NOTICE OF MEETING
Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 3:30 p.m.
Leichtag Building Conference Room

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(1) Minutes of Meeting of December 3, 2013

(2-7) Announcements

(a) Chair Kit Pogliano
   • 2014-2015 Senate Election

(b) Chancellor Pradeep Khosla [rev.]

(c) Ramesh Rao, Director, Qualcomm Institute, the UCSD Division of CalIT2: Innovation Space

(8) Special Orders

(a) Consent Calendar
   • CPB Annual Report 2012-2013

(9) Reports of Special Committees [none]

(10) Reports of Standing Committees

(a) Graduate Council [Joel Norris, Graduate Council Chair]
   • MAS program in Data Science and Engineering, in Department of CSE
   • Proposed Revision to Division Regulation 515 – Progress Toward Degrees and Probation [rev.]

(b) Educational Policy Committee [Partho Ghosh, Educational Policy Committee Chair]
   • Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix II – UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship [rev.]

(11) Reports of Faculties [none]

(a) Revelle [Paul Yu, Revelle College Provost]
   • Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Faculty of Revelle College
   • Proposed Revision to Division Regulation 605 – Academic Requirements of Revelle College

(b) Health Sciences/School of Medicine [Leslie Martin, Health Sciences Faculty Chair, and Thomas Savides, former Health Sciences Faculty Chair]
   • Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Health Sciences Faculty
   • Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine
   • Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Medicine (committees)
   • Proposed Revision to Division Regulation 503 – Grading Policy – School of Medicine
• Proposed Revision to Division Regulation 502 – Grade Appeals  
  (School of Medicine provisions only)

(12) Petitions of Students [none]

(13) Unfinished Business [none]

(14) New Business
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Chair Pogliano called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm. A quorum was present (see attached attendance sheet), as were other Academic Senate members and guests. Chair Pogliano welcomed members and guests to meeting. Goes over who can motion and vote. Chair Pogliano reviewed the Academic Senate Bylaws governing the privilege of the floor and voting. Chair Pogliano introduced guests and reviewed meeting agenda.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR OF THE DIVISION**
Chair Pogliano gave an update on resolution regarding health care plan changes. Many complaints were brought forth and a proposed resolution was voted on unanimously during the Representative Assembly meeting on October 29, 2013. Resolution was forwarded to the Office of the President. A discussion at the Office of the President occurred on what is appropriate when consulting with campuses on major changes, such as the changes to health care plans. The Office of the President posted an FAQ on their website on 12/2/13. UCOP will allow individuals to change their healthcare plan, past the open enrollment period, if they made an incorrect choice in their new plan; this will be for an undisclosed period (anticipate it being for a month or two). However, changes will not be retroactive, so employees are suggested to contact their benefits representative as soon as possible if they are interested in making changes. Retirees’ who choose a plan and move to a new state, will be subject to ‘pre-existing conditions.’ Resolution prompted other campuses to do the same thing. In response to a request made at the October 29, 2013 Representative Assembly meeting, a survey was opened for faculty to gauge the satisfaction with the health care changes and specific issues that they may have encountered during open enrollment. The survey is ongoing and is posted on the Academic Senate webpage. There has been participation in this survey from 10% of the faculty. Chair Pogliano invites all faculty to participate in this survey; Chair Pogliano asked all in attendance to spread the word to colleagues and encourage them to participate in the survey.

Chair Pogliano explained that as a result of the Moreno Report, there has been a request from the Office of the President for campuses to report on bias; collaborating with the Committee on Privilege & Tenure to produce report. Procedures referred to in the Moreno Report are more or less implemented on the UCSD campus. There is an ongoing effort to improve climate.

Chair Pogliano announced there is a joint workgroup that has begun looking at how to balance undergraduate admission, specifically how to get and keep majors at an acceptable number of undergraduate students. Want to make sure we are taking advantage of all departments across campus.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR**
Chancellor Khosla explained that the budget for this year and the three following has been set. There have been two 5% base increases in this year’s budget (partly a tuition buyout from 2012-2013). Money lost from past years will not be recovered. Following years will see a 4% base increase in budget. The campus has seen an increase of the nonresident student population. If nonresident student population increase occurs next year, there will be another increase in revenue. Campus goal will be a 20% nonresident student population (undergraduates). However, these increases will not be enough to sustain future budgetary demands since there are currently no plans to increase tuition for undergraduate students. The campus will have to generate revenue to maintain faculty size that we currently have. This is just the start of this conversation.

Chancellor Khosla stated that there is a reconsideration of the number of units required for undergraduate graduation. The national norm is 180 units; 180 - 200 units required seems reasonable. Anything above this increases the workload in departments, department chair and vice chairs participating in this discussion. Also looking at ways to handle enrollment growth and impacted majors. There is a trend that impacted majors fall way below enrollment targets the years after impaction, then once the major falls below their targeted numbers, become
unimpacted again. In this instance, there is currently no rational way to allocate FTE’s to departments, because
there is no way of predicting how much teaching help will be needed. There are departments on campus that
have significant under-enrollment. Senate should take a fresh look at how undergraduate students are admitted. It
would be good to have approximate number of undergraduate students that would be ideal for each department.
Allocation of resources will be skewed if the current trend of enrollment number continues to go significantly up
and down in departments each year.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH AND CHAIR OF CONFLICT OF
INTEREST INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
Vice Chancellor – Research Sandra Brown: Conflict of Interest reporting is an annual requirement for all faculty,
the form is available online. “Conflict of Interest” refers to situation in which financial or other personal
consideration may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, professional judgment in administration,
management, teaching, and the design, conduct or reporting of research results. Be sure what you’re reporting in
your annual reports will match what will be published in report.

Conflict of interest has state and UC mandated requirements. There is a faculty advisory committee appointed by
the Chancellor, chaired by Doug Madge. The Independent Review Committee (IRC) is comprised of senior
faculty. The IRC considers if there is an appearance of conflict of interest, risk for bias by the conflicted individual,
risk to the reputations of the conflicted individual and UCSD, risk to the human subjects participating in the
research.

Recent changes for Conflict of Interest Reporting, must report: publicly traded entities that have a combination of
equity and/or compensation more than $5,000, non-publicly traded entities in which any equity interest or
compensation is more than $5,000, intellectual property payments that are more than $5,000 for any IP rights or
interests, and travel payments which are sponsored or reimbursed travel of more than $5,000, whether payment is
made to the investigator directly or expenses that are paid on his/her behalf. Upcoming Change: Affordable Care
Act requires drug manufacturers to report payments and items of value given to physicians and teaching hospitals.
Full details on changes can be found on the UCSD Conflict of Interest webpage.

Doug Madge, Chair COI/IRC: Primary coal of IRC is to ensure faculty meet their campus responsibilities. Legally
required to say where money is coming from. If in doubt about what to report, consult/disclose to administration
and/or committee.

An assembly member posed the question: things such as large data sets from a company to use as part of research,
would that fall under what must be reported? Doug answered that there are different rules for things that are non-
monetary; some are under prevue of committee, some fall under purchasing, some under graduate studies; how
something is handled would partly depend on what it is called when an agreement is made; things of value in
monetary terms can be vague. If in doubt, declare.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Results of Special Election to fill two Committee on Committee vacancies in Health Sciences – Chair Pogliano
thanked everyone who participated in Special Election. Karen Oegema (Professor, Department of Cellular &
Molecular Medicine) will serve the remainder of a three-year terms ending August 31, 2016. Kenneth Lyons Jones
(Professor, Department of Pediatrics) will serve the remainder of a three-year term ending August 31, 2014. Chair
Pogliano thanked everyone who stood for election and congratulated newly elected committee members.

Election of Two Representative Assembly Members to Senate Council – At October 29, 21013 Representative
Assembly meeting Patricia Rincon (Senior LSOE, Department of Theatre) volunteered to serve on Senate Council,
but her term as a member of the Representative Assembly expired at the end of the 2012 – 2013 year;
Representative Assembly membership is a two year term, cannot serve consecutive terms. Still need two members
to serve on Senate Council. Chair Pogliano called for nominations from the floor for the two positions. Vice Chair
Boss spoke on behalf of Constance (Connie) Benson (Professor, Department of Medicine), who was not in
attendance at the meeting, she has agreed to serve on Senate Council. Rachel Klein (Associate Professor,
Department of History) volunteered to serve on Senate Council. Chair Pogliano calls for a vote of acceptance by acclamation; vote is accepted. Chair Pogliano noted that the next Senate Council meeting will be on Monday, January 6 at 3:30 p.m.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [none]

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Graduate Council - Department of Medicine: Proposal to Establish a UCSD/SDSU Joint Doctoral Program in Applied Social Science with an Emphasis on Substance Use and Bioninformatics and Systems Biology Graduate Program: Proposal to Establish a Ph.D. in Bioinformatics and Systems Biology with a Specialization in Biomedical Informatics

Professor Joel Norris (Chair, Graduate Council) presented Assembly with proposed degrees. Clarification provided on Joint Doctoral Program: Division of Global Public Health in the Department of Medicine at UCSD is working in conjunction with the School of Social Work as SDSU. An Assembly member asked if Bioinformatics and Systems Biology is a department or program; it is a program, comprised of faculty members from several departments across campus.

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Norris moved that the UCSD/SDSU Joint Doctoral Program in Applied Social Science with An Emphasis on Substance Use be approved as proposed. [Because the motion is made on behalf of a committee, no second is required.] The motion was approved by a majority voice vote, 5 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Norris moved that the Ph.D. in Bioinformatics and Systems Biology with a Specialization in Biomedical Informatics be approved as proposed. [Because the motion is made on behalf of a committee, no second is required.] The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REPORTS OF FACULTIES [none]

PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [none]

UNFINISHED BUSINESS [none]

NEW BUSINESS [none]

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Ashley Welch
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- Joseph Pogliano / [Samuel Rickless] (Earl Warren College) +
- Matthew Herbst / [Roosevelt College] +
- Michael David / [Sixth College] +
- Janis Jenkins / [Sixth College] +
- David Miller / [Richard Attiyeh] (Emeritus Faculty) [+]
- Steven Parish / [Anthropology] +
- Kun Zhang / [Peter Wang] (Bioengineering) +
- Lin Chao / [Stephan Hedrick] (Biological Sciences) +
- Gurrol Suel / [Kaustuv Roy] (Biological Sciences) +
- Huilin Zhou / [George Sen] (Cellular & Molecular Med.) +
- Charles Perrin / [Patricia Jennings] (Chemistry & Biochemistry) +
- Tadeusz Molinski / [Robert Pomeroy] (Chemistry & Biochemistry) [+]
- Angela Yu / [Gedeon Deak] (Cognitive Science) [+]
- Morana Alac / [Stefan Tanaka] (Communication) +
- Charles Elkan / [Yuanyuan Zhou] (Computer Science & Engineering) +
- Alex Orailoglu / [Pavel Pevzner] (Computer Science & Engineering) +
- Mark Machina / [Jim Andreoni] (Economics) +
- Christopher Chambers / [Ivana Komunjer] (Economics) [+]
- Carolyn Hofstetter / [Thandeka Chapman] (Education Studies) [+]
- James Buckwalter / [Zhaowei Liu] (Electrical & Computer Engineering) +
- Young-Han Kim / [Deli Wang] (Electrical & Computer Engineering) +
- Steven Hayden / [Richard Clark] (Emergency Medicine) +
- Sara Kaplan / [Curtis Marez] (Ethnic Studies) +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status 1</th>
<th>Status 2</th>
<th>Status 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Allison</td>
<td>[Anthony Gamst]</td>
<td>(Family &amp; Preventive Med.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal Golan</td>
<td>[Mark Hendrickson]</td>
<td>(History)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Klein</td>
<td>[Tom Gallant]</td>
<td>(History)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Naughton</td>
<td>[Yasu-Hiku Tohsaku]</td>
<td>(IR&amp;PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Caballero</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>(Linguistics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O'Brien</td>
<td>[Yingjin Zhang]</td>
<td>(Literature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille Forbes</td>
<td>[Babak Rahimi]</td>
<td>(Literature)</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Meyer</td>
<td>[Patrick Fitzsimmons]</td>
<td>(Mathematics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Rabin</td>
<td>[Jason Schweinsberg]</td>
<td>(Mathematics)</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Tyan</td>
<td>[Xanthippi Markenscoff]</td>
<td>(Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kal Seshadri</td>
<td>[Prab Bandaru]</td>
<td>(Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Ix</td>
<td>[David Smith]</td>
<td>(Medicine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Benson</td>
<td>[Dianne McKay]</td>
<td>(Medicine)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharina Rosenberger</td>
<td>(Fall) / [Amy Cimini]</td>
<td>(Music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Smyth</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Wtr/Spr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Lipomi</td>
<td>[Andrea Tao]</td>
<td>(NanoEngineering)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rissman</td>
<td>[Karen Pierce]</td>
<td>(Neurosciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hnasko</td>
<td>[Ronald Ellis]</td>
<td>(Neurosciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Zangwill</td>
<td>[Bobby Korn]</td>
<td>(Ophthalmology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sameer Shah</td>
<td>[Simon Schenk]</td>
<td>(Orthopaedics)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[+]+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Powell</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>(Pathology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pride</td>
<td>[Robert Fitzgerald]</td>
<td>(Pathology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bradley</td>
<td>[Bena Bonsu]</td>
<td>(Pediatrics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Bird</td>
<td>[Sheila Gahagan]</td>
<td>(Pediatrics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Joiner</td>
<td>[Hyam Leffert]</td>
<td>(Pharmacology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bechtel</td>
<td>[Gerald Doppelt]</td>
<td>(Philosophy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Dudko</td>
<td>[Oleg Shpyrko]</td>
<td>(Physics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Grinstein</td>
<td>[Avi Yagil]</td>
<td>(Physics)</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Kernell</td>
<td>[Fonna Forman-Barzilai]</td>
<td>(Political Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ [ ]</td>
<td>(Political Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Clark</td>
<td>[Wesley Thompson]</td>
<td>(Psychiatry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xianjin Zhou</td>
<td>[David Welsh]</td>
<td>(Psychiatry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rickard</td>
<td>[Leslie Carver]</td>
<td>(Psychology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Advani</td>
<td>[Todd Pawlicki]</td>
<td>(Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ [ ]</td>
<td>(Radiology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuval Rottenstreich</td>
<td>[Uri Gneezy]</td>
<td>(Rady School of Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kauffman</td>
<td>[Dwayne Stupack]</td>
<td>(Reproductive Medicine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Allen</td>
<td>[Kathy Barbeau]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Constable</td>
<td>[Amro Hamdoun]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Hastings</td>
<td>[James Leichter]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria (Gabi) Laske</td>
<td>[Andrew Dickson]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy Ogden</td>
<td>[Dean Roemmich]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Talley</td>
<td>[Brad Werner]</td>
<td>(SIO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akos Rona-Tas</td>
<td>[Amy Binder]</td>
<td>(Sociology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Bourne</td>
<td>[Geoffrey Chang]</td>
<td>(SSPPS)</td>
<td>[+]+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr Krysl</td>
<td>[Hyonny Kim]</td>
<td>(Structural Engineering)</td>
<td>[+]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Chen</td>
<td>[Todd Costantini]</td>
<td>(Surgery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Eliceiri</td>
<td>[David Rapaport]</td>
<td>(Surgery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Burrett</td>
<td>[Charles Means]</td>
<td>(Theatre and Dance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam Clancy</td>
<td>[Patricia Rincon]</td>
<td>(Theatre and Dance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[+]+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Hock</td>
<td>[Ruben Ortiz]</td>
<td>(Visual Arts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyong Park</td>
<td>[Brett Stoelbaum]</td>
<td>(Visual Arts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[+]+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advisors:**

- Amy Tsai / [Alexei Kritsuk] (Research - General Campus) +
- David Boyle / [Michael Baker] (Research - Health Sciences) +
- Julie McClean / [David Chadwell] (Research - Marine Sciences) +
- Robby Boparai (Undergraduate Student) +
- Andrew Busselt (Undergraduate Student) +
- Jordan Gosselin (Graduate Student) +
- Rahul Kapadia (Graduate Student) +

**Key:** + present [+]+ alternate present - not member or advisor at the time of meeting
Annual Report  
Committee on Planning & Budget  
2012-13

The Committee on Planning & Budget (CPB) is pleased to report that it had a successful first year in its expanded complement of nine faculty members.

