

MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, June 7, 2007
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II
REVISED May 31, 2007

Page No.

1. Transcript of the April 2, 2007 Meeting	2
2. Announcements by the President - None	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None	
4. Announcements by the Chief Campus Officer - None	
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None	
6. Special Orders	
a. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Linda Bisson	
7. Reports of Special Committees	
8. Reports of Standing Committees	
a. Committee on Committees	
i. 2007-2008 Committee Appointments	3
b. Distinguished Teaching Award Committee	
i. Confirmation of the 2007 Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients	7
c. Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	
i. <i>*Report: CoC Nomination/Election Spring 2007</i>	15
ii. Amend DDBL 16: The proposal was endorsed by the Executive Council.	16
1. MySenate Ballot Module Demonstration	
d. Graduate Council	
i. DDR 520C: Clarification endorsed by the Executive Council.	24
1. 520C Block Diagram	32
e. Committee on Academic Personnel	
i. UCAP Action: Barrier Review between Professor Step V and VI	33
f. Committee on Transportation and Parking	
9. Petitions of Students - None	
10. Unfinished Business	
11. University and Faculty Welfare - None	
12. New Business	

Patricia Harrison, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

TRANSCRIPT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Monday, April 2, 2007

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

1. Transcript of the February 5, 2006 Meeting

Action: Unanimously Approved

2. Announcements by the President - None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None
4. Announcements by the Chief Campus Officer - None
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
 - a. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Linda Bisson
 - b. *Nominations to the standing Committee on Information Technology

Action: Unanimously Approved

7. Reports of Special Committees
 - a. Pandemic Planning Task Force
 - i. Amend DDBL 73: The proposal was endorsed by the Executive Council.

Action: Unanimously Approved

8. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Transportation and Parking – Judith S. Stern, Chair
9. Petitions of Students - None
10. Unfinished Business
 - a. RE89 – Tobacco Initiative

Motion: To Approve RE89

Action: Defeated 1:47

Motion: While the Davis Division recognizes the significant negative impact of tobacco use on the health of peoples worldwide, and while we vehemently denounce any attempts by any individual or agency to subvert the integrity of academic inquiry, we do not support RE89.

Action: Withdrawn

Motion: We authorize the Chair of the Davis Division to write a letter stating the procedure that was followed and reporting the results of the vote.

Action: Unanimously Approved

11. University and Faculty Welfare - None
12. New Business

Patricia Harrison, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Divisional Officers – 2007-08

Chair: Linda Bisson

Vice Chair: Robert Powell

Secretary: Patricia Harrison

Parliamentarian: Jerry Kaneko

Academic Federation Excellence in Teaching Award:

Stanley Sue

Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Albert Lin, Chair, Catherine Kudlick, Max Nelson, Joan Rowe, Thomas Bills

UCAF Davis Divisional Representative: Albert Lin

Academic Personnel Appellate Committee

Stuart Cohen, Chair, Biswanath Mukherjee, Ron Hedrick, Joy Mench and Walter Stone

Academic Personnel Oversight Committee

Christopher Reynolds, Chair, William Casey, Laurel Gershwin, Ines Hernandez-Avila, Steven Tharratt, Ahmet Palazoglu, Gregg Recanzone, John Widdicombe

UCAP Davis Divisional Representative: William Casey

Admissions and Enrollment

Keith Widaman, Chair, Jennifer Chacon, Penny Gulan, Terrence Nathan, and Ronald Phillips

*BOARS Davis Division Representative: **To be selected by the committee membership***

Affirmative Action and Diversity

Bruce Haynes, Chair, Christopher Elmendorf, Ann Orel, Katayoon Dehesh, Gloria Rodriguez, Jon Rossini, and Monica Vazirani

UCAAD Davis Divisional Representative: Bruce Haynes

Courses of Instruction

Greg Clarke, Chair, Linton Corrunccini, Robert Bell (W, S), Ben Shaw, Alan Stemler

Distinguished Teaching Awards

Krishnan Nambiar, Chair, Jim Shackelford, and Gina Werfel, Frances Dolan, James Wilen

Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Jay Helms, Chair, Tom Farver, and G. J. Matthey

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Emeriti

Alan Jackman, Chair, Bill Lasley, Joanna Cannon, Maria Manoliu, Dean Simonton, Robert Smiley, and Tom Rost

