (the physics and astronomy department is ranked in the first 30% of departments nationwide according to the latest NRC rankings) has now brought us into competition for graduate students with neighboring schools which again requires that we supplement financial aid packages with partial fellowships to make it competitive. Additionally, the loss of TA positions due to budget cuts in CNAS has forced us to offer financial aid as a mixture of partial TAs and fellowships. Please also note that the graduate curriculum in Physics and Astronomy requires that students take classes for the first two years (which is the national norm). All this makes the requirement of a 3.5 GPA unrealistic as a financial aid supplement. Note that a GPA of 3.5 corresponds to getting “A” grade in a majority of classes. This will only lead to unintended consequences such as grade padding and grade inflation. A GPA requirement of 3.3, which requires that the student obtain an average grade of “B+” or higher would be in line with the requirement of “above average” performance to obtain a partial fellowship. We urge the Graduate Council to consider this request.

Sincerely
Umar Mohideen
Graduate Advisor
Department of Physics and Astronomy
January 26, 2011

TO: KAMBIZ VAFAI, CHAIR
    RULES AND JURISDICTION

FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA POLICY ON STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE

Attached for your review, please find the newly revised University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline. Please review the policy and submit your response back to me by February 18, 2011. The intention is to submit the policy to all the appropriate Senate Committees and the Division.

Thank you.
University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline

To be adopted: Amended _____

University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, Section 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline states,

"Chancellors may impose discipline for the commission or attempted commission (including aiding or abetting in the commission or attempted commission) of the following types of violations by students...:

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

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

Requirements and Expectations: Research

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

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

Allegations of Misconduct in Research

All university members, including faculty members, lecturers, teaching assistants, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers, should immediately report suspicion of research misconduct by students to the chair of the department, dean of the school or college, or director of the organized research unit. A written report must then be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Research.

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

Requirements and Expectations: Courses

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

Allegations of Misconduct in Courses: Investigation Process

The Table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process. The steps are the same for undergraduate students and graduate students, with the exception that different investigation bodies will participate in the Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty member’s suspicion of misconduct in a course, communication with student, and determination of outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td>Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP]</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review of case by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs]</td>
<td>Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the AICs</td>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the GAIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td>Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiation of Cases

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

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

The Faculty member or the student may request the presence at the consultation meeting of the Ombudsperson or a member of the Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP] for undergraduate students or the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in the Graduate Division [Graduate Division] for graduate students.

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

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

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

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

Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., Individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the chair of the department or the dean of the college/school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.
If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member is expected to assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.

B. Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review

1. If the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct based on facts that the accused student does not dispute

The Faculty member may impose an appropriate academic action, typically a reduced or failing grade for the assignment or a reduced or failing grade for the course. The action should take into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the students’ experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and pre-meditation of the misconduct.

Actions taken must be documented through the Academic Misconduct Referral Form addressed to SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students]. The referral form must include the student’s name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge, and the academic sanctions assigned.

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] will formally notify the student of the academic action assigned by the Faculty member, as well as any additional disciplinary sanctions that may be assigned by the University. Such written notification will occur within 20 calendar days of the receipt of the referral by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address. In addition, notification will be sent to the Faculty member and to the Dean (or his/her designated associate dean for academic affairs) of the college/school in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

2. If the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct based on facts that the accused student disputes:

The Faculty member will refer the case to SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] using the Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The referral form must include the student’s name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (to include a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course) and the academic actions recommended by the Faculty
The Faculty member is encouraged to evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and to note the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the *University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline* or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

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

**a. Initial [Administrative] Review process:** The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students], involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] deems it necessary, a joint meeting will be scheduled at a time when both the Faculty member and the student can attend. If the Faculty member is unavailable for a timely Initial [Administrative] Review, the department chair or dean of the school will be asked to serve in place of the Faculty member.

**b. Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review:** If SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] determines that it is *more likely than not* that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic actions recommended by the Faculty member, as well as any disciplinary sanctions imposed by the University, will be assigned.

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

3. **Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct** or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by the Faculty member by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] for a Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

4. **A student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing** from a course. A student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course with a grade of "W."