Issues Discussed

CPB participated in campus enrollment management and planning and discussions of proposed Composite Benefit Rates by the Strategic Planning & Budget Council.

It devoted much of its time to Senate reviews and discussion of the following topics:

- Campus Salary Equity Plans
- System-wide and local UCSD Negotiated Salary Plans
- UC Rebenching proposals
- Faculty Rewards TF Recommendations
- UC Open Access proposals
- Technology Transfer protocols
- Changes in the Technology Transfer Office
- UCSD Strategic Planning Initiative
- Financial Aid Funding Proposals
- UC, UCSD & State budgets (May revise)
- Academic Affairs budget
- ORU reviews
- Proposed ORUs
- Facilities Management Review Committee
- Proposed Affiliation Agreement between Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program & Salk Institute
- Task Force on Self Supporting Programs
- Proposed new masters and MAS degrees
- Department requests for impacted status
- Online and Technology Enhanced Education SATF
- Transportation Services Policies, Fees & Budget
- IP protections in UCSD’s Coursera contract

Moreover, CPB presented two Faculty Budget Education Workshops whose goal was to bring faculty up to speed on budget and planning issues in the context of the Chancellor’s Strategic Planning Initiative.

UC-wide, via its chair, CPB participated in the University Committee on Planning and Budget in Oakland and presented CPBs views bi-weekly to senior UCOP officials including Executive Vice-President & Provost Aimée Dorr, Executive Vice President for Business Operations Nathan Brostrom, Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor, Vice-
President for Budget Patrick Lenz, Associate Vice President, Operating Budget and Facilities Management Debora Obley, and Controller Peggy Arrivas. Topics included vigorous discussions on the deleterious effects of the proposed Composite Benefit Rates that would double rates associated with grants rendering the latter competitive and on UC PATH, the new centralized payroll and human resources system that will add a substantial tax on limited campus resources.

**Campus ORU Reviews**

Units reviewed included:

- Stein Institute for Research on Aging (SOM)
- Center for Human Development (SOM)
- Center for Comparative Immigration Studies (DSS)
- Center for Iberian & Latin American Studies (DSS)
- Center for Academic Research and Training in Anthropogeny (SOM)
- San Diego Super Computer Center (AA)
- AIDS Research Institute (SOM)

ORU proposals reviewed:

- Establishment of the Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation (SIO)
- Center for Drug Discovery Innovation (SOM/SSPPS)

Self-Supporting Masters and MAS Degree Programs reviewed included:

- Accelerated MBA (Rady)
- Master of Finance (Rady)
- Master of Professional Accountancy (Rady)

- MAS in Climate Science & Policy (SIO)
- MAS in Big Data Science (CSE)

With respect to ORU reviews, CPB would like to take the opportunity to share some conclusions it arrived at while assessing them:

First, under current rules, there is apparently no requirement for the inclusion of budget and planning data in ORU reviews. Such data would include: revenues by source including IDC funds, expenditures, and accumulated reserves for the review period as well as projections for the next 3-5 years. In the view of the Committee, this information is all the more crucial in a difficult public and private funding environment for assessing the financial health of ORUs. Absent such data it is its considered judgment that CPB cannot meaningfully fulfill its charge in ORU reviews. In September 2012 outgoing and incoming CPB chairs requested via the Senate that the Office of Research Affairs introduce such a requirement. In September 2013 the outgoing and incoming chairs of
CPB along with the chair of the Committee on Research reviewed these matters with VC for Research Sandy Brown.

A second concern is that the current ORU model that assumes access to substantial outside funding whereas this holds best by far for STEM fields. This concern is shared by the Committee on Research as well. CPB hopes to pursue discussions with the ORA on revising this current model to better match the funding environments of both STEM and non-STEM fields.

Thirdly, when it comes to assessing ORUs, it may be helpful to distinguish between a recognized campus need in interdisciplinary research and the proper academic research vehicle for meeting it. This would allow the campus to retire ORUs that have served their purpose while acknowledging the continuing legitimacy of the needs they used to meet.

**UCSD Enrollment Management and Planning**

With respect to questions of enrollment management and planning, CPB reached several conclusions. As the campus increasingly markets its academic enterprise for the purposes of generating new revenue, as evidenced by the effort to recruit non-resident students, pressure will grow from departments for their slice of the new funding proportionate to non-resident student enrollments in their courses. Such pressure already implicitly exists in the case when high non-resident enrollments lead to an urgent need for greater resources. CPB recommends that the campus, especially the Senate, look into policies concerning the allotment of new resources to departments generating non-resident enrollments. Furthermore, the general issue of how academic units may be understood to “generate” tuition and state-per-student education allocation net their relative costs should also be examined.

Concerning the question of requests for impacted status, an admittedly imperfect solution, CPB concluded that the campus should explore developing tools that help to predict how many students would leave UCSD or not enroll in UCSD should a department become impacted as well as the majors to which affected students would switch when a department becomes impacted. These tools should include surveys of admitted students who decline UCSD, and surveys of existing undergraduates.

**UCSD’s Contract with Coursera**

In response to concerns raised by faculty regarding IP protections in spring quarter 2013, CPB also reviewed UCSD’s affiliation agreement with Coursera signed February 15, 2013. It noted that the working draft submitted for review by the Senate Council in January 2013 allowed only one week for comments, which was too short a time for adequate review of a legal document on a campus where faculty dispose of little juridical expertise. Moreover, the Academic Senate never received a final draft of the contract from Academic Affairs for review by relevant Senate committees as promised.

At its June meeting, CPB after a preliminary discussion followed by consultation with IP experts on the faculty of the Center for Technology and Law at the Berkeley Law School
and the Associate Librarian of UCLA Libraries that confirmed that some of the concerns had merit, it was decided to host a joint discussion with the Committee on Faculty Welfare in July. This resulted in the redaction of an August 2, 2013 memo to Dan Parks, Campus Chief Counsel and Jeff Elman Dean of Social Sciences outlining faculty concerns including:

- the status of faculty as author/shareholders of course content of blended or pure online courses
- faculty’s right to license to anyone course content they have authored
- the contract’s weak IP protections and their conflict with existing UC copyright and intellectual property policy dating from 1992
- the contract’s clauses and releases that appear to assign course ownership to the University and Coursera alone
- clauses regarding faculty liability and mechanisms of indemnification
- lack of campus infrastructure for the university and its faculty to do due diligence with respect to third-party copyrighted materials embedded in blended and pure online courses

CPB recommended that relevant Senate committees draw up an FAQ for faculty interested in working with Coursera that details the benefits and risks involved.

**Faculty Budget Education Workshops**

Finally, during the academic year Planning & Budget also prepared and presented to campus two Faculty Budget Education Workshops (October 2012 and April 2013) whose goal in the context of the Chancellor’s Strategic Planning Initiative was to bring faculty up to speed on the structure and functioning of campus budgets and the financial and planning challenges facing UCSD. These were made possible through the extensive assistance of Academic Senate staff and the data and budget offices of all the Vice-Chancellor areas. CPB posted an expanded Reference Edition (196 slides with a navigation tool) to the Senate website October 2013 that it hopes will serve as a baseline for future budget communication and discussions. CPB plans to update the data regularly as needed.

Sincerely,

Roddey Reid, Chair (Literature)
John Kosmatka, Vice-Chair (Structural Engineering)
Henry Abarbanel (Physics)
Julian Betts (Economics)
Sam Buss (Mathematics)
Charles Elkan (Computer Science & Engineering)
Lisa Porter (Theater & Dance)
Jean Wang (Medicine, SOM)
William Young (SIO)
REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

At its January 13, 2014 meeting, the Graduate Council approved a proposal for a new program of study leading to a Master of Advanced Studies degree in Data Science and Engineering (MAS-DSE) in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. The MAS-DSE is a two-year part-time program for working professionals. Students will complete a total of 38 units: 26 units of required coursework, eight units of elective courses, and a four-unit capstone course. The curriculum is designed to teach theoretical and practical aspects of data modeling, data analysis, data query and curation, machine learning, programming and benchmarking in a format that is accessible to working professionals with backgrounds in computer science, statistics, and the physical sciences.

The MAS-DSE is a professional degree program and the Department of Computer Science and Engineering has proposed a self-supporting budget model. The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposal and provided its comments to the Graduate Council. The Council determined that based on the faculty's expertise in Data Science and the relevancy of the proposed curriculum to working professionals in the San Diego region, the MAS-DSE is likely to attract a strong applicant pool.

The Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal.

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review at:
http://senate.ucsd.edu/assembly/1314/MASDataScienceEngineering.pdf

Proposal for a new Master of Advanced Studies in Data Science and Engineering in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Executive Summary

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) in collaboration with the San Diego Supercomputer Center, proposes a new master's degree program in “Data Science and Engineering” (DSE) leading to a Master of Advanced Studies (MAS). Data Science refers to large, diverse, complex, longitudinal, and/or distributed data sets generated from instruments, sensors, Internet transactions, email, video, click streams, and/or all other digital sources available today and in the future.

An increasing fraction of human and non-human activity around the world is digitized and shared, resulting in a tsunami of data covering all aspects of life. Managed well, this data can be used to unlock new sources of economic value, provide fresh insights into science and hold governments to account.

Processing big data also creates new challenges. Despite the abundance of tools to capture, process and share all this information-sensors, computers, mobile phones and the like—it already exceeds the available storage space. Moreover, protecting privacy is becoming harder as increasing amounts of information on individuals is collected and shared between a huge variety of services, from cell phones to social networks to medical institutions.
A new kind of professional has emerged, the data scientist, who combines the skills of software programmer, database manager, statistician and storyteller/artist to create mathematical models of the data, identify trends and deviations, and present them in effective visual ways that can be understood and appreciated by others. The term "data scientist" is to the point. The scientist's goal is to understand systems by creating simplified models that capture its essence. The data scientist aims to model systems which manifest themselves through data that is often much larger than the capacity of typical machines. The system can be biological (genomic and clinical data from malignant tumors of all cancer patients), physical (plate-tectonics or a bridge) or human communication (social networks, real-time data generated by mobile devices), but the goal is the same – simplified models that can be used to predict or identify major events.

The program is designed for working professionals with a broad background in education and/or training in related areas of computer science, or other engineering or mathematics and with substantial experience in data analysis. It consists of seven required courses (three foundational courses and four core courses), two electives chosen from six course options, and a two-quarter capstone project course, for a total of 38 units. The program is designed to be completed over a two-year period. The admission selection and program administration will benefit from the process used by current MAS programs offered at UCSD under the supervision of the Office of Graduate Studies.
REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council proposes amending Divisional Senate Regulation 515. Progress Toward Degrees and Probation to make explicit that the Council has the ability to consider and approve proposals to establish minimum grade requirements in graduate curricular programs. Currently, Senate Regulation 515(A)(4) states that departments and programs may set a minimum standard for the satisfaction of requirements within the undergraduate curriculum with the approval of the Educational Policy Committee. No parallel regulation applies to graduate curricula.

The Graduate Council requested clarification from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction on whether Senate Regulation 515(A) prevented departments and programs from instituting minimum grade requirements for graduate degree requirements with the approval of the Graduate Council. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction determined that Divisional Bylaw 220 provides the Graduate Council with the ability to consider and approve proposals to establish minimum grades requirements in graduate curricular programs. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction also recommended that the Graduate Council amend Senate Regulation 515 to make this authority explicit and establish campus-wide parameters as Senate Regulation 515(A)(4) does for undergraduate curricula.

In response to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s recommendation, the Graduate Council proposes adding item 6 to section A of Senate Regulation 515 to clarify that departments and programs may set higher standards for the satisfaction of graduate degree requirements with the approval of the Council. The Council considers the setting of higher standards for degree requirements as a means to allow graduate programs to be explicit about expectations for completing graduate degrees.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction found the proposed amendment consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate. The Graduate Council requests that the Division approve the proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 515(A).

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

******************************************************************************

515. Progress Toward Degrees and Probation

(A)

(1) In order to apply the units of a course toward unit requirements for a degree, a student must receive an A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, P, or S grade in the course.

(2) Further, an undergraduate student must have a 2.0 or higher GPA to receive a Bachelor’s degree and a graduate student must have a 3.0 or higher GPA to receive a higher degree.

(3) With the approval of the Educational Policy Committee and when student demand exceeds any reasonable capacity to accommodate, departments and programs may require undergraduate students to achieve a GPA higher than 2.0 in a specific set of prerequisite courses and may limit admission to the major to students who have met that standard. No department or program may require a GPA higher than 2.0 for continuation in or graduation from any undergraduate major.
(4) With the approval of the Educational Policy Committee, departments and programs may set a minimum standard for the satisfaction of requirements within that department’s or program’s undergraduate curriculum. Except as may be provided for in Paragraph 3 of this Regulation, the minimum standard may not be set higher than C-.