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers

Robert Rucker, Chair, Ed Imwinkelreid, Evelyn Lewis, and Martine Quinzii

Faculty Research Lecture Award

Gerrat Vermeij, Chair, Alan Taylor, Alan Hastings, Zuhair Munir, Anne Marie Busse Berger

Faculty Welfare

Michael Maher, Chair, Norma Landau, Joel Hass, Saul Schafer, Lisa Tell, Chi-Ling Tsai and Alan Jackman (Emeritus member)

UCFW Davis Divisional Representative: Lisa Tell

Grade Changes

Robert Becker, Chair, Andres Resendez, David Webb, Jeffery Williams, James Boggan

Graduate Council

Jack Gunion, Chair, Nicole Baumgarth, Vice Chair, Ann Britt, Peggy Farnham, Lynette Hunter, Tonya Kuhl, Walter Leal, Martha Macri, Hans-Georg Mueller, Jeffrey Schank, Rachel Goodhue, Andre Knoesen

CCGA Davis Divisional Representative: Matthew Farrens

Graduate Student Privilege Advisor

Jerry Hedrick

Information Technology

Michael Hogarth, Chair, Giulia Galli, Niels Jensen, Eric Rains, Felix Wu

ITTP Davis Divisional Representative: Michael Hogarth

International Studies and Exchanges

Pablo Ortiz, Chair, Xiaoling Shu, Robert Borgen, Robert Flocchini, Niels Jensen, Cristina Martinez-Carazo, Frank Verstraete

UCIE Davis Divisional Representative: Robert Flocchini

(A/F) Joint Federation/Senate Personnel

Robert Gilbertson and Philip Shaver

(A/F) Administrative Series Personnel Committee

Diana Strazdes

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Library

Winder McConnell, Chair and Andrew Waldron

UCOL Davis Divisional Representative: Andrew Waldron

Planning and Budget

Ann Orel, Chair, Bruno Nachtergaele, Jeannette Money, Michael Turrelli, James MacLachlan, Zhi Ding, James Boggan, Chris Van Kessel, Jane-Ling Wang

UCPB Davis Divisional Representative: Bruno Nachtergaele

Instructional Space Advisory Group (subcommittee of Planning and Budget)

Patricia Boeshaar and Joseph Sorensen (Chair and one other member is selected by Planning and Budget Committee from its membership)

Privilege and Tenure – Hearings

Bill Hing, Chair, Bassam Younis, Mary Christopher, Deborah Diercks, Ted Margadant, Robert Hendren, Thomas Joo, Nelson Max, Jim MacLachlan, Sally McKee, Diane Amann, Fern Tablin (VM:APC)

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative

Daniel Link, Chair, Greg Kuperberg, Vito Polito, Lisa Pruitt, David Hollowell

UCPT Davis Divisional Representative: Daniel Link

Public Service

Paul Heckman, Chair, John Largier, Rachel Goodhue, Carlton Larson, Norman Matloff

Research – Grants

James Carey, Chair, Katharine Burnett, William Hagen, Saud Joseph, Kathryn Olmstead, Qizhi Gong, David Fyhrie, Rama Kota, Younis Bassam, William McCurdy, Reen Wu

Research – Policy

James Carey, Chair, David Mills, Robert Berman, Jon Ramsey, Scott Gartner, Anthony Wexler, Gregory Miller, Anapum Chandler, Eduardo Blumwald, Rena Zieve, Adela de la Torre

CORP Davis Divisional Representative: James Carey

Student-Faculty Relationships

Raul Piedrahita, Chair, Gail Goodman, Lori Lubin, Philip (Rick) Vulliet

Transportation and Parking

Charles Hunt, Chair, Eitan Gerstner, Susan Handy, Yu-Fung Lin, Joana Groza

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Undergraduate Council

Thomas Famula, Chair, Alessa Johns, Vice Chair, Matt Bishop, Christina Drake, Linda Egan, Philip Kass, Matt Traxler, Alan Stemler, Elizabeth Constable, Krishan Nambiar, Richard Levin, Daniel Potter
CEP Davis Divisional Representative: Linda Egan

UGC – General Education

Kathryn Radke and Elizabeth Constable, Co-Chairs, Patricia Boeshaar, Jay Lund, and Deborah Swenson (COCI Representative will be forwarded by COCI)