C. **Review Stage 2: Academic Integrity Committees and Hearing Panels**

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1.

1. **College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students**

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

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

2. Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for Cases Involving Graduate Students

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

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

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committees will be provided by the office of the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution and the office of the Associate Dean in the Graduate Division responsible for academic integrity.

3. Hearing Panels

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Notification of decision:** Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or designee will send written notification to the student, the Faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.
- **Records:** An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained in SCAIP or the Graduate Division as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for seven years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter (see Section F below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

5. **Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1:**

The Academic Integrity Committees and the GAIC also function as the appellate bodies for decisions made at Review Stage 1. See Section E below for appeal procedures.

D. **Review Stage 3: Annual Assessments of Cases and Appeals from Stage 2**

For each hearing, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his designee shall select one Faculty member and one student from each Academic Integrity Committee to serve as the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee for undergraduates. A subcommittee of the Academic Senate Graduate Council will serve in this role for graduate students.

The annual assessments will be conducted for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee also serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for undergraduate students. The Graduate Council serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for graduate students.

E. **Appeals**

1. **Channels for Appeals**

For Undergraduate Students: Primary decisions of SCAIP may be appealed through

---

1 Primary in the policy refers to the initial review of cases and is sometimes qualified to reflect who is doing this first review (e.g. Primary SCAIP review or Primary AIC review).
the appropriate college/school Academic Integrity Committee. Appellate decisions by a college/school Academic Integrity Committee are final. Primary decisions of a college/school Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions by the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final. In any decision that includes a sanction of dismissal of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter.

For Graduate Students: Primary decisions of the Graduate Division may be appealed to the GAIC. Appellate decisions by the GAIC are final. Primary decisions of the GAIC may be appealed to the Graduate Council. Appellate decisions by the Graduate Council are final. In any decision that includes a sanction of dismissal of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter.

2. Criteria for Appeals

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

3. Appeal Procedures

- The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 10 calendar days after the written decision is made available.
- Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.
- The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided. Grades or degrees may be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.
- When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal as soon it has been received by the appropriate appellate body and will be given an opportunity to submit a

---

2 Appellate refers to cases that were appealed and reflect the decision of the body reviewing and deciding on the appeal.
written statement for consideration during the appeal process.

- The appellate body will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.
- The appellate body will make a decision based on the written submissions within 20 calendar days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.
- The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the Faculty member, and the original adjudicating body within 20 calendar days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. *The decision of the appellate body is final.*

### F. Maintenance of Records

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

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

**Justification for proposed changes:**

1. The proposal adds clarity about procedures, and corrects some ambiguities, redundancies, and inconsistencies in wording of the existing policy. A summary table is added to illustrate the stages of review and the responsible bodies at each stage.
2. The proposal adds a separate pathway for adjudication of alleged misconduct by graduate students. Procedures themselves are not changed for undergraduates.

3. The proposal modifies the term of office for members of the college/school and graduate Academic Integrity Committees (from July 1-June 30 to Sept 1-Aug 31). This will correspond with the term of office for members of other Academic Senate committees and will assure continuity for cases they may have begun during the spring term and carried over into the summer months.

**Presented for review to:**
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 2/4/11
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: Date
Approved by Graduate Council: Date
Approved by the Committee on Academic Freedom Date
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: Date
Reviewed by the Executive Council: Date
The Qualifying Exam Committee

Before advancement to candidacy, the student must pass an oral exam conducted by a Qualifying Committee. This Committee is nominated by the graduate department or program, and officially appointed by the Graduate Dean. The Committee is comprised of five members, a majority of whom are affiliated with the program. The Chair of the Qualifying Committee is normally from the academic unit supervising the student's Ph.D. program and a voting member of the Academic Senate. All Committee members should normally be regular faculty of the University of California. Any exceptions must be supported by a memo of justification from the Graduate Advisor and a vita. A memo need not be written for those holding Adjunct faculty positions.