(5) Nothing in this regulation shall be construed as prohibiting the establishment of higher standards in honors programs or independent majors.

(6) With the approval of the Graduate Council, departments and programs may set higher standards for the satisfaction of that department’s or program’s graduate degree requirements.

(B) An undergraduate student is subject to academic probation if at the end of any term his or her GPA for that term or the cumulative GPA is less than 2.0. An undergraduate student is subject to academic disqualification from further registration if at the end of any term his or her GPA for that term is less than 1.5 or if he or she has completed two successive terms on academic probation without achieving a cumulative GPA of 2.0. Continued registration of an undergraduate who is subject to disqualification is at the discretion of the faculty of the student’s college, or its authorized agent.

(C) A graduate student is subject to disqualification if the cumulative GPA in upper division and graduate course work taken as a graduate student is less than 3.0, or if more than a total of eight units of F and/or U grades has been accumulated. Continued registration of a graduate student is at the discretion of the Dean of Graduate Studies. [SR 904]

(D) If a student is not currently in scholastic good standing or has been denied registration for the next ensuing quarter on the date on which he or she left the University, a statement of the student’s status shall accompany the transcript.
REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

The Educational Policy Committee proposes several amendments to Appendix II – UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship. The revised Policy below shows the affected portions of the Policy, with proposed additions underlined and proposed deletions shown with strike outs. There are two major changes to the Policy to include a new section documenting procedures for cases of academic dishonesty occurring outside of coursework and the implementation of a deadline for instructors to withdraw charges of academic dishonesty. The other changes are editorial or provide clarification where experience has informed us that it is needed.

A brief summary of the proposed revisions in the Policy:

General
• References to the Academic Integrity Coordinator have been replaced with the Academic Integrity Office (AI Office).
• References to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs have been amended to reflect that position’s new title of Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
• References to notifications are uniformly listed as notifications “in writing”. This replaces references to notifications sent “via e-mail” or “via hard copy”.

Section IV
• Section IV has been amended to more clearly identify the source of authority for instructors and the administration relevant to resolution of charges of academic dishonesty.
• Section IV.B – Added a link to the sanctioning guidelines.
• Section IV.C – Revised to state that all involved parties will normally be notified of extensions to the policy’s procedural deadlines.

Section V
• Section V.A, paragraph 4 – Amended to direct instructors to submit their charge as soon as possible or within fifteen days of the due date for grades.
• Section V.A, paragraph 5 – Amended to clarify that academic grades may be determined solely on academic work.
• Section V.A, paragraph 6 – Added a new paragraph to state that, “An instructor may not withdraw a charge if a student has accepted responsibility of violating the Policy or has been found responsible for violating the Policy.”
• Section V.B.3, paragraph 1 – Amended to clarify that the student must explain why he or she contests the charges when he or she requests an Academic Integrity Review of the charge.
• Section V.C.1 – Changed the submission process to direct appeals to the AI Office. The AI will forward the appeals to the appropriate Provost or Dean of Graduate Studies.

Section VI
• Bullet 2 – Amended to clarify that Academic Records will only administratively re-enroll a student in a course if the student drops the course after a charge has been filed. This paragraph also was amended to allow instructors to submit charges for all coursework submitted by students, including those students that have since dropped themselves from the course. In these cases, academic
sanctions will not be applied, but the revision would permit the University to apply administrative sanctions in cases where a student is found responsible for violating the Policy.

Section VII (new section)
- Added new section to cover academic dishonesty in independent exams (exams outside of coursework; for example, qualifying exams). The proposed text outlines appropriate academic sanctions for cases of dishonesty in independent exams, and stipulates that only the timelines included under the section on appeals of academic sanctions apply in these cases.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the revised Policy and found it consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

The Educational Policy Committee recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the amended version of the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship and that it take effect on the first day of instruction of Spring Quarter, 2014.

Partho Ghosh, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

*******************************************************************************

APPENDIX II
UCSD POLICY ON INTEGRITY OF SCHOLARSHIP

http://senate.ucsd.edu/manual/Appendices/apxtoc.htm#Part2

Integrity of scholarship is essential for an academic community. The University expects that both faculty and students will honor this principle and in so doing protect the validity of University intellectual work. For students, this means that all academic work will be done by the individual to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind. Instructors, for their part, will exercise care in planning and supervising academic work, so that honest effort will be upheld.

The UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship (herein the “Policy”) states the general rules and procedures associated with student integrity of scholarship. This Policy applies to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a UCSD course. A separate policy exists governing integrity of research. Medical students are governed by policies specified in the Handbook for School of Medicine Advisors and Students, as formulated by the School of Medicine Committee on Educational Policy. Pharmacy students are governed by the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) Policy on Integrity of Scholarship as formulated by the SSPPS faculty. In this Policy, the term “in writing” is defined as communications delivered either on paper or electronically via email.

I. Instructors' Responsibility

The Instructor shall state in writing how graded assignments and exams will contribute to the final grade in the course. If there are any course-specific rules required by the Instructor for maintaining academic integrity, the instructor shall also inform students of these in writing.
II. Students' Responsibility

Students are expected to complete the course in compliance with the instructor's standards. No student shall engage in an activity that involves attempting to receive a grade by means other than honest effort; for example:

- No student shall knowingly procure, provide, or accept any unauthorized material that contains questions or answers to any examination or assignment to be given at a subsequent time.
- No student shall complete, in part or in total, any examination or assignment for another person.
- No student shall knowingly allow any examination or assignment to be completed, in part or in whole, for himself or herself by another person.
- No student shall plagiarize or copy the work of another person and submit it as his or her own work.
- No student shall employ aids excluded by the instructor in undertaking course work or in completing any exam or assignment.
- No student shall alter graded class assignments or examinations and then resubmit them for regrading.
- No student shall submit substantially the same material in more than one course without prior authorization.

III. The Instructional Assistant's (IA) Responsibilities

A student acting in the capacity of an Instructional Assistant (IA), a category including but not limited to teaching assistants, readers, and tutors, has a special responsibility to safeguard integrity of scholarship. In this role the student functions as an apprentice instructor, under the tutelage of the responsible instructor. An IA shall equitably grade student work in the manner agreed upon with the course instructor. An IA shall not provide a student with any information or collaboration that would aid the student in completing the course in a dishonest manner (e.g., providing access to unauthorized material related to tests, exams, homework).

IV. Responsibility for Resolution of Cases of Violation of the Policy

The responsibility for maintaining the standards of academic honesty rests with two University authorities: the faculty and the administration. Under the Standing Orders of the Regents, authority over courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty through the Academic Senate. The University of California’s Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline authorizes UCSD administration to discipline students for academic misconduct, is the exclusive responsibility of the campus administration, while authority over courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty through the Academic Senate. All
cases in which the Student is found responsible for violating the Policy will result in both an academic and an administrative sanction.

**A. Academic Responsibilities and Sanctions**

The Instructor shall report the alleged violation to the Academic Integrity Coordinator, shall participate in the process according to the Policy, and when the case is resolved, shall determine the Student’s grade in the course. Any violation of the Policy by the Student may be considered grounds for failure in the course, although less serious consequences may be incurred in less serious circumstances. An Instructor shall not assign an academic sanction for academic dishonesty unless he or she has submitted a report of an alleged violation of the Policy and the Student has either admitted responsibility for, or has been found responsible for, violating the Policy.

**B. Administrative Authority and Sanction**

The appropriate administrative authority shall impose an administrative sanction in accordance with guidelines authorized by the Educational Policy Committee. For undergraduates, the appropriate administrative authority is the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. For graduate students, the appropriate administrative authority is the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies. Administrative sanctions range in severity from administrative probation to dismissal from the University. Students found responsible for multiple cases of academic dishonesty shall be subject to dismissal from the University. Sanctioning guidelines can be found at http://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu.

**C. The Academic Integrity Coordinator Office (AI Office)**

The AIC AI Office is the initial contact for the Instructor and the administrative manager for the processing of cases of Policy violations. The AIC AI Office may extend any timelines in the Policy when practical exigencies so dictate, in which case all involved parties will normally be notified in writing and via email. The AIC AI Office shall maintain a record of all cases and shall report annually to the Academic Senate Educational Policy Committee, to the Council of Provosts, and to the Senior Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on the number, nature, and type of cases; the pattern of decision-making; the severity and type of academic and administrative sanctions; and other relevant matters as directed by the Educational Policy Committee.

**V. Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Violations of the Policy**

The procedure for resolution of cases of violating the Policy is divided into three phases: A, Reporting Phase; B, Decision and Resolution Phase; C, Appeals Phase.

**A. The Reporting Phase**

When an Instructor has reason to believe that a Student has violated the Policy, the Instructor should proceed in one of two ways:
(I) Meet with the Student to discuss the suspected violation. If the Instructor decides that there is evidence of a Policy violation, he or she must submit a formal charge describing the suspected violation to the Office of the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) at Office.

(II) Submit a formal charge to the AIC Office describing the alleged violation.

All alleged cases of academic dishonesty must be reported. To file a charge of violating the Policy with the AIC Office, an Instructor must submit in writing or via email the following information: the Student’s name, the Student’s PID, the course name and number, the date of the alleged incident, and a description of the incident. Upon receiving the charge, the AIC Office will initiate the resolution process, as described in Section B below.

If the Instructor has submitted a formal charge of violating the Policy, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the Student until the charge has been resolved. If the course concludes before the charge is resolved, the Instructor will assign an “X” code on the course grade sheet for the Student’s grade and will indicate in the memorandum column that this X is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”.

If there is insufficient time to submit a charge of violating the Policy before grades are due (e.g., suspected violation occurred during the final exam), then the Instructor may assign an X code for the course before a charge is filed with the AIC. In this case, the Instructor must:

i) assign an X code on the course grade sheet for the Student’s grade and indicate in the memorandum column that this X is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”.

ii) notify the AIC Office within 48 hours of submitting the grade sheet of the Student’s name, that an Integrity X code has been assigned, and that a formal charge is forthcoming, and

iii) file a formal charge to the AIC Office as soon as possible, normally within fifteen (15) business days of assigning the X code the grades due date.

If, after reporting a charge to the AIC Office, the Instructor decides to withdraw the charge, the Instructor shall notify the AIC Office via email in writing of his or her decision. The Instructor shall determine the grade for the course based on the student’s academic work. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved”. The AIC Office shall notify the Student, the appropriate Dean, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records that the charge against the Student has been withdrawn by the Instructor. All notation of the charge shall be removed from the Student’s academic record. The charge may be reinstated in accordance with this Policy should new evidence become available.

An instructor may not withdraw a charge if a student has accepted responsibility of violating the Policy or has been found responsible for violating the Policy.

B. The Decision and Resolution Phase

Once the Instructor has reported a charge of violating the Policy to the AIC Office, the AIC Office shall immediately notify the appropriate Dean in writing and via email, with a copy to the Instructor and to Academic Records that the Student is charged with violating the
Policy. Within two (2) business days, the Dean shall notify the Student in writing and via email of the charge and copy the AIC AI Office and the Instructor. The official notice shall be sent to the Student’s UCSD email address, and a written notice shall also be sent to the Student’s current address of record on file with the UCSD Registrar’s Office. It shall be assumed that the notice of the charge was received by the Student when it is sent in this manner.

If Students from two or more undergraduate colleges are allegedly involved in the same incident, the AIC AI Office will direct the case to the chair of the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The chair will then appoint one of the Deans to proceed with the case for all Students, regardless of undergraduate college. If the charge involves both undergraduate and graduate Students, the chair of the Council of Deans of Student Affairs and the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies shall consult and agree on how to proceed with the case.

1. The Student’s deadline for responding to charge(s) of violating the Policy

   Within ten (10) business days of the date of notification by the Dean, the Student must respond to the Dean acknowledging receipt of the charge and arranging to meet (either in person or via telephone) with the Dean to discuss the charge(s) and possible administrative sanctions. The Dean shall review the charge(s) with the Student and may advise and assist the Student regarding possible administrative sanctions and the process for resolution of the charge(s) of violating the Policy. Within twelve (12) business days of the date of notification by the Dean, the Student must report to the Dean his or her decision either to accept the charge of violating the Policy or to contest the charge and request an Academic Integrity Review.

2. Decision I: Student accepts charge(s) of violating the Policy

   a. Administrative Sanction

      Administrative sanctions range from administrative probation to dismissal from the University, depending on the severity of the case, any previously recorded offenses, and any mitigating circumstances.

      For undergraduate students, the appropriate Dean shall make a recommendation of the administrative sanction(s) to the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The Council of Deans of Student Affairs shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall notify the AIC AI Office of the decision within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the AIC’s AI Office’s notification of the charge.

      For graduate students, the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall notify the AIC AI Office of the administrative decision within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the AIC’s AI Office’s notification of the charge.

      A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the AIC AI Office, the appropriate Dean, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs (for undergraduates), and Academic Records.
b. Academic Sanction

Within ten (10) business days of being notified of the administrative sanction(s), the AIC-AL Office shall notify the Instructor, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records of the administrative sanction(s) and shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade for the course and submit the Change of Grade form if an X has been assigned.

The Instructor shall determine the grade for the course. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved”. Upon notification from Academic Records that the final grade has been recorded, AIC-AL Office will notify the Student, the Instructor, the Dean, and the department chair/program director of the resolution of the case with a report of both the administrative and academic sanctions.

3. Decision II: The Student contests the charge of violating the Policy and requests an Academic Integrity Review

If the Student contests the charge of violating the Policy (Decision II), he or she must submit to the appropriate Dean a written request for an Academic Integrity Review with an explanation of why the charge is contested to the appropriate Dean.

a. This request must be received by the appropriate Dean within twelve (12) business days of the date of the notification of the charge.

b. Within two (2) business days of receiving the Student’s written request for an Academic Integrity Review, the Dean shall transmit the written request to the AIC-AL Office along with any additional relevant documentation.

b. Within two (2) business days of receiving the Dean’s request, the AIC-AL Office shall notify the Student, the Instructor, and the Dean via email in writing that the request for an Academic Integrity Review was received.

4. The Academic Integrity Review (AIR)

The purpose of an Academic Integrity Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the charge and to reach an informed, evidence-based conclusion as to whether the Policy was violated.