UGC – Preparatory Education

Richard Levin, Chair, John Bolander, Alyson Mitchell, Jon Rossini, Roman Vershynin
UCOPE Davis Divisional Representative: Richard Levin

UGC – Special Academic Programs

Krishnan Nambiar, Chair, Ning Pan, Brenda Schildgen, Diana Strazdes, Jerold (Jerry) Last

UGC – Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

Dan Potter, Chair, Aaron Smith, Barbara Sellers-Young

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

Silas Hung, Chair, Hussain Al-Asaad, Abdul Barakat, Patricia Boeshaar, Andrew Chan, Rama Kota, Ting Guo, Richard Levin, Bassam Younis, Joseph Sorensen, Julie Sze, Matthew Traxler, Nancy True, Jean Vandergheynst, Susan Rivera, Rena Zieve

Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate

Representatives through August 31, 2008 (2-year term): Matthew Farrens, Margaret (Peg) Rucker, and W. Jeffrey Weidner

Representatives through August 31, 2009 (2-year term): Daniel Simmons, Donald Price, Birgit Puschner

Alternate Representatives through August 31, 2009 (2-year term):

Alternate #1 Xiangdong Zhu;

Alternate #2 Fred Block;

Alternate #3 Jessica Utts

2007 Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients

**Citation for
JOHN HARADA
Plant Biology
Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award**

Dr. John Harada, professor of the Department of Plant Sciences, is a very dedicated professor. He is dedicated to his work, the integrity of UC Davis, and most importantly, the students of UC Davis.

Dr. Harada's dedication towards student education is first demonstrated in what he does outside the classroom setting itself. As an advocate for undergraduates in curricular matters on campus, he chaired the initiative to design the Plant Biology major, a major derived from the former Plant Physiology and Botany Majors. In addition to creating the Plant Biology major, he has also implemented innovative techniques to teach PLB 113, Molecular and Cellular Biology of Plants. Dr. Harada uses an innovative approach of teaching concepts using hypothesis testing, as opposed to rote memorization, and encourages students to discuss and interpret data with each other in order to discover biological significances, rather than just being told. Students comment that "he made [the students] think about the material that [they] were taught" and that "he encouraged outside investigation of [the] subject and critical thinking."

Dr. Harada has also restructured PLB 112, Plant Growth and Development, with co-instructor Dr. Sundarsen, because it had not kept up with advancements in understanding molecular mechanisms. Instead of relying on a textbook to teach course material, Dr. Harada relies on current lecture notes derived from current research literature. While a very challenging task indeed, not relying on a book, Harada has successfully conveyed new concepts by developing a course using model organisms and a solid foundation in genetics and molecular biology.

"[Dr. Harada] actually wanted everyone to do well in his class."

"I was surprised when he showed up in discussion (more than once)"

"Dr. Harada is one of the best professors here at UC Davis. He is accessible, knowledgeable, and made a class I was dreading (I don't generally study plant biology), into one of my favorites of my college career."

Such is the nature of many comments made by students of Dr. John Harada. He makes a personal investment with every student he meets from the first day of class by photographing them to learn their names and by being as accessible as he possibly can. He regularly holds extra office hours to help any student understand concepts discussed in class or even to answer questions beyond the scope of the class. Many students of Dr.

Harada, attribute their success after their undergraduate education to Dr. Harada's commitment and interest in their academics. A former undergraduate student, who is now a graduate student at UCLA in the Department of Plant Molecular Biology, stated that if it were not for Dr. Harada's mentorship, she may have never even applied to UCLA's graduate programs.

Clearly, John Harada is eager to improve the undergraduate experience and is concerned about how his students are learning. So, for his outstanding commitment and dedication to students, the Committee is proud to present the 2007 Distinguished Teaching award to Dr. John Harada.

**Citation for
DAVID VAN LEER
English
Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award**

Professor David Van Leer is an accomplished scholar and teacher whose courses, ranging from the Puritans to the Broadway musical, engage and inspire students. Van Leer's career demonstrates wide-ranging and constantly changing interests, deep erudition, robust curiosity, and bold innovation.