One member of the Qualifying Committee, designated the "outside member," must be a voting member of the UC Academic Senate who does not hold an appointment in the student's academic unit or graduate group. This person represents the faculty at large and acts as a "third party ensuring fairness."

The oral exam must be held on a single day. A passing performance requires that no more than one Committee member votes to fail. If a student fails the qualifying examination, the Committee should make a recommendation for or against a second examination and specify what part or parts of the original exam are to be repeated. Ordinarily, the second examination is not administered until at least three months have elapsed. A third examination is not permitted.

This text is from the Graduate Division web site under “Doctoral Degree”, which is found under “Academic Affairs – Rules and Regulations".
DOCTORAL QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS

The Qualifying Exam Committee

Before advancement to candidacy, the student must pass an oral examination conducted by a Qualifying Committee. This Committee is nominated by the graduate department or program, and officially appointed by the Graduate Dean. The Committee is comprised of five members, a majority of whom are affiliated with the program. The Chair of the Qualifying Committee is normally from the academic unit supervising the student's Ph.D. program and a voting member of the Academic Senate. All Committee members should normally be regular faculty of the University of California. Any exceptions must be supported by a memo of justification from the Graduate Advisor and a vita. A memo need not be written for those holding Adjunct faculty positions. The anticipated research supervisor of the student (the "major professor") will normally be a member of the Qualifying Committee (Bylaw GR4.5.1).

When constituting the committee, care must be taken to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest between the examiners and the candidate. In addition, one member of the Qualifying Committee, designated the "outside member," must be a voting member of the UC Academic Senate who does not hold an appointment in the student's academic unit or graduate group. This person represents the faculty at large, acts as a "third party ensuring fairness" and must be a tenured faculty. At the time of appointment of the “outside member”, he/she is to be informed of this obligation.

The oral exam must be held on a single day. A passing performance requires that no more than one Committee member votes to fail. If a student fails the qualifying examination, the Committee should make a recommendation for or against a second examination and specify what part or parts of the original exam are to be repeated. Ordinarily, the second examination is not administered until at least three months have elapsed. A third examination is not permitted.

Instructions For Chairperson of the Committee
(To be communicated by the Chairperson to Committee Members before the examination is held.)

Upon the recommendation of the program chairperson or graduate advisor, doctoral qualifying committees are appointed by and are responsible to the Graduate Council through the Dean of the Graduate Division. The doctoral qualifying committee is charged with examining (i) the student's intellectual capabilities; (ii) his/her knowledge of the general field of study and the related fields and areas of special interest; (iii) the adequacy of the student's preparation and qualifications to be advanced to candidacy for the doctorate.

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

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

• All Members of the qualifying committee must be physically present for the entire oral examination period as well as the entire deliberation period. All examiners must ask questions and have the opportunity to follow up on their own questions or those of others; no restrictions are to be placed on questions unless a committee member is abusing his/her time.

• Prior to commencement of the examination, the Chairperson must announce to the committee that the “outside member” serves as a third party to ensure fairness.

• If written materials are to be prepared by the student prior to the oral examination (e.g. research proposals commonly required by science and engineering units), the oral examination is not to be held until those materials have been accepted by all members of the examining committee as adequate for the purpose of discussion. As a consequence, a candidate standing an acceptable oral examination shall not be failed for perceived inadequacies of the preparatory materials.

• Should the student not appear for the examination or become ill during the examination, appropriate steps should be taken to ensure that the candidate is judged fairly in deciding whether or not the examination is to be rescheduled.

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

• There are no conditional passes.

The findings of the committee must be reported within 48 hours to the Graduate Council through the Graduate Division on Ph.D. Form 3, "Report of Qualifying Examination". A unanimous committee report for or against approval will be accepted for the Graduate Council by the Dean of the Graduate Division. If a student has failed the qualifying examination, the committee will make a written recommendation for or against a second examination and specify what part or parts of the original exam are to be repeated. The second oral examination ordinarily will not to be given until at least three months have elapsed. The date of the second oral examination should be communicated to the Graduate Division in writing at least two weeks prior to its occurrence. A third examination is not permitted.

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