5. Composition of the Academic Integrity Review Board and the Review Panel

The composition of the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) shall be as follows:

a. Twenty-five (25) faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees.

b. At least six (6) graduate students appointed by the Graduate Student Association in collaboration with the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies.

c. At least twelve (12) upper division undergraduate students, two from each college, appointed by the college Dean.
For each AIR request, the AIC-AI Office shall select from the AIRB five (5) members (the “Review Panel”), which shall normally be composed of three faculty members, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student. The AIC-AI Office shall also select a college Dean, who is not the Dean of the Student, to serve as the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer shall conduct the review and advise the Review Panel on procedure, but shall not vote. In the event that a five-member Review Panel is not available (e.g., during the summer months or due to unforeseen circumstances, a recusal or challenge of a Review Panel member, or last minute absences), the Student shall be given the option of electing to proceed with a reduced Review Panel. If the Student elects to proceed with a reduced Review Panel, the Presiding Officer, or the AIC-AI Office when appropriate, may agree to proceed with not less than two (2) faculty members and one (1) student (either undergraduate or graduate).

A Review Panel member may recuse himself or herself or the Student may challenge the participation of a Review Panel member only when a reasonable person would recognize a conflict of interest or an inability of the Review Panel member to be unbiased; for example, when there is a personal or authoritative relationship between the Student and a Review Panel member. The Presiding Officer shall make the final determination on challenges to Review Panel composition. In the event that the AIR cannot proceed due to Review Panel composition, the Presiding Officer shall call for a continuance until such time as an appropriate Review Panel can be constituted.

6. Notice of the Academic Integrity Review

As soon as possible, and normally no longer than one quarter after receipt of the request for an AIR, the AIC-AI Office shall schedule a review of the case by a Review Panel. The AIC-AI Office shall normally provide at least ten (10) business days’ notice in writing to the Student and the Instructor of the time, date, and location of the AIR, although exceptions can be made if both the Student and the Instructor agree. The official notice shall be sent to the Student’s UCSD email address, and a written notice shall also be sent to the Student’s current address of record on file with the UCSD Registrar’s Office. It shall be assumed that the notice of review was received by the Student when it is sent in this manner.

The notice shall include a statement that the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship is alleged to have been violated and a statement that an AIR has been scheduled. If the time and place of the AIR are not known, the notice shall include a statement indicating that a subsequent notice will be sent specifying same. In the event that the time or place is adjusted after the original notice is sent, an email notifying the parties to this effect shall be deemed sufficient notice.

Objections to the time and date of the AIR will be ruled on by the Presiding Officer no later than five (5) business days before the AIR. Academic Integrity Reviews shall not normally be rescheduled to accommodate the Student’s work, class, or personal conflicts unless undue hardship would otherwise be experienced by the Student. Academic Integrity Reviews shall not normally be rescheduled to accommodate the availability of Relevant Parties.
7. The Review Packet

Once an AIR has been requested by the Student, the relevant documents will be collected, including the facts of the charge by the Instructor and the Student’s dispute of the facts of the charge. The Student or the Instructor may also submit to the AIC-AI Office additional documents relevant to the charge, or the names and contact information of any additional people (e.g., classmates, teaching assistants) who have knowledge relevant to the charge (Relevant Parties). All documents must be submitted to the AIC-AI Office within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the review request by the AIC-AI Office.

The AIC-AI Office will make available to the Presiding Officer, the Instructor, and the Student a copy of the documents relevant to the charge (the Review Packet) no later than five (5) business days before the date of the AIR.

Newly available documents not included in the Review Packet can be presented at the AIR subject to the approval of the Presiding Officer. In such circumstances, the Presiding Officer should provide the Review Panel, the Student, and the Instructor with adequate time to review the new information.

8. Parties Attending the AIR

A Relevant Party is one with direct and material understanding of the case.

Normally, the Instructor bringing the charge forward and the Student requesting the AIR must be present for the AIR. However, in lieu of attending the AIR, the Instructor and/or the Student may forfeit in-person participation and provide a written statement.

The Student’s absence from or silence during the AIR shall not imply acceptance of responsibility.

The University will normally conduct a single AIR to address the charges made against multiple Students in the same incident unless the Students would experience substantial prejudice as a result of a joint AIR. The Dean with whom the Students meet to request an AIR will, in consultation with the AIC, hear and decide on prejudice concerns.

Recognizing their formal role in the University instruction, in cases where an Instructional Assistant (IA) is involved, the IA may also be present for the entire AIR rather than partially as a Relevant Party.

The Student may be accompanied by an Associated Students Student Advocate in the AIR. The Student should present his or her own case, but the Advocate may assist the Student with questioning and procedural issues. The Advocate may not normally appear at the AIR in lieu of the Student, but in the event that the Advocate is present but the Student is not, the AIR may continue at the discretion of the Presiding Officer, questions may be asked of the Advocate, and the Advocate may address procedural issues on behalf of the Student. Prior to the AIR, the AIC-AI Office shall be available to advise the
Instructor of the procedures and options for presentation of the case, but the Instructor may be accompanied in the AIR Office only by a faculty colleague acting under the same restrictions as a Student Advocate.

The Instructor and the Student shall have the right to present Relevant Parties and question all Relevant Parties present at the AIR. In lieu of Relevant Parties attending the AIR, the Instructor and/or the Student may submit written statements from Relevant Parties as part of the Review Packet. Normally, Relevant Parties are present at the AIR only for the time they are presenting their statements and being questioned by the Instructor, the Student, and the Review Panel.

9. The Academic Review Process

The Review Panel shall hold an AIR and decide based on the preponderance of evidence presented at the AIR whether or not the Student is responsible for violating the Policy. Academic Integrity Reviews are fundamentally educative and investigative in nature, and thus the rules of evidence used in legal proceedings do not apply.

The Presiding Officer shall conduct the AIR in such a manner as to ensure fairness to the Student and to the Instructor, to maintain order and decorum, to facilitate presentation of evidence, and to provide an opportunity for questions to be asked by the Review Panel.

No AIR shall be undertaken without a reliable recording. The Presiding Officer shall provide for either a reliable audio recording of the AIR or keep written minutes summarizing the AIR. Any recording shall be retained as part of the permanent record by the Student’s Dean. Transcripts of the AIR will not be made by the University, but if either the Instructor or the Student makes a transcript at his or her own expense, copies should be provided to the other party for the cost of the copy or ten cents per page, whichever is less. Procedures for such record keeping are covered by the UCSD Student Records Policy as implemented by PPM 160-2.

No other recording or broadcasting devices shall be allowed in the AIR.

The final determination of the case shall rest with the Review Panel. The Instructor and the Student, along with any other parties to the AIR, will be excused before the Review Panel begins its deliberations. Review Panel deliberations shall always be confidential and conducted in private with only the Review Panel members and the Presiding Officer present. The responsibility of the Review Panel is only to determine whether the Student violated the Policy, although the Review Panel can make recommendations regarding administrative sanctions to be considered by the Council of Deans. In AIRs where there is more than one Student charged, the Review Panel must make a separate determination for each Student.

Within five (5) business days from the date on which the AIR is completed, the Presiding Officer shall forward via email the Review Panel’s determination to the appropriate Dean, with copies to the Academic Integrity Review Office, the department chair/program director, the Instructor, and the Student.
10. Determination of Sanctions

a. Administrative Sanction

If an undergraduate Student is found responsible for violating the Policy, the appropriate Dean shall make a recommendation of the administrative sanction(s) to the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The Council of Deans of Student Affairs shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall inform the Student and the AIC-AIC Office in writing within ten (10) business days after the receipt of the notice of the Review Panel’s determination.

A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the AIC, the appropriate Dean, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs (for undergraduates), and Academic Records.

b. Academic Sanction

The AIC-AIC Office shall notify the Instructor, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records of the administrative sanction(s) and shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade for the course and submit the Change of Grade form if an X has been assigned.

Within ten (10) business days after receiving the official notice from the AIC-AIC Office, the Instructor shall determine the grade for the course. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved”. Upon notification from Academic Records that the final grade has been recorded, the AIC-AIC Office will notify the Student, the Instructor, the Dean, and the department chair/program director of the resolution of the case with a report of both the administrative and academic sanctions and that the case is closed.

If the Review Panel finds the evidence insufficient to sustain the charge of violating the Policy, the administrative authority and the Instructor shall dismiss the matter without further action against the Student, who shall be permitted either to complete the course without prejudice or to withdraw from it. The AIC-AIC Office shall notify the Student of his or her options and, within five (5) business days of the date of the letter, the Student shall notify the AIC-AIC Office of his or her decision. If the Student does not notify the AIC-AIC Office within this timeframe, it shall be assumed that the Student is electing to complete the course without prejudice. The AIC-AIC Office shall then notify the Instructor and Academic Records of the Student’s decision. If the Student withdraws from the course, the course shall not be listed on his or her transcript.

C. The Appeals Phase

The Student may appeal the determination of the Review Panel, the academic sanction determined by the Instructor, and/or the administrative sanction(s) determined by the appropriate administrative authority.
1. Appeal of the Determination of the Review Panel:

An undergraduate student may appeal the Review Panel’s determination by submitting a written appeal to the Council of Provosts, with a copy to the AIC AI Office, within five (5) business days of formal notification of the determination of the Review Panel. The AI Office will forward the student’s appeal to the appropriate Provost. The Council of Provosts will consider the appeal within ten (10) business days from the date the appeal was received. The decision of the Council of Provosts regarding the Student’s appeal shall be sent to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Student’s Dean, the AIC AI Office, and Academic Records.

A graduate student may appeal the Review Panel’s determination by submitting a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies, with a copy to the AIC AI Office, within five (5) business days of formal notification of the determination of the Review Panel. The AI Office will forward the student’s appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will consider the appeal within ten (10) business days from the date the appeal was received. The decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be sent directly to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, the AIC AI Office, and Academic Records.

The basis for appeal of the Review Board’s determination shall be: (i) that standards of procedural fairness were violated, e.g., that the Student did not have sufficient opportunity to present his or her side of the case; or (ii) that there exists newly discovered important evidence that has substantial bearing on the determination of the Review Panel. If the appeal is sustained, the case shall be referred back to the AIC AI Office to schedule a new AIR before a new Review Panel. Except for such appeals, the determination of the Review Panel shall be final.

2. Appeal of the Academic Sanction:

Appeals must be submitted to the Educational Policy Committee within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC AI Office of the academic sanction assigned. If the case was reviewed by a Review Panel, the Committee shall receive the determination of the Review Panel and accept its determination as to the facts of the case. The Educational Policy Committee shall consider the appeal in accordance with its established procedures.

3. Appeal of Administrative Sanction:

An appeal of the administrative sanction(s) shall be submitted by an undergraduate student to the Council of Provosts with a copy to the AIC AI Office, within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC of the administrative sanction. The Council of Provosts shall evaluate the Student’s appeal and make a final decision within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the Council of Provosts shall be sent by the Chair of the Council of Provosts to the Student (via mail and email) and copied to the Dean, the AIC AI Office, and Academic Records.
An appeal by a graduate student shall be directed to the Dean of Graduate Studies with a copy to the AIC-AI Office within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC of the administrative sanction. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall evaluate the Student’s appeal and make a decision within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be sent to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, the AIC-AI Office, and Academic Records.

A decision of the Council of Provosts or of the Dean of Graduate Studies regarding an appeal is final.

VI. Policy Regarding Student Academic Records

- Until a charge of violating the Policy has been resolved, the Student’s transcript will show a blank for the course. Academic Records will note in attached text to the course (i.e., not on the Student’s transcript) that the hold is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”.
- While a hold is in effect Once a charge is filed with the AI Office, the Student shall not drop the course. If the Student drops the course before the charge of violating the Policy has been resolved, he or she will be administratively reenrolled in the course by Academic Records. If a student drops or withdraws from a course before a charge is filed with the AI Office, the resolution process will proceed as described in the Policy but no academic sanction will be applied.
- The faculty hold shall not be removed by Academic Records until notification from the AIC-AI Office that the case has been resolved or that the Instructor has withdrawn the charge.
- If a passing grade is assigned and a conflict arises because of the Student’s enrollment in a duplicate, cross-listed, or equivalent course taken after the charge has been resolved, Academic Records shall drop the Student from the duplicate course or remove the grade for the duplicate course from the Student’s record.
- If the Student has been found responsible for violating the Policy, the grade assigned by the Instructor will count in the Student’s GPA even if the course is retaken. Academic Records will permanently note in text attached to the course (i.e., not on the Student’s transcript) that the grade was given as a result of “Academic Dishonesty”.
- If the Student withdraws from UCSD before the final resolution of the case, the following policy shall govern. If the Student is found responsible for violating the Policy and the Instructor assigns the Student a final grade in the course, this grade shall be permanently entered on the transcript. If the administrative sanction is dismissal, the transcript shall bear a notation that readmission is contingent upon approval from the Chancellor. Any administrative penalty less severe than dismissal shall be imposed if and when the student returns to the University.
- If a case of alleged Policy violation is also the subject of an administrative inquiry under the Policy on Integrity of Research, then the Senior Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Review Panel, may make such modifications in procedure as are necessary to coordinate the two inquiries.
- If the administrative sanction is suspension or dismissal, the fact that the Student was suspended or dismissed for violating the Policy must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the sanction.
VII. Review of this Policy

The Educational Policy Committee shall periodically review this Policy and propose changes as it deems necessary.

VII. Academic Dishonesty in Independent Exams

In cases where academic dishonesty is reported in independent exams (exams held outside of coursework), such as placement exams and qualifying exams, the procedures described above shall apply, with exception to the language regarding administration of a grade as an academic sanction in section V.B.10.b and appeals of the academic sanction (section V.C.2).

A. Academic Sanctions

The academic sanction will be determined by the faculty member or faculty committee with ultimate responsibility for evaluating the exam. The sanction will establish the following:

1. Evaluation of exam results. This may include granting the student full, partial, or no credit for the exam.
2. Provision to allow or deny the student the ability to repeat the exam.

The responsible party shall report the academic sanction to the Student and the AI Office, which shall notify the appropriate administrative offices of the sanction (per Section V.B.10.b).

B. Appeals of the Academic Sanctions

Appeals of academic sanctions must be submitted to the Educational Policy Committee following the timelines specified in the section V.C.2 of the Policy.
REPORT OF THE REVELLE COLLEGE FACULTY

The proposed changes to the Revelle College bylaws have been endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and reviewed by Rules and Jurisdiction. The proposed changes were approved by a vote of the Revelle College Faculty in September 2013.