Van Leer's colleagues and students particularly value his trailblazing in creating and teaching courses in gay and lesbian fiction and in queer film at the University of California at Davis. As one colleague in the English department writes, Van Leer invented new courses and advocated for a minor in the field of Lesbian and Gay studies, "before the field was fashionable, indeed, when it was a marginalized one met by other students, and sometimes faculty, with skepticism and even derision. He did this with a degree of risk to himself, in that openly gay faculty who not only teach courses in L/G Studies but integrate knowledge from that field into their 'mainstream' courses can face student resistance and the resulting problems in their evaluations. David Van Leer has taken these risks while maintaining the respect and admiration of students of many different political positions and sexual orientations—which is evidence of a remarkable ability to challenge students while respecting their differences." Many students repeat this praise for Van Leer's ability to create a safe atmosphere in the classroom, in which students can express their views and explore their differences. As one student writes, "He does not profess as much as he opens an un-intimidating intellectual discussion to his students, creating an open, friendly atmosphere in the classroom that encourages students to participate and speak their minds plainly, while at the same time prompting them to think more astutely. He always appreciates good ideas and is quick to give credit. At the same time, he holds his students accountable for even small mistakes in writing that are overlooked regularly, encouraging a more critical level of thinking and seriousness." Other colleagues also thank Van Leer for warming up a climate once chilly to women and Lesbian/gay faculty (and students).

Van Leer also teaches a full range of American literature courses. His students emphasize that he is able to get them excited about topics and authors such as William Bradford and

Melville that they start out assuming are decidedly unsexy. Students praise his ability to make even apparently “archaic” material “immediately significant to the student.” Students write that he made them “fall in love with” Puritan writers, that he motivates reading by pulling nuances out of texts that students never suspected were there, and that he has even “taken a class of self-proclaimed opera haters and transformed them into great enthusiasts.” One of the striking things about Van Leer’s evaluations and student testimonials is that they reveal that he is rarely preaching to the choir but rather winning over students who initially resist the material.

He does all this by being peripatetic (even lecturing from the back of the room), bouncy, funny (without distracting from the seriousness of his enterprise), utterly idiosyncratic and charismatic--and loud. Students, clearly writing out of genuine affection, variously describe him as “the loudest professor on campus” and the one with the cutest dog. Many mention how accessible he is outside of the classroom: “he is not only dedicated to education in and out of the classroom, but genuinely enjoys interacting with students, discussing issues and imparting as much knowledge as possible;” “Van Leer treats the students as intelligent people and he seems to really be genuinely interested in our opinions.”

Beyond the classroom, Van Leer has established an impressive record of national and international pedagogical contributions. In 1993 he organized a conference on gay and lesbian film, which drew non-academics as well as faculty members and students. As a result of his national reputation for erudition, Van Leer was chosen to serve on the Advisory Board for the GRE English Subject Examination at the Education Testing Service, a test required by graduate schools that serves the pedagogical function of helping to shape the literary canon students are expected to master. Finally, in 2006, Van Leer was invited by the U. S. State Department to deliver a series of lectures to programs in Literature and English in Thailand. Presented to a mixed audience of undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty, these ten lectures explored the pedagogical issues associated with teaching gender, sexuality, race, and multi-ethnicity. These lectures also introduced innovative techniques for classroom use of media; especially film, television, popular music and advertising. This lecture series demonstrates Van Leer’s international reputation; he is admired for his scholarship and his success in adopting new teaching techniques.

The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee is pleased to recognize Professor Van Leer’s manifold accomplishments with a 2007 Distinguished Teaching Award.

**Citation for
GAIL FINNEY
Comparative Literature/German and Russian
Distinguished Graduate/Professional Teaching Award**

Gail Finney is a Professor of Comparative Literature and German. Finney receives strong praise from graduate students in all levels of graduate education. Letters from colleagues and former students all attest to her meticulous, intellectual rigor and humane mentorship of graduate students, both in and outside of formal classroom interactions.

Professor Finney's graduate courses and group studies demonstrate both her primary areas of interest and her interdisciplinary engagement: covering theatre, comedy, the novel, and film, they range into modern German philosophy and feminism, including such topics as Holocaust Literature and Film, and Gender and Comedy.

One colleague notes that Professor Kinney's work does not stop with formal graduate seminars, but that she engages in numerous group study classes and independent studies. Finney helps students launch their careers as professors and scholars by initiating collaboration and networking with other scholars. In her statement of teaching philosophy, Professor Finney reminds us about the implications of the German term for dissertation director- Doktorvater or Doktormutter -how during the job application process, this definition is most evident: "the wish for a young person whom one has taught and mentored to achieve professional success surely possesses a parental dimension." This role is confirmed by a former student's observation, "She embodies the German term for this role- Docktormutter- insofar as she is both nurturing and inspiring."

In her nomination letter, a student is quoted who asks what is it that Professor Finney does so well, "She has high standards, she is ethical, she is intellectually encouraging- I want to learn to relate to students as she does." Another concludes, "As a teacher, Dr. Finney is nothing short of outstanding." Several of Professor Finney's former students hold tenure track positions – at Brandeis University and St. John's College among others, and these numbers are testimony to Finney's success in placing students in a very tight job market.

A former student who has recently attained tenure at his institution concludes his enthusiastic letter on behalf of Professor Finney "...because Dr. Finney regarded me from the beginning as a future professor, I came to regard myself as one. That I became a professor in fact I owe in large part to her teaching, mentoring and modeling and I continue to be grateful." Another student's summation serves as an appropriate conclusion to this citation: "Organized, efficient, reliable; caring, nurturing, supportive; challenging, stimulating, inspiring; all of these terms aptly describe Professor Finney."

The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee is pleased to recognize Professor Gail Finney's impressive roster of achievements with a 2007 Distinguished Teaching Award.

**Citation for
KENT PINKERTON
VM: Anatomy, Physiology & Cell Biology
Distinguished Graduate/Professional Teaching Award**

His students characterize him as the "Mr. Rogers" of UCD Veterinary School. He is a teacher who always has a "Moral of the story" moment in his lectures. "Dr. Pinkerton shows respect for his students and he gets tremendous respect in return" noted one student in the nomination letter. "Dr. Pinkerton is amazing", "Very patient with students", "Wow, what a great, kind professor", "Very dedicated", "Great teacher" these are some of the comments

that repeatedly appear in Professor Pinkerton's student evaluations. "I have benefited enormously from Dr. Pinkerton's warmth and selfless nature", wrote one student. Dr. Pinkerton is an extremely nice and patient professor. He is always thinking about the student and making sure that we understand everything. He is good at explaining things so that we can understand it", wrote another.

Professor Pinkerton has been the advisor and mentor to many graduate and professional school students. He served as the graduate advisor and Recruitment Chair for the Pharmacology and Toxicology Graduate Group at UC Davis for many years. In addition to his teaching activities, he also runs a well funded active research program. He has published nearly 150 peer reviewed scientific publications and around 24 books or book chapters. He serves on many national scientific study sections. He is also the Director of the Center for Environmental Health at UC Davis. He sets an exemplary example with his collaborative efforts within the Department, across the school and the campus and the wider scientific community.

Professor Pinkerton is very active in engaging undergraduate and high school students in research through The Young Scholars Program, NIEHS training program and Environmental Toxicology Summer Internship Program. He works with graduate students helping them mentor high school and undergraduate students. He also helps the high school and undergraduate students prepare their presentations at the end of their research training. A number of these students have gone on to win Science Fair Awards and other recognitions. Regarding his interaction with graduate students a colleague wrote: "Dr. Pinkerton takes on some of the toughest students in the program and inspires them to become motivated and perform to their highest potential, primarily through his own infectious enthusiasm".

Professor Pinkerton has been quite active in continuously revising the course syllabus, incorporating modern cutting edge teaching technologies. He devoted a considerable effort to the creation and production of the teaching tool "Virtual Heart", which he developed in collaboration with a colleague, Dr. Lynette Hart. "Virtual Heart" is available to all veterinary students at UC Davis as well as being used by other school systems to aid in teaching biology classes. He also reviewed and made available to UCD vet students copies of the CD "Visible Heart Viewer" an educational program directed at training physicians.

The Department Chair writes: "Kent teaches with a style that is supportive, helpful and leads to an excellent learning atmosphere in the Anatomy Teaching Laboratories. It is in the laboratory where one-on-one learning can take place and he is marvelous in that role. Students are comfortable learning from him and he creates a very positive learning atmosphere and experience for them. He is highly committed and has demonstrated the ability to get students perform to the very best of their ability". It is no wonder that Professor Pinkerton received the "Favorite Teacher Award" twice in 1998 and 2000 from UCD Vet students and the Distinguished faculty Teaching Award from the School of Veterinary Medicine. "He is a rare commodity at the University and receiving the award would be just recognition for having enriched the intellectual lives of so many graduate and professional students.", wrote the Chair.