The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

Revisions are proposed to the Revelle College Bylaws to amend Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Faculty of Revelle College. The proposed changes pertain to the required quorum needed to conduct College business. Faculty teaching, service, and research schedules compete for faculty attendance at College business meetings. A quorum based on the total number of faculty, many of whom may be on leave, makes it difficult to conduct business. Additionally, proposed changes provide for electronic or mail ballot voting mechanisms, consistent with recent changes in the Academic Senate rules. These changes are appropriate since they allow for faculty participation and broader communication tools.

Christine Harris, Chair of the Faculty
Revelle College
I. MEMBERSHIP
All members of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate appointed to Revelle College are voting members of the Revelle College Faculty.

II. FUNCTION
The faculty shall be concerned with the academic program of Revelle College and all related aspects of its educational environment.

III. FACULTY MEETINGS
At least one Faculty meeting per year shall be called. Meetings can also be called by the Executive Committee or by the written request of ten members of the Revelle Faculty. [Am 5/75]

IV. QUORUM
The presence of 15% of the membership faculty in residence or a minimum of 10 members of the faculty whichever is smaller shall constitute a quorum.

V. OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES
A. A member of the Faculty of Revelle College shall be elected by the Faculty each year to serve as Chair of the Faculty, effective from September 1st. The Chair of the Faculty shall preside at all meeting of the Faculty and of the Executive Committee. [Am 11/4/03]

B. The Executive Committee of the Faculty of Revelle College shall consist of the Provost and the Chair of the Faculty, ex officio, and four elected faculty members. Two students, selected by the Revelle students in a representative manner, shall be student representatives to the Executive Committee and shall be invited to meet regularly with it. [Am 5/75; Am 11/4/03]

The elected Faculty members of the Executive Committee shall normally serve two-year terms. [Am 5/75; Am 11/4/03]

The Executive Committee, or any member of it, may call meetings of the Revelle College Faculty. The Executive Committee shall have authority to appoint ad hoc committees which, like those appointed at Faculty meetings, shall report to the Revelle College Faculty and may be instructed to report to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee may appoint some of its members as faculty representatives to the Revelle College student government in accordance with its Bylaws. [Am 5/75]

C. In the Spring of each year, the Executive Committee shall solicit from the members of the Faculty nominations for election as Chair of the Faculty and members of the Executive Committee. If fewer than two persons are nominated for each position to be filled by election, the Executive Committee shall make such additional nominations as necessary. Election shall be by mail or electronic ballot. Elections to the Executive Committee shall be conducted in such a manner that at least one member remains in office for another year. If an elected member of the Executive Committee, who has served for less than two years, is elected as Chair of the Faculty, another member of the Faculty shall be elected to the Executive Committee for a new two-year term.

VI. RULES OF ORDER
Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the transaction of business, except for modification of these Bylaws or the Academic Plan of Revelle College. At the request of a majority of the voting members present at a faculty meeting, the question before the meeting shall be submitted to a mail ballot of the faculty. The procedure for such modifications is stipulated in Bylaws VII and VIII.

VII. ACADEMIC PLAN
Changes in the Revelle College Academic Plan shall be approved for submission to the Undergraduate Council by a simple majority vote at a faculty meeting. or by mail or electronic ballots, as deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee of the Faculty, provided that the faculty has been notified of the meeting and the proposed change at least five days of instruction prior to the meeting. Mail and electronic ballots shall include arguments for and against any proposed changes. [Am 3/1/11]
VIII. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

The procedure for amendment of these Bylaws shall be the same as for changes in the Academic Plan, except that a two-thirds majority is required. Faculty may be apprised of proposed amendments to the Bylaws via mail or electronic notification, and if no faculty member objects, amendments to the Bylaws via mail or electronic ballot of the faculty as deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee of the Faculty.
REPORT OF THE REVELLE COLLEGE FACULTY

The proposed changes to the Revelle College General Education Requirements have been endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and reviewed by Rules and Jurisdiction. The proposed changes were approved by vote of the Revelle Faculty in April 2013.

The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

Revisions are proposed to the Revelle College General Education Requirements to eliminate redundancy and to increase flexibility in the College’s requirements. UC San Diego’s campus-wide graduation requirement in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), which is satisfied by completing one course from a series of courses specified by the CEP, is very similar to a College requirement in American cultures. At Revelle, the general education requirements currently specify that students must complete at least one course in American cultures. When this requirement was introduced about ten years ago, the purpose was to educate students about the diversity of ethnic cultures and communities in the United States. That educational objective is now met by the DEI requirement. Given the new DEI requirement, the Revelle College Faculty has voted to amend the Social Sciences and American Cultures requirement of the College, removing the American Cultures requirement. This will also give students greater flexibility in the courses they select in the Social Sciences. Therefore, the Revelle faculty supports the proposed changes in the college’s general education curriculum.

Christine Harris, Chair of the Faculty
Revelle College
605. Academic Requirements of Revelle College [En 5/18/65; Am 11/14/67; Am 1/30/01]

(A) Degrees

Revelle College will recommend candidates for the degrees of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science, designated as a major. [EC 1/18/80]

(B) General Requirements [Am 10/25/77; Am 1/30/01]

(1) Revelle College students are required to demonstrate an acceptable level of basic knowledge in the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, language, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences.

(2) The General Requirements are:

(a) A five-course sequence (24 units) in an interdisciplinary Humanities program including two (6-unit) courses with intensive instruction in university level writing. Written work is also required in each of the remaining three (4-unit) quarter courses. [Am 3/19/85]

(b) One course in the Fine Arts.

(c) Three courses in Mathematics each of which shall include integral and/or differential calculus.

(d) Five courses in the Physical and Biological Sciences to include at least four quarters of Physics and Chemistry, and one quarter of Biology.

(e) Basic conversational and reading proficiency in a modern foreign language, or advanced reading proficiency in a classical language. This requirement can be met by passage of a UCSD proficiency exam (in which case the result is posted to the transcript), or by completion of the fourth quarter (or third semester) of foreign language instruction with a passing grade, or with an equivalent Advanced Placement Exam score of 4 or 5 or an SAT II Language Exam score of 700 or higher. [Am 11/25/80; Am 2/28/95; Am 11/04/03]

(f) Three Two lower division courses in the Social Sciences, chosen from an approved list, to include two courses in the same social science, and at least one course in American Cultures. [Am 11/27/90]

(g) Three courses in an area non-contiguous to the major. The three courses must be interrelated and should focus on some discipline, subject area, or topic. For the purposes of this requirement, the humanities/arts, the social sciences, and the natural sciences/engineering/mathematics are considered three different areas. [Am 2/28/95]

(3) Transfer students accepted to Revelle College, including transfer students who have completed an approved Inter-segmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC-SR 478), must meet the same general education requirements as students admitted as freshmen. Courses taken prior to transfer that satisfy any or all of these requirements will be applied toward completion of the requirements. [Am 1/30/01]
(C) Graduation Requirements

(1) The minimum requirement for graduation will be satisfactory completion of 184 units; 60 units must be from the upper division. [Am 10/24/72; Am 6/10/97]

(2) A major shall consist of not less than 12 upper division courses. [Am 10/25/77; Am 11/27/90]
REPORT OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL

The proposed changes to the Health Sciences Bylaws and the School of Medicine bylaws have been endorsed by the School of Medicine (SOM) Committee on Educational Policy and the Health Sciences Faculty Council. In June of 2013, the proposed revisions were approved by a vote of the Health Sciences Faculty.

The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

Currently, the chairs of the Recruitment and Admissions Committee (RAC), the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), and the Standing and Promotions Committee (SPC) serve on the Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC), and report annually, or as necessary, on their activities. The chairs of these committees also serve on the School of Medicine Committee on Educational Policy (SOM CEP) as non-voting, ex officio members.

It is proposed that the RAC, the SAC, and the SPC should instead report to the SOM CEP, and the chairs of these committees should serve as voting members of the SOM CEP. The SOM CEP is closer to the concerns of these committees and it would be beneficial to realign the reporting system for these committees, as outlined in the proposed revisions to the HS and SOM bylaws (attached). The SOM CEP oversees all educational matters within the School of Medicine. The areas overseen by the RAC, the SAC, the SPC are relevant and important to the School's educational mission. These committees deal with matters that directly affect the educational and learning environments for medical students.

It is also proposed that the review of proposals for endowed chairs within the School of Medicine be shifted from the SOM CEP to the HSFC. This is to ensure that input is obtained at the highest committee level (the HSFC) when proposals for endowed chairs are reviewed. The approval of endowed chairs is not substantially a part of the “educational mission” that SOM CEP serves, and this change would somewhat balance the committee workloads in light of the new input from the RAC, the SAC and the SPC.

The proposed changes are attached to this report.

Thomas Savides, M.D., Chair
Health Sciences Faculty Council

*****************************************************************************************
BYLAWS OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY

I. FUNCTIONS

The primary function of the Health Sciences Faculty shall be to authorize and supervise all courses and curricula for health science students and to advise the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences concerning various matters, including the resources necessary to perform its missions and to implement the curricula as part of the shared governance process of UCSD Health Sciences. The Faculty shall be responsible for determining the conditions for admission, testing, and promoting medical and pharmacy students, and determining the conditions for awarding the degree of Doctor of Medicine and the degree of Doctor of Pharmacy, and recommending to the President candidates for each degree.

The Faculty shall be responsible for selecting, training, and certifying students in Health Sciences Graduate Education Programs. The Faculty shall participate in selecting, training, and certifying health sciences graduate students to the Graduate Dean, for research degrees. The Faculty shall also participate in the training of other professionals.

The Faculty shall engage in research in biomedical science, health care, or related fields, to fulfill the responsibility of the University to develop, transmit, and apply new knowledge in the health sciences.

II. MEMBERSHIP

The members of the Health Sciences Faculty shall consist of:

A. Those members of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in Departments of Health Sciences Schools or who hold an FTE, or portion thereof, assigned to the School of Medicine (SOM) or Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS).

B. Other Faculty and Academics, i.e., Clinical Professors, Adjunct Professors, Project Scientists, Research Scientists, Lecturers and any other series approved by Faculty Council, who have appointments in Health Sciences Departments and who devote 100% of their professional effort in support of the programs of the Health Sciences Schools.

C. Other UCSD Faculty who devote a significant proportion of their professional
effort to the programs of the School of Medicine or Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences; subject to annual approval by the HS/Faculty Council on recommendation of the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, which shall solicit their nomination from Health Sciences Faculty.

All other individuals who hold academic titles in Departments of the School of Medicine or Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences shall be designated Associate Faculty.

D. The Associate Faculty of the Health Sciences Schools shall be invited to attend all meetings of the General Faculty and to participate in all discussions. Associate members may also be appointed to serve as voting members of Standing Committees or Subcommittees of the Health Sciences Faculty, including the HS/Faculty Council, in which case voting privileges are restricted only as indicated in Bylaw paragraph III “Voting Membership”, immediately below.

III. VOTING MEMBERSHIP

The voting Members of the Health Sciences Faculty shall consist of those members of the School of Medicine and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Faculty who are also members of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), salaried physicians, pharmacists, or academic staff at the VA who hold a faculty appointment in the SOM or SSPPS subject to academic review, academics in the Research Scientist series in the SOM or SSPPS who hold 51% or greater appointments, and SOM or SSPPS emeritus faculty; with the provision that voting privileges shall be exercised in compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75. All members of the Faculty, as defined above, shall have the privilege of voting. To ensure compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75, on those occasions when the Health Sciences Faculty is either taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate or advising in the name of the Senate, votes of Senate and of non-Senate members shall be recorded separately and only votes of Senate members will be transmitted. Compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75 allows that all eligible faculty can vote on questions that will be referred for final Senate action to another Senate agency, such as the campus Graduate Council.

IV. OFFICERS

The Officers of the Faculty shall consist of a Chair and a Vice-Chair.

A. The Chair shall be assumed by the Vice-Chair of the preceding year. In case the
Vice-Chair is not able to so serve, the Faculty shall elect a Chair from a slate of two nominees proposed by the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee. Additional nominations may be made by petition of five members of the Faculty. The Chair of the Faculty shall serve also as Chair of the HS/Faculty Council. He/she shall serve ex officio without vote on the UCSD Medical Center Board of Governors.

B. The Faculty shall elect the Vice-Chair of the Faculty each year. The SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, shall propose two nominees. Additional nominations may be made by petition of five members of the Faculty. The Vice-Chair of the Faculty shall serve as Vice-Chair of the HS/Faculty Council. He/she shall become Chair of the Faculty at the end of his/her first year in office, or at any earlier time that the Chair should be vacated.

C. The Vice Chancellor Health Sciences shall designate a Secretary of the HS/Faculty Council, annually from the Health Sciences Administrative staff. The Secretary shall not have the privilege of vote, and shall be responsible for the recording and distribution of Minutes.

Department Chairs and Administrative Officers of the Schools shall be ineligible for nomination as either Chair or Vice-Chair of the Faculty. All Officers of the Faculty as well as Chairs and members of the Faculty Committees (except those serving ex officio) shall serve from September 1 of each year.

V. MEETINGS

The Faculty shall meet at least once during the academic year and, in addition, on written request by twenty of its members. Notice of a Faculty meeting must be given at least five days in advance of each meeting. The number equal to 25% of the Faculty shall represent a quorum. The Associate Faculty shall be invited to attend all Faculty meetings of the School. The HS/Faculty Council shall meet at least once during each month of the regular academic year.

VI. COMMITTEES

As required by Legislative Ruling 12.75, all votes conducted by any standing committee of the Health Sciences where non-Senate faculty have a vote will be submitted to the Health Sciences Faculty Council for final approval by its Senate membership. For all Standing Committees of the Faculty, a quorum shall consist of one half the voting membership, plus one. The Standing Committees of the Faculty shall consist of committees that are both common and specific to the individual schools, i.e. Medicine and Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Standing Committees common to the Health Sciences include:

A. HS/Faculty Council
The HS/Faculty Council shall consist of the positions described herein below. The HS/Faculty Council is composed of the Chair; the Vice-Chair (Chair-Elect); one member of the Associate Faculty nominated by the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, and approved by the balance of the Council; and six other members of the Faculty elected by ballot of the Health Sciences faculty. Not more than two of such six members may come from the same department. The ballot shall consist of a slate of two candidates for each open position proposed by the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, plus any nominations made by petition of five members of the Faculty following circulation of the proposed slate. Directly elected members of the HS/Faculty Council shall serve staggered three-year terms.