We concur with the sentiments expressed by Professor Pinkerton's colleagues and students alike and are proud to present Professor Pinkerton the 2007 Academic Senate Distinguished Graduate and Professional Teaching Award.

**Citation for
SUBHASH RISBUD
Chemical Engineering & Materials Science
Distinguished Graduate/Professional Teaching Award**

Looking over the list of courses taught by Professor Subhash Risbud, you might think you had *another* list – a sampling of courses from across the entire campus taught by a wide range of faculty members. The list includes courses such as “Exploring the Soul of an Ancient Culture through Indian Classical Music,” “A Cradle to Grave Look at Materials,” “The Way Life Works,” and “Neutron-based Materials Characterization.”

All of these courses have been taught to students at all levels of the university while Professor Risbud has simultaneously maintained one of the most vigorous research groups in the College of Engineering, produced over 250 publications, six patents, and mentored numerous graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who have gone on to positions of distinction in academia, industry and government laboratories. And, by the way, these accomplishments were achieved while he served for several years as the Chair of the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science and, for the past two years, as the Director of the Internship and Career Center.

One of his former graduate students is now the CEO of a nanotechnology company who was previously named the Outstanding Young Alumna of UCD by the Cal Aggie Alumni Association, and she writes: “Now that I am a member of the UCD Graduate School of Management Dean’s Advisory Council as well as the UCD External Research Advisory Board, I reflect back on my days as a student each time I return to campus I suppose you could say I’m a proof in principle of Professor Risbud’s outstanding talent as an educator and mentor. His success as an educator is vast, and I am just one example of the many students that Professor Risbud has personally influenced and continues to influence with compassion and grace.”

A former postdoctoral fellow who is now a tenured professor at another UC campus writes: “The characteristics that make Professor Risbud an outstanding mentor include his skill and clarity as a teacher, his ability to guide the development of graduate students and post-doctoral scholars into independent researchers, and his close attention to the career goals and personal welfare of group members.... I find his accomplishments even more remarkable with each passing year – as my own career progresses and my level of responsibility becomes greater.”

Professor Risbud’s excellence in graduate research and teaching has been recognized by various awards on campus as well as recognition nationally and internationally. As an example, he received the highest research award of his primary professional society early in his career. Twenty years later, he received the highest teaching award from the same society.

The Committee is delighted to recognize this outstanding teacher and mentor with the 2007 Distinguished Teaching Award.

**Citation for
MICHAEL WILKES
SOM: Internal Medicine
Distinguished Graduate/Professional Teaching Award**

Dr. Michael Wilkes joined the UCD Medical School in 2001, and since then has been widely recognized here for his innovative approaches to curriculum reform, enthusiastic teaching, and humane approach to life. He is no stranger to being recognized for his exceptional attitude and commitment: he has won the Association of American Medical Colleges' highest teaching prize, the Glaser Award, as well as awards from the American College of Physicians, the Society of General Internal Medicine, the American Academy of Clinical Practice, and the American College of Preventive Medicine. He complements his skills as a physician and internist with a desire to train his students to become compassionate clinicians and life-long learners. One of his former students called him a "visionary," and a UCD colleague stated that he has "single-handedly set the course of our curriculum toward innovation and excellence, and he has led our students in the same direction."

Dr. Wilkes has played a central role in numerous instructional initiatives at UCD, including online learning, telemedicine, expanding the public health curriculum, mentoring and advising medical students. He also has been the Principal Investigator for four major educational research projects that have dealt with such topics as ethics and clinical genetics, and strategies to achieve cultural diversity in medical education. He is most noted for his seminal role in the creation of the "Doctoring curriculum," which has received worldwide recognition in the past 16 years. This three-year set of courses emphasizes the knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes required of all physicians. It pays attention to important ethical and social issues, stressing that medicine itself is a distinct culture that students need to understand if they are to be socially responsible practitioners. One colleague described its aims in terms that sound like the Boy Scout Oath as applied to medicine: "sensitive communication with patients, ethical probity in all things, social responsibility, perpetual honest self-examination, empathy, duty, charity, and continual refinement of medical skills, science, and knowledge." This curriculum is now being used in 15 schools and on four continents, and has had a major impact here at UCD. In conjunction with this curriculum, Doctor Wilkes produced a DVD video series on "The Culture of Medicine."

He is also noted for being a committed instructor who lectures, supervises students and residents, and serves as a caring mentor and advisor. He is always available to students, not only through an "open door" policy during business hours but also in the evenings, as he encourages students to call him if they have questions or concerns. One student who took advantage of this cell-phone policy recalled that "he always made me feel as though I was a priority." (He has also been available to readers of the Sacramento Bee, where he writes a weekly health column.) His outreach includes Nicaragua, where he helped UCD medical students build a free clinic, and he has supervised medical students working in Europe and Africa on health care issues.

Students and faculty alike praise Dr. Wilkes for being willing to courageously express his opinions, and relate the practice of medicine to the highest ethical and humane standards. As one former student noted, “he made it mainstream at UC Davis for students to strive to care for the undeserving, to tackle daunting health issues, and to take individual and social responsibility.” One of his colleagues summed up the general sentiment that “Dr. Wilkes is one of the finest teachers and supervisors in our school and much of our institutional success in medical student and resident education can be traced to Dr. Wilkes.” The DTA is delighted to add to his acclaim with a 2007 Award.

May 17, 2007

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, RULES AND JURISDICTION NOMINATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Call for Nominations for membership on the Committee on Committees was sent to all members of the Division on April 12, 2007. There were four vacancies to be filled: three for 3-year terms (ending in spring 2010) and one for a 2-year term (ending in spring 2009). This procedure was required under Davis Division Bylaw 39(B) because a member, elected in 2006, is stepping down in spring 2007.

Election of the Current Nominees: the Secretary received two nominations. Where the number of persons nominated does not exceed the number of places to be filled, Bylaw 16(C)(5) specifies that “the election by ballot shall be omitted.” The nominees and the terms for which they shall serve are:

Trish Berger (Animal Science), serving through spring 2010.

Michelle Yeh (East Asian Languages & Cultures), serving through spring 2010.

As required by Bylaw 16(C)(5), the Secretary shall, upon instruction by the Representative Assembly at the June 7, 2007 meeting, declare these nominees elected for the terms noted. They shall then take office immediately.

Continuing Committee Members: Pursuant to Bylaw 39(B)(1) the regular three-year terms of three members of the Committee will expire on June 7, 2007 when the election of the nominees is declared at the instruction of the Representative Assembly. In addition, Richard Lecouteur (Veterinary Medicine), whose term was to expire in spring 2009, has resigned effective June 7, 2007. The five continuing members of the Committee are

Susan Stover (Veterinary Medicine), serving through spring 2008.

Craig Tracy (Mathematics), serving through spring 2008.

William Hagen (History), serving through spring 2008

Zhaojun Bai (Computer Science), serving through spring 2009

Brian Mulloney (Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior), serving through spring 2009

Filling of Remaining Vacancies on an Interim Basis: Following the election of the nominees on June 7, 2007, there will be two vacant positions on the Committee: one expiring in spring 2009 and one expiring in spring 2010. Pursuant to Davis Division Bylaw 40(A), the new Committee (comprising the five continuing members and the two newly-elected members) shall convene to fill these two vacancies in its membership, and the members so appointed shall serve “until the next regular election of members of the committee” in spring 2008.

Process for the Spring 2008 Election: In spring 2008 there shall be an election to fill five positions: one expiring in spring 2009, one expiring in spring 2010, and three expiring in spring 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Jay Helms, Chair

Thomas B. Farver

G. J. Matthey

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 16
(With Conforming Changes in Other Bylaws)
TO ALLOW FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING
May 7, 2007

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction.

Rationale: Davis Division Academic Senate Bylaws currently require all ballots of the Division to be conducted by postal mail. These ballots include elections for members of the Committee on Committees, Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the (systemwide) Academic Senate, and ballots on issues which are submitted to the voters by the Representative Assembly, the Executive Council, by petition, or by other means. Voting by postal ballot is cumbersome, time-consuming, and expensive.

A voting module of MySenate is now operational at Davis. This electronic voting system includes important safeguards: access is protected by Kerberos passwords; no person may determine whether any individual has voted or how the vote was cast; once a vote is cast neither the voter nor any other person may change the vote; and no person has access to partial results prior to the deadline for the casting of votes.