The HS/Faculty Council shall also include the Chairs of the following committees from SOM and SSPPS: SOM Committee on Educational Policy; SOM Recruitment and Admissions; SOM Standing and Promotions; SOM Student Affairs; both the SOM and SSPPS Committees on Academic Personnel and the SSPPS Educational Policy and Academic Oversight Committee (EPAOC). In addition, the HS/Faculty Council shall include the immediate past Chair of the HS/Faculty Council, the Chair of the SOM/Nominating Committee, Chair of the HS/Faculty Rights and Welfare Committee and Chair of the HS/Planning and Budget Committee.

The Vice Dean for Medical Education, the Chair of the Board of Governors, the Chief of Staff Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, the Dean of the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences shall also serve, ex officio without privilege of vote. In future, the HS/Faculty Council may approve more or different Committee Chairs as members of HS/Faculty Council as individual Schools evolve and change their Committee structure.

The HS/Faculty Council shall advise the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences and represent the Faculty on matters related to the education, research, and service programs of the Schools. It shall review proposals for the creation of endowed chairs in the SOM. It shall also resolve all tie votes in connection with runoff elections specified by the HS/Bylaws. The HS/Faculty Council shall approve matters that must by regulation receive final action by the Academic Senate.

A member of the HS/Faculty Council who holds a position by virtue of being a Chair of a Committee of the Faculty may be replaced at a HS/Faculty Council meeting by the Vice-Chair of that committee or another member designated by the committee, who will have the right to vote under the Voting regulations detailed in paragraph III. above. Elected members of the HS/Faculty Council may not send substitutes to meetings.

The HS/Faculty Council shall be responsible for coordinating and integrating the
activities of the other Faculty Committees. To facilitate this, the minutes of each of the other Committees shall be distributed to the HS/Faculty Council. The HS/Faculty Council shall be the final decision making body of the Health Sciences Faculty for all matters save those requiring full Faculty vote. At any given time, no less than nine members of HS/Faculty Council must be Senate faculty.

B. Health Sciences Committee on Planning and Budget (HS/CPB)

The HS/Committee on Planning and Budget shall consist of a Chair and Vice-Chair, and four other members selected in accordance with SOM Bylaws Article VI.F. (paragraph 3). The Deans of the School of Medicine and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, or their representatives shall serve ex-officio, without vote. The members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

The HS/Planning and Budget Committee shall provide faculty input on resources necessary for the Faculty to fulfill its missions. This committee shall review and comment on Administration plans in regard to School of Medicine and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences budgets, plans for new and existing programs and facilities, and other resources that affect the functioning of the Faculty.

C. Health Sciences Faculty Rights and Welfare Committee (HS/FRWC)

The HS/Faculty Rights and Welfare Committee shall consist of six full-time Health Sciences faculty members proposed by the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, and elected by the Faculty in accordance with Article VI.A. To ensure broad representation on the HS/FRWC, the SOM/Nominating Committee, in consultation with the SSPPS/Nominating Committee, shall, when possible, consider nomination of individuals from all faculty series. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee shall be selected in accordance with VI.A. The Deans for Academic Affairs of both SOM and SSPPS serve ex-officio without vote. The members shall serve staggered 4-year terms.

The HS/FRWC shall consider and make recommendations to the HS/Faculty Council on matters pertaining to the welfare of the Health Sciences Faculty in general or of specific faculty groups having shared concerns. The HS/Faculty Council will develop specific charges as issues arise. While individual faculty members may propose such issues, it is not intended that the HS/FRWC act as a grievance committee for individual problems.

D. Special Committees, Commissions and Task Forces

From time to time HS/Faculty Council may create special Committees, Commissions, or Task Forces to address issues that either do not fall under the
jurisdiction of standing committees, or which require effort, resources, or expertise beyond the capabilities of standing committees. Such bodies shall be created by vote of the HS/Faculty Council, and their terms shall normally not exceed three years without re-authorization by the HS/Faculty Council. Depending on circumstances, HS/Faculty Council may appoint the Chair of the Special Committee, Task Force, or Commission to the HS/Faculty Council as either a voting or nonvoting member.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON COMMITTEES

The Vice Chancellor Health Sciences shall appoint members of his staff to serve on each Committee of the Health Sciences Faculty (without privilege of vote). These appointments shall be made annually before September 1 in consultation with the Chairperson-Elect of the Faculty and the Chairs of the respective committees.

VIII. ELECTIONS

Except for special elections, election of Officers of the HS/Faculty for any given academic year will be held in the spring quarter of the preceding academic year. Terms of office shall commence September 1 of each year. In the election of the Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect of the Faculty, or membership on the HS/Faculty Council, whenever there are more than two candidates and no candidate obtains a majority of the votes cast, a runoff election shall be conducted between the two candidates with the greatest number of votes.

IX. AMENDMENTS

Initiative for amendment of the Bylaws may be taken either by the HS/Faculty Council or by petition signed by thirty-five (35) or more members of the Faculty. Such amendments are to be submitted to the Faculty in writing at least five days prior to a meeting, but approval of the amendment requires a two-thirds majority vote of those faculty members responding to a ballot.

At the request of thirty-five (35) members of the faculty, submitted in writing to the Chair of the Health Sciences Faculty Council within ten calendar days after the posting of the minutes of a Council meeting to the Council’s website, any action of the Council shall be submitted to the vote of the full faculty of the Health Sciences. The results of any such referendum are conclusive, and the matter may not be reconsidered for a period of 50 days.
I. FUNCTIONS

All faculty of the School of Medicine (SOM) and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) are considered Health Sciences (HS) faculty. Therefore, the HS Faculty Council and standing committees assume some duties for the SOM and SSPPS when they are not specifically required for the operation and accreditation of the individual school, as detailed in the HS Bylaws. Standing committees required for the operation and accreditation of the SOM are described in the SOM Bylaws below.

The primary function of the Faculty of the UCSD School of Medicine (SOM) shall be to authorize and supervise all courses and curricula for medical students, and to advise the Dean of the School concerning various matters, including the resources necessary to perform its missions and to implement the curricula as part of the shared governance process of UCSD Health Sciences. The SOM Faculty shall be responsible for determining the conditions for admission, testing, and promoting medical students, and determining the conditions for awarding the degree of Doctor of Medicine and recommending to the President candidates for the degree.

The SOM Faculty shall be responsible for selecting, training, and certifying students in Graduate Medical Education Programs. The SOM Faculty shall participate in selecting, training, and certifying health sciences graduate students to the Graduate Dean for research degrees. The SOM Faculty shall also participate in the training of other professionals.

II. MEMBERSHIP

The members of the SOM Faculty shall consist of:

A. Those members of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in SOM Departments or who hold an FTE, or portion thereof, assigned to the SOM.

B. Other Faculty and Academics, i.e., Clinical Professors, Adjunct Professors, Project Scientists, Research Scientists, Lecturers and any other series approved by HS/Faculty Council, who have appointments in SOM Departments and who devote 100% of their professional effort in support of the programs of the SOM.
C. Other UCSD Faculty who devote a significant proportion of their professional
effort to the programs of the SOM; subject to annual approval by the HS/Faculty
Council on recommendation of the HS/Nominating Committee, which shall solicit
their nomination from SOM Faculty.

All other individuals who hold academic titles in Departments of the SOM shall be
designated SOM Associate Faculty.

D. The Associate Faculty of the SOM shall be invited to attend all meetings of the
General SOM Faculty and to participate in all discussions. Associate members
may also be appointed to serve as voting members of Standing Committees or
Subcommittees of the SOM Faculty, including the HS/Faculty Council, in which
case voting privileges are restricted only as indicated in Section III of the Bylaws
of the Health Science Faculty.

III. VOTING MEMBERSHIP

The voting Members of the Faculty of the School of Medicine shall consist of
those members of the School of Medicine Faculty who are also members of the
Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), salaried physicians or academic
staff at the VA who hold a faculty appointment in the SOM subject to academic
review, academics in the Research Scientist series in the SOM who hold 51% or
greater appointments, and SOM emeritus faculty; with the provision that voting
privileges shall be exercised in compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75. All
members of the Faculty, as defined above, shall have the privilege of voting. To
ensure compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75, on those occasions when the
Faculty is either taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate or
advising in the name of the Senate, votes of Senate and of non-Senate members
shall be recorded separately and only votes of Senate members will be
transmitted. Compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75 also allows that all eligible
faculty can vote on questions that will be referred for final Senate action to
another Senate agency, such as the HS/Faculty Council or campus Graduate
Council.

IV. OFFICERS

In compliance with the desire of the SOM and the HS faculty to take advantage
of efficiencies where possible, the Officers of the Faculty of the SOM shall
consist of the Officers of the Health Sciences Faculty Council, as described in
“Section IV Officers” of the Bylaws of the Health Sciences Faculty.

V. MEETINGS

The Faculty of the SOM shall meet at least once during the academic year and,
in addition, on written request by twenty of its members as described in “Section
V. Meetings” of the Bylaws for the Faculty of Health Sciences. In compliance with the desire of the SOM and the HS faculty to take advantage of efficiencies where possible, meetings may be in conjunction with all of the Health Sciences Faculty or specific to the Faculty of the SOM.

VI. COMMITTEES

In compliance with the desire of the SOM and the HS faculty to take advantage of efficiencies where possible, the Standing Committees of the Faculty of the SOM include the following Standing Committees of the Faculty of the Health Sciences, as described in “Section VI. Committees” of the Bylaws of the Faculty of Health Sciences; which section addresses quorum requirements for all Standing Committees:

A. Health Sciences Faculty Council
B. Health Sciences Committee on Planning and Budget
C. Health Sciences Faculty Rights and Welfare Committee

Although the Standing Committees listed above are described in the Bylaws of the Faculty of Health Sciences, they are essential to the function of the Faculty of the SOM. No change in these bylaws may be made that will be in conflict with the bylaws of the Health Sciences faculty, or with the bylaws, regulations, or legislative rulings of the Academic Senate of the University of California or of its San Diego Division.

In addition, the following Standing Committees are necessary for the specific functions of the Faculty of the SOM.

D. School of Medicine Committee on Academic Personnel (SOM/CAP)

The SOM/Committee on Academic Personnel shall consist of a Chair, a Vice-Chair, and three members of the full-time Faculty, three of whom must be Senate members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). The members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

This Committee shall review all salaried Clinical Faculty in the School of Medicine for appointments, accelerations, appraisals, career reviews, promotions or terminations, who may not otherwise be reviewed by the Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel; makes recommendations to the SOM/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on the basis of these reviews; reviews and revises as necessary the criteria for appointment and advancement for the Faculty series in its purview. The committee also reviews the non-salaried Clinical Faculty for appointment and promotion at the Associate or Full Professor rank. The committee reports to the HS/Faculty Council annually.

E. SOM/Committee on Educational Policy (SOM/CEP)
The SOM/CEP shall consist of a Chair (to be selected from a past Chair of the SOM/Core Curriculum Committee or the SOM/Electives Committee or someone who has served on the SOM/CEP for a minimum of two years); a Vice-Chair (the Chair of either SOM/Core Curriculum Committee or SOM/Electives Committee), the Chairs or representatives of the SOM/Core Curriculum Committee, SOM/Electives Committee, SOM/Associated Health Professions Education Committee, SOM/Continuing Medical Education, SOM/Graduate Medical Education Committee, and SOM/Graduate Programs Education Committee. SOM Recruitment and Admissions Committee, SOM Standing and Promotions Committee, and SOM Student Affairs Committee; the Vice-Chair of the SOM/Core Curriculum Committee, Vice-Chair of the SOM/Electives Committee, and three at-large members, two of whom shall be elected by a vote of the SOM Faculty according to Bylaws of the Health Sciences Faculty, Section IV A. The at-large members shall serve staggered 3-year terms. At any given time, no less than seven members of CEP must be Senate faculty.

To provide appropriate liaison with other faculty committees performing activities of relevance to the SOM/CEP mission, the following individuals will serve as ex officio members without vote: Dean for Medical Education, Chairs of the SOM/Recruitment and Admissions Committee SOM/Student Affairs Committee SOM/Standing and Promotions Committee the SOM Associate Deans for Admissions and Student Affairs, Undergraduate Medical Education, Graduate Medical Education, and Continuing Medical Education; Assistant Deans for Educational Support Services and for Student Affairs; the Chair of the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences EPAOC or Chair or Co-Chair of SSPPS CEP, and both the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and the SSPPS Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The SOM/CEP shall also include, ex officio without vote the Director of the Biomedical Library, the Assistant Dean for Educational Development and Evaluation, the Assistant Dean for Educational Computing, and the Assistant Dean for Curriculum.

The function of the SOM/CEP shall be to represent the Faculty in all educational matters, especially regarding the curriculum for undergraduate, graduate and continuing medical education and other aspects of educational policy. It has authority to take action on all educational matters that do not require a vote of the Faculty. SOM/CEP reports to the HS/Faculty Council for information or to resolve difficult problems on request of more than one member of SOM/CEP, or on matters that must be presented to the full Faculty. The SOM/CEP shall establish liaison and coordination with the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Graduate Council, and appropriate student organizations.

The SOM/CEP shall have the following subcommittees:

1. SOM/Associated Health Professions Education Committee
The SOM/AHPEC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice-Chair (chosen from among the other members of SOM/AHPEC by the HS/Nominating Committee) and four full-time Faculty members, including one based on the La Jolla campus and at least one based at the UCSD Medical Center, appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Membership shall also include the Director of the Department of Nursing at the UCSD Medical Center; the Dean of the SOM and the Chief of Staff Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, or their respective representatives. All members shall have the right to vote. Members shall serve staggered 2-year terms.

The Chair of SOM/AHPEC is a member of SOM/CEP, and shall be a member of the full-time Faculty. This is a joint committee of the Faculty and the Administration of UCSD Medical Center that reports to the SOM/CEP for approval and action.

SOM/AHPEC is charged with the responsibility to perform the academic review of existing and new programs for education in the associated health professions which do not grant UCSD Health Sciences' degrees and are not part of the Medical Doctor residency. The work of the committee includes an assessment of each program's quality and its impact on other medical education programs both existing and new. The committee also advises the Chief Executive Officer, University of California San Diego Medical Center or other appropriate official regarding the impact of these programs on UCSD facilities.

2. SOM/Core Curriculum Committee (SOM/CCC)

The SOM/CCC shall consist of a Chair (appointed for a two year term), a Vice-Chair and a minimum of twelve other members, at least ten of whom should be full-time Faculty, appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

The function of the SOM/CCC shall be to recommend to the SOM/CEP that curriculum which shall be required of all undergraduate medical students. The SOM/CCC shall identify and recommend to the SOM/CEP the time that shall be allocated to each course. It will focus its duties on the core courses of the SOM. SOM/CCC shall approve a Course Chair who will act as the instructor of record and provide oversight for each course.

The SOM/CCC shall have joint responsibility with the SOM/Electives Committee (SOM/EC) for those courses that fulfill the requirements for direct patient care responsibility, as described in Article VI.E.3.
3. **SOM/Electives Committee (SOM/EC)**

The SOM/EC shall consist of a Chair (appointed for a two-year term), a Vice-Chair and a minimum of twelve other members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

The SOM/EC shall make recommendations to the SOM/CEP concerning elective courses and administration of the undergraduate requirement for satisfactory completion of the elective component of the curriculum (including the Independent Study Project). The SOM/EC shall review new preclinical electives, third-year electives, fourth-year electives, and SOM graduate course proposals. While the SOM/GPEC (see description in Article VI.E.5) is responsible for reviewing proposals for new SOM graduate programs, the SOM/EC shall be responsible for reviewing new SOM graduate course proposals.

The SOM/EC shall have the primary responsibility to perform reviews of new and existing advanced senior clerkships and all elective courses, including those with direct patient care. The SOM/EC shall meet with the SOM/CCC at least once per year to discuss the portfolio of all electives, including those with direct patient care, and shall consult with the SOM/CCC on the status of direct patient care electives at other times as needed. The Chair of the SOM/EC will consult with the Chair of the SOM/CCC on electives for which a determination needs to be made as to whether they involve direct or non-direct patient care responsibility; if necessary, the proposals shall be reviewed by two SOM/CCC members who will assist the SOM/EC in making this determination.

SOM/EC shall have joint responsibility with the SOM/CCC as described in Article VI.E.2.

4. **SOM/Graduate Medical Education Committee (SOM/GMEC)**

The SOM/GMEC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice Chair and a minimum of six other members, at least five of whom shall be full-time Faculty, appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

Additional voting membership on the SOM/GMEC shall also include the Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education (GME) and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) Designated Institutional Official (DIO), residents nominated by their peers, representative Program Directors, the Director of GME, and GME administrators in order to comply with ACGME requirements. The Chief of Staff Veterans Affairs San Diego
Healthcare System and the Chief Medical Officer of the UC San Diego Health System, or their designees, are invited to attend all meetings.

The function of the SOM/GMEC shall be to ensure that clinical graduate training programs offered by departments of the SOM meet institutional and national performance standards, including ACGME and American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) standards. The SOM/GMEC shall assume all functions not otherwise specified herein as required by ACGME. The SOM/GMEC shall report to the SOM/CEP and shall advise the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences. The SOM/GMEC may create subcommittees or task forces in order to maintain compliance with ACGME requirements.

The SOM/GMEC receives input regarding institutional and ACGME guidelines from the SOM/GMEC Executive Committee, which meets monthly. Membership of the SOM/GMEC Executive Committee includes the SOM/GMEC Chair and Vice-Chair, subcommittee Chairs, the Associate Dean for GME/DIO, the Director of GME, and GME administrators as needed. The SOM/GMEC Executive Committee has a reporting responsibility to SOM/GMEC.

5. SOM/Graduate Programs Education Committee (SOM/GPEC)

The SOM/GPEC shall include ex-officio, with vote, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Scientific Affairs, a minimum of three other SOM Faculty, appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3), plus the Health Sciences representative to the campus-wide Graduate Council. At large faculty members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

The SOM/GPEC shall monitor and make recommendations on 1) SOM financial and other support of graduate programs; 2) SOM learning environment for graduate students, postgraduate academic trainees and medical students pursuing research; and 3) new SOM graduate programs or major changes or expansions in existing programs. These recommendations and proposals will be presented to SOM/CEP, after which the Chair of the SOM/CEP shall present them to the HS/Faculty Council. Proposals for new or changed/expanded graduate programs shall then be submitted to Graduate Council.

Periodic reviews of graduate programs involving the SOM are conducted by the Office of Graduate Studies on behalf of Graduate Council. The SOM/GPEC is available as needed to assist in these reviews.

6. SOM/Recruitment and Admissions Committee (SOM/RAC)
The SOM/RAC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice Chair, and members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). The SOM/RAC may also provide for student participation. In addition, a representative from the Administration shall be appointed with the privilege of vote. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms.

The SOM/RAC shall determine the conditions for the admission of undergraduate medical students, including but not limited to the educational requirements, policies and procedures for selection, the sequence for admission of candidates, and shall participate in other aspects of the admissions process.

An Executive Committee shall be established with duties as set forth in the Policies and Procedures of the SOM/RAC as approved by the HS Faculty Council SOM/CEP. It shall consist of the Chairperson of the SOM/RAC, a representative from the Administration, other faculty members, and SOM students to be selected by the Chairperson of the SOM/RAC and approved by the HS/Faculty Council SOM/CEP.

7. SOM/Standing and Promotions Committee (SOM/SPC)

The SOM/SPC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice Chair, and fifteen other members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

This Committee will be concerned with the academic performance of students in both clinical and non-clinical courses. At the end of each quarter the SOM/SPC is charged with examining the records of all students and making decisions regarding the future course of action. Using all available data on student performance, the SOM/SPC is also charged with determining that a student is ready for promotion to subsequent years. It is also to examine the records of each student prior to graduation and certify to the HS/Faculty Council that the requirements for the M.D. degree at the UCSD SOM have been met.

8. SOM/Student Affairs Committee (SOM/SAC)

The SOM/SAC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice Chair, and five other members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms. Additionally, the Assistant Dean for Diversity will serve ex officio without vote.

This committee shall deal with student affairs other than those concerned with the admissions process or academic performance.

F. SOM/Nominating Committee (SOM/NC)
The SOM/Nominating Committee shall consist of seven full-time Faculty members (two of whom shall be non-Senate faculty and not more than two of whom shall be from any one department) who shall be elected by the Health Sciences Faculty from among those nominated by the HS/Faculty Council (two nominees for each open position). The current members of the Committee shall elect the Chair from among the Committee membership each year. The members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

This Committee shall submit a slate from which the Faculty Officers will be elected, as specified in Health Sciences Bylaws Article IV A and SOM Bylaws Article VI. F. (paragraph 3).

This Committee shall nominate all Chairs, Vice-Chairs, and committee members for standing committees of the Health Sciences and School of Medicine faculty, in consultation with the current committee Chairs, except those specified to be elected by the Faculty as a whole, or as otherwise specified in the Bylaws. The HS/Faculty Council, on recommendation of the HS/Nominating Committee, shall appoint all Chairs, Vice-Chairs, and committee members prior to the September 1 start of their term of office. Appointment of Chairs, Vice-Chairs, and members of these committees is subject to approval by a majority of the HS/Faculty Council. Each Committee Chair appointed shall serve a one-year term, with the possibility of reappointment to one additional year.

The SOM/Nominating Committee shall also recommend to the Health Sciences Deans the names of Faculty for service on Administrative Committees, as needed. It shall make other nominations from time to time as required by the HS/Faculty Council or the Health Sciences Deans.

G. SOM/Recruitment and Admissions Committee (SOM/RAC)

The SOM/RAC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice-Chair, and members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). The SOM/RAC may also provide for student participation. In addition, a representative from the Administration shall be appointed with the privilege of vote. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms.

The SOM/RAC shall determine the conditions for the admission of undergraduate medical students, including but not limited to the educational requirements, policies and procedures for selection, the sequence for admission of candidates, and shall participate in other aspects of the admissions process.

An Executive Committee shall be established with duties as set forth in the Policies and Procedures of the SOM/RAC as approved by the HS Faculty Council. It shall consist of the Chairperson of the SOM/RAC, a representative from the Administration, other faculty members, and SOM students to be selected by the Chairperson of the SOM/RAC and approved by the HS/Faculty Council.

H. SOM/Standing and Promotions Committee (SOM/SPC)

The SOM/SPC shall consist of a Chair, a Vice Chair, and fifteen other members appointed as specified in
Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

This Committee will be concerned with the academic performance of students in both clinical and non-clinical courses. At the end of each quarter the SOM/SPC is charged with examining the records of all students and making decisions regarding the future course of action. Using all available data on student performance, the SOM/SPC is also charged with determining that a student is ready for promotion to subsequent years. It is also to examine the records of each student prior to graduation and certify to the HS/Faculty Council that the requirements for the M.D. degree at the UCSD SOM have been met.

I. SOM/Student Affairs Committee (SOM/SAC)

The SOM/SAC shall consist of a Chair a Vice Chair and five other members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms. Additionally, the Assistant Dean for Diversity will serve ex officio without vote.

This committee shall deal with student affairs other than those concerned with the admissions process or academic performance.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON COMMITTEES

The Dean of the SOM shall appoint members of his or her staff to serve on each Committee of the Faculty of the SOM (without privilege of vote, except as provided above for the SOM/RAC). These appointments shall be made annually in consultation with the Chairperson-Elect of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Chairs of the respective SOM committees.

VIII. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS ON SOM COMMITTEES

Students in good standing may be appointed by their Class Steering Committee or other duly constituted body to represent their class as members of SOM/CEP and its associated subcommittees. Student members of the SOM/GMEC shall be postgraduate medical students (residents or fellows) appointed by the Interns and Residents Association. Each standing committee shall determine the number of student members to maintain appropriate participation.

The privilege of voting on a SOM Committee shall be awarded each year to student members on the basis of a majority vote by the faculty members of that committee or subcommittee. The faculty members shall determine the number of student votes appropriate to each committee each year. Voting privileges shall be exercised in compliance with Legislative Ruling 12.75, in that non-Senate members may only vote on questions that will be referred for final Senate action to another Senate agency, such as the HS/Faculty Council or the campus Graduate Council.

IX. ELECTIONS

Except for special elections, election of Officers of the Faculty for any given academic year will be held as described in “Section VIII Elections” in Bylaws for
the Faculty of Health Sciences.

X. AMENDMENTS

Initiative for amendment of the SOM Bylaws may be taken either by the HS/Faculty Council or by petition signed by five or more members of the Faculty of the SOM. Such amendments are to be submitted to the Faculty of the SOM in writing at least five days prior to a meeting, but approval of the amendment requires a two-thirds majority vote of those faculty responding to a ballot.

At the request of thirty-five (35) members of the faculty, submitted in writing to the Chair of the Health Sciences Faculty Council within ten calendar days after the posting of the minutes of a Council meeting to the Council’s website, any action of the Council shall be submitted to the vote of the full faculty of the Health Sciences. The results of any such referendum are conclusive, and the matter may not be reconsidered for a period of 50 days.
The proposed changes to the School of Medicine (SOM) bylaws have been endorsed by the (SOM) Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The proposed changes were approved by the Health Sciences Faculty Council in July 2013.

The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

Revisions are proposed to the School of Medicine (SOM) Bylaws to update the responsibilities of the Electives Committee (EC) and the Graduate Programs Education Committee (GPEC). The proposed changes pertain to the oversight of SOM graduate courses that are taken virtually only by graduate students (and not medical students). These specialized courses do not pertain to medical students and/or are offered at times that conflict with the School of Medicine course schedule. For years the EC has felt that its expertise to review such graduate courses has been limited. It was decided that it would be best to shift this responsibility from the Electives Committee (EC) to the Graduate Programs Education Committee (GPEC). This change is appropriate since the GPEC is more involved in oversight of graduate programs in general.

The proposed changes are attached to this report.

Thomas Savides, M.D., Chair
Health Sciences Faculty Council

*****************************************************************************
3. Electives Committee

The SOM/EC shall consist of a Chair (appointed for a two-year term), a Vice-Chair and a minimum of twelve other members appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3). Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms.

The SOM/EC shall make recommendations to the SOM/CEP concerning elective courses and administration of the undergraduate requirement for satisfactory completion of the elective component of the curriculum (including the Independent Study Project). The SOM/EC shall review new preclinical electives, third-year electives, fourth-year electives, and SOM graduate course proposals that pertain to medical students. Those graduate courses in which there is a clear time conflict which would prohibit medical students from enrolling in the course, or are deemed to be specialized to the point that medical students would not enroll except on rare and specialized situations will be reviewed by the SOM/GPEC. The Chair of SOM/EC and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education will determine which graduate course proposals are appropriate for SOM/EC review.

While the SOM/GPEC (see description in Article VI.E.5) is responsible for reviewing proposals for new SOM graduate programs, the SOM/EC shall be responsible for reviewing new SOM graduate course proposals.

The SOM/EC shall have the primary responsibility to perform reviews of new and existing advanced senior clerkships and all elective courses, including those with direct patient care. The SOM/EC shall meet with the SOM/CCC at least once per year to discuss the portfolio of all electives, including those with direct patient care, and shall consult with the SOM/CCC on the status of direct patient care electives at other times as needed. The Chair of the SOM/EC will consult with the Chair of the SOM/CCC on electives for which a determination needs to be made as to whether they involve direct or non-direct patient care responsibility; if necessary, the proposals shall be reviewed by two SOM/CCC members who will assist the SOM/EC in making this determination.

SOM/EC shall have joint responsibility with the SOM/CCC as described in Article VI.E.2.
5. Graduate Programs Education Committee

The SOM/GPEC shall include ex-officio, with vote, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Scientific Affairs, a minimum of three other SOM Faculty, appointed as specified in Article VI. F. (paragraph 3), plus the Health Sciences representative to the campus-wide Graduate Council. At large

The SOM/GPEC shall monitor and make recommendations on 1) SOM financial and other support of graduate programs; 2) SOM learning environment for graduate students, postgraduate academic trainees and medical students pursuing research; and 3) new SOM graduate programs or major changes or expansions in existing programs. These recommendations and proposals will be presented to SOM/CEP, after which the Chair of the SOM/CEP shall present them to the HS/Faculty Council. Proposals for new or changed/expanded graduate programs shall then be submitted to Graduate Council.

The SOM/GPEC shall have the responsibility to perform reviews of new and existing SOM graduate courses that would pertain only to graduate students, and not medical students. The SOM/EC is responsible for reviewing SOM graduate courses that pertain to medical students. The Chair of the SOM/EC and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education will determine which graduate courses are appropriate for the SOM/EC to review, and which courses should be referred to the SOM/ GPEC for review, as described in Article VI.E.3.

Periodic reviews of graduate programs involving the SOM are conducted by the Office of Graduate Studies on behalf of Graduate Council. The SOM/GPEC is available as needed to assist in these reviews.
REPORT OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL

In December of 2012, proposed revisions to the UC San Diego School of Medicine Grading Policy (Divisional Regulation 503) were approved by a vote of the Health Sciences Faculty Council. The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

The proposed changes are endorsed by the School of Medicine (SOM) Core Curriculum Committee, the SOM Committee on Educational Policy, and the Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC).

The HSFC believes the change in policy is in alignment with other medical education institutions and that it will allow an alignment of the policy with current practices. The designation of the Near Honors (NH) grade alerts the administration that performance in a core clerkship is significantly better than a Pass grade. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education conveys this in the Medical Student Performance Evaluation letter. The change would formalize Near Honors (NH), so this grade may now appear on the student's transcript.

Therefore, changes are requested to Divisional Regulation 503. The proposed changes are outlined below.

Thomas Savides, M.D., Chair
Health Sciences Faculty Council

*****************************************************************************

PART I. GENERAL REGULATIONS

503. Grading Policy - School of Medicine [En 10/29/85; Rt by Assembly 3/4/86]

(A) Beginning in fall quarter, 2010, the work of all students in those courses designated by the Faculty of the School of Medicine as constituting the Preclerkship Core Curriculum, as well as in the Principles to Practice course, will be graded P (pass) or F (fail). Beginning in summer quarter, 2014, the work of all students in core clinical clerkships will be reported in terms of four grades: H (honors); NH (near honors); P (pass); F (fail). The work of all students in all other required courses will be reported in terms of three grades: H (honors); P (pass); F (fail). [Am 4/25/95; Am 1/29/02; Am 12/1/09]
(B) In all preclerkship elective courses, grades shall be reported on a S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale. [Am 12/1/09]
(C) In all third year selective courses, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). [En 1/25/11]
(D) In all fourth year elective courses, grades shall be reported as H (honors); P (pass); F (fail) unless the course director has designated a mandatory S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale and this has been approved by the Electives Committee. [En 12/1/09, Am 1/25/11]
(E) No grade-points per unit shall be assigned.
REPORT OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL

In July of 2013, proposed updates to the UC San Diego School of Medicine (SOM) Grading Policy (Divisional Regulation 503) were approved by a vote of the Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC). The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

The proposed updates to Regulation 503 - Grading Policy, School of Medicine (Appendix 1) are endorsed by the School of Medicine (SOM) Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and the Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC).

The revisions to Regulation 503 are intended to better reflect all of the grading policies of the School of Medicine, as it appears that sections of Regulation 500 - Grading Policy (Appendix 2) and Regulation 502 - Grade Appeals (Appendix 3) do not currently apply (or no longer apply) to medical students taking courses in the M.D. curriculum. The SOM CEP and the HSFC have voted to recommend that Regulation 502 be revised to indicate that medical students must follow grade appeal procedures outlined in Regulation 503. Revisions are proposed to Regulation 503 to indicate that medical students would follow grade appeal procedures in the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook (Appendix 4). The Standing and Promotions Committee (described in the UCSD SOM Advisor and Student Handbook) oversees the academic progress of all medical students, and makes decisions regarding their academic standing. Medical students are not required to petition the Educational Policy Committee, a Standing Committee of the Academic Senate, to appeal a grade in a School of Medicine course.

Updates Regulation 503 will allow the eGrades (electronic grading) system to be amended for courses in the M.D. curriculum according to the grading policies of the SOM. At times, final grades for medical students in SOM courses need to be recorded after the deadlines currently set in the eGrades system. One example is the assignment of the Incomplete “I” grade. In eGrades, the “I” grade is scheduled to default to a Fail “F” grade if course work is not completed one quarter following the course. This timeline is not feasible for medical students taking SOM courses due to the structure of the M.D. curriculum and its requirements. Sample cases are attached for reference (see Appendix 5). In September of 2012, the SOM Committee on Educational Policy informed the Educational Policy Committee of the Academic Senate of this issue and submitted a request to extend the deadline associated with the assignment of “I” grades for courses in the M.D. curriculum. The Educational Policy Committee approved an extension of the Incomplete deadline in the M.D. core curriculum to one year. The Educational Policy Committee of the Academic Senate became aware that Regulation 503 requires modifications to accurately reflect the total grading policy for the SOM curriculum.

Thomas Savides, M.D.
Chair, Health Sciences Faculty Council

Attachments:
Appendix 1 Regulation 503 - Grading Policy - School of Medicine. Proposed revisions are noted.
Appendix 2 Regulation 500 - Grading Policy
Appendix 3 Regulation 502 - Grade Appeals. Proposed revisions are noted.
Appendix 4 Excerpts from the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook (for reference)
Appendix 5 Sample cases - SOM grading (for reference)
APPENDIX 1

DRAFT 7-2013

Proposed revisions are underlined

MANUAL OF THE SAN DIEGO DIVISION
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULATION

503. Grading Policy - School of Medicine [En 10/29/85; Rt by Assembly 3/4/86]

(A) Beginning in fall quarter, 2010, the work of all students in those courses designated by the Faculty of the School of Medicine as constituting the Preclerkship Core Curriculum, as well as in the Principles to Practice course, will be graded P (pass) or F (fail). Beginning in summer quarter, 2014, the work of all students in core clinical clerkships will be reported in terms of four grades: H (honors); NH (near honors); P (pass); F (fail).

The work of all students in all other required courses will be reported in terms of three grades: H (honors); P (pass); F (fail). [Am 4/25/95; Am 1/29/02; Am 12/1/09]

(B) In all preclerkship elective courses, grades shall be reported on a S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale. [Am 12/1/09]

(C) In all third year selective courses, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). [En 1/25/11]

(D) In all fourth year elective courses, grades shall be reported as H (honors); P (pass); F (fail) unless the course director has designated a mandatory S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale and this has been approved by the Electives Committee. [En 12/1/09, Am 1/25/11]

(E) No grade-points per unit shall be assigned.

(F) Grade Changes

All grades except Incomplete (I), In Progress (IP), and Provisionally Unsatisfactory(Y) are final when filed by an instructor in the end of term course report. However, a final grade may be corrected when a clerical or procedural error is discovered. No term grades except I and Y may be revised by further examination.

(G) Grade Appeals

A medical student may appeal a course grade by following procedures described in the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook.

(H) Definitions of Grades. Student evaluation is based on the following:

1. The H Grade:

The grade H (Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship or a fourth-year elective is considered to be outstanding. Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core or preclerkship elective courses or third-year selective courses nor in the Independent Study Project.

2. The NH Grade

The grade NH (Near Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship is significantly higher than a Pass grade, but lower than an Honors grade. Near Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core courses, preclerkship elective courses, third-year selective courses, fourth-year elective and core courses, or in the Independent Study Project.
The P Grade:
The grade P (Pass) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is satisfactory.

The F Grade:
The grade F (Fail) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is unsatisfactory. The assigned F (Fail) grade will remain on the transcript. When an F grade is remediated by examination, a memorandum to that effect will be posted to the transcript. If the F grade is remediated by repetition of the course, the course will appear chronologically a second time on the transcript.

The S Grade:
The grade S (Satisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a pre-clerkship elective course is satisfactory.

The U Grade:
The grade U (Unsatisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a pre-clerkship elective course is unsatisfactory. The assigned U (Unsatisfactory) grade will remain on the transcript.

The Y Grade:
The grade Y (Provisionally Unsatisfactory) is assigned as an initial grade. A Y grade is replaced either by a P (Pass) or S (Satisfactory) grade when the requirements for the course have been satisfied; or, if a student fails to complete the requirements satisfactorily within a period of time determined by the course instructor, an F (Fail) or U (Unsatisfactory) grade is assigned. The Y grade cannot be replaced by a Near Honors or an Honors grade.

The I Grade:
The grade I (Incomplete) is assigned when a student’s work is of passing quality but is incomplete for good cause (illness or family emergency, for example). The grade I will be replaced with a grade when the remaining course work is completed.

The instructor shall make arrangements with the student for completion of the work required at the earliest possible date, but no later than one year following the course. An extension to this deadline may be granted by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education, if there are extenuating circumstances.

The IP Grade:
For courses extending over more than one quarter, and in which evaluation of a student’s performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, a grade of “In Progress” (IP) shall be assigned and replaced by a final grade when the student completes the course sequence.

The W Grade:
The grade W (Withdraw) is assigned when a student has completed some portion of the course and for personal, medical, or other reasons must withdraw from the course. The W grade will remain on the transcript. When the course is repeated at a later date, it will appear a second time on the transcript. The Withdraw grade must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education. Students are not permitted to withdraw after the midpoint of the quarter.
502. Grade Appeals [En 5/23/78; Am 6/10/97]

(A)
(1) If a student believes that non-academic criteria have been used in determining his/her grade in a course, he/she may follow the procedures described in this Regulation.
(2) Non-academic criteria means criteria not directly reflective of academic performance in the course. It includes discrimination on political grounds, or for reasons of race, religion, sex or ethnic origin.
(3) Appeals to this committee [see (B)(4)] shall be considered confidential. Neither any member of the subcommittee nor the Academic Senate Office shall release any information about the appeal except as specifically provided in this Regulation. [Am 6/10/97]
(4) If a medical student wishes to appeal a grade in a School of Medicine course, he or she must follow procedures described in Regulation 503, instead of Regulation 502.

(B)
(1) The student must attempt to resolve the grievance with the instructor within the first month of the following regular academic quarter. [Am 6/10/97]
(2) If the grievance is not resolved to the student's satisfaction, he/she may then attempt to resolve the grievance through written appeal to the department chair or equivalent, who shall attempt to adjudicate the case with the instructor and the student within two weeks.
(3) If the grievance still is not resolved to the student's satisfaction, he/she may then attempt to resolve the grievance through written appeal to the provost of his/her college, or the Dean of Graduate Studies, or the Dean of the School of Medicine, who shall attempt to adjudicate the case with the instructor, the chair and the student within two weeks.
(4) If the grievance is not resolved to the student's satisfaction by the provost or dean, the student may request consideration of his/her appeal by the Educational Policy Committees (hereinafter called the committee) according to the procedures outlined below. This request must be submitted before the last day of instruction of the quarter following the quarter in which the course was taken. [Am 3/1/11]

(C)
(1) The student's request for committee consideration should include a written statement outlining the nature of the grievance, including copies of any and all documents in his/her possession supporting the grievance. The submission of the statement to the committee places the case before it and restricts any change of the challenged grade to a change initiated by the committee, unless the committee determines that all other avenues of adjudication have not been exhausted. [Am 6/10/97]
(2) Upon receipt of the student's request, the committee shall immediately forward a copy of it to the instructor, the department chair or equivalent, and the provost or dean, with a request for written reports of their attempts to resolve the complaint. [Am 6/10/97]
(3) The committee, after having determined that all other avenues of adjudication have been exhausted, shall review the complaint and the reports to determine if there is substantial evidence that non-academic criteria were used. [Am 6/10/97]
   (a) If the committee finds substantial evidence that non-academic criteria were used, it shall follow the procedure in paragraph (D) below.
   (b) If the committee decides the allegations are without substance, it shall serve written notification of its findings to the complainant and to the instructor within two weeks. Within ten days the complainant or the instructor may respond to the findings. If there are no responses, or if after consideration of such responses the committee sustains its decision, the grade shall not be changed. [Am 6/10/97]
(D) (1) If the committee determines that there is evidence that non-academic criteria were used, it shall interview any individual whose testimony might facilitate resolution of the case. The complainant shall make available to the committee all of his/her work in the course which has been graded and is in his/her possession. The instructor shall make available to the committee all records of student performance in the course and graded student work in the course which is still in his/her possession. At the conclusion of the case each document shall be returned to the source from which it was obtained. [Am 6/10/97]

(2) The committee shall complete its deliberations and arrive at a decision within two weeks of its determination that evidence of the use of non-academic criteria had been submitted. A record of the committee's actions in the case shall be kept in the Senate Office for three years.

(3) If the allegations of the complainant are not upheld by a preponderance of the evidence, the committee shall so notify the complainant and the instructor in writing. Within one week of such notification, the complainant and the instructor shall have the opportunity to respond to the findings and the decision of the committee. If there are no responses, or if after considering such responses the committee sustains its decision, it shall so notify the complainant and the instructor in writing and the grade shall not be changed.

(4) If the committee determines that non-academic criteria were significant factors in establishing the grade, it shall give the student the option of either receiving a grade of P or S in the course or retroactively dropping the course without penalty. A grade of P or S awarded in this way shall be acceptable towards satisfaction of any degree requirement even if a minimum letter grade in the course had been required, and shall not be counted in the number of courses a student may take on a P/NP basis. If the student elects to receive a grade of P or S, the student may also elect to have a notation entered on his/her transcript indicating that the grade was awarded by the Divisional grade appeals committee.

(a) The committee shall serve written notification of its findings and its decision to the complainant and the instructor. The complainant and the instructor may respond in writing to the findings and the decision of the committee within one week of such notification.

(b) If there are no responses, or if after considering such responses the committee sustains its decision, the grade shall be changed; the committee shall then instruct the Registrar to change the grade to P or S or, if the student elected the drop option, to retroactively drop the course from the student's record. Copies of the committee's instruction shall be sent to the complainant and the instructor.

(E) These procedures are designed solely to determine whether non-academic criteria have been used in assigning a grade, and if so to effect a change of that grade.

(1) No punitive actions may be taken against the instructor solely on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the personnel file of the instructor. The use of non-academic criteria in assigning a grade is a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Sanctions against an instructor for violation of the Faculty Code may be sought by filing a complaint in accordance with San Diego Divisional Bylaw 230(D). A complaint may be filed by the student or by others.

(2) No punitive actions may be taken against the complainant solely on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the complainant’s file. The instructor may, if he/she feels that his/her record has been impugned by false or unfounded charges, file charges against the complainant through the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, or the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Associate Dean for Student Affairs of the School of Medicine.

(F) All decisions of the Committee shall be final, except as may otherwise be provided in San Diego Divisional Bylaw 205. [En 6/10/97]