Electronic voting offers many benefits: a member may cast a ballot when off campus – web access is the only requirement. Members need not depend on the campus or US mail system to deliver their ballot in a timely manner. Spoiled ballots will be eliminated because the voting module will alert the voter if the ballot is marked in a manner that would render it invalid (e.g., by voting for more candidates than the number of vacancies). Finally, the Academic Senate Office will conserve valuable staff time and operating funds through the elimination of paper ballots.

We therefore propose that electronic voting be authorized and implemented. The proposed Bylaw 16 defines the procedures for conducting electronic ballots, while preserving the option for a mail ballot as a “fail safe” measure.

The proposal also makes minor changes in several other Bylaws (13, 14, 17, 28, 33, 35, 39, 42, 71, 191, 192 and 193) to replace references to “mail” or “postal” ballots with a generic reference to “ballots.” In addition, the 7 day time limit for the completion of the ballot in Bylaw 17 must be replaced with a limit of 14 calendar days for conformity with systemwide Bylaw 95, and the language of Bylaw 14(B) that is redundant with Bylaw 16 is eliminated.

Proposed Revision: Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

Bylaw 16

The current Bylaw 16 shall be repealed in its entirety and the replacement appearing in **bold** shall be enacted.

16. ~~Elections~~

A. ~~When elections by postal ballot are required by the Bylaws or ordered by other action of the Davis Division, they shall be conducted by the Secretary of the Davis Division under the supervision of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction and with the assistance of such other tellers as the Committee deems necessary.~~

B. ~~Notice of Election~~

1. ~~Elections other than Representative Assembly. Not less than 30 days prior to any election the Secretary shall initiate such election by sending to each member of the Davis Division a notice that nominations for the office in question will be accepted during the next ten days and specifying the date and time after which nominations will no longer be accepted. Each nomination shall be in writing, shall contain a statement that the nominee will accept the nomination, and shall be signed by five members of the Davis Division.~~

C. ~~Except as provided otherwise for the election of members of the Representative Assembly, balloting shall be conducted as follows:~~

1. ~~Not less than ten days after the time for receiving nominations has expired, the Secretary shall send to the members of the Division a ballot containing, in alphabetical order, the names of those persons who have been nominated as herein before prescribed. This ballot shall be accompanied by a list of the nominees, together with the names and departmental affiliations of those nominating each, a statement that the ballot is to be returned within ten days to the Secretary, and instructions concerning the proper method of recording the ballot. If the ballot is conducted by US mail, each voter receives a plain envelope in which to enclose the marked ballot and a second envelope addressed to the appropriate secretary to be used for the return of the sealed ballot. The envelope addressed to the Secretary provides a space for the signature of the voter. Ballots lacking this validating signature are void.~~

2. ~~Election to an office shall be determined by a plurality. The candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected. In elections to fill vacancies with different length terms, the candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be declared elected to the longer terms of office in the order of their total votes. In case of tie votes, the ranking of candidates shall be determined by lot. (Am. 6/4/85)~~

3. ~~No ballot shall be valid on which more names are marked than the number of vacancies to be filled. (Renum. 6/4/85)~~

4. ~~If the ballot is conducted by US mail, any voter who spoils a ballot may, by tearing it across once and returning it to the Secretary, obtain another ballot. (Renum. 6/4/85)~~

5. ~~In case the number of persons nominated as herein above prescribed is not in excess of the number of places to be filled, the election by ballot shall be omitted and the Secretary of the Davis Division shall, if so instructed by the Representative Assembly, declare all nominees elected. The candidates, who are to serve terms of different lengths, if any, shall be determined by lot. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71; Renum. 6/4/85; Am. 10/20/97)~~

16. Elections by Ballot

- A. When elections by ballot are required by the Bylaws or ordered by other action of the Davis Division (except for the election of Departmental Representatives to the Representative Assembly) they shall be conducted by the Secretary of the Davis Division under the supervision of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction.**
- C. Manner of Election: Ballots may be conducted by mail or electronically. The Secretary of the Davis Division, in consultation with the Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction, shall have discretion to determine whether an election will be conducted by mail or by electronic means. Throughout these Bylaws the term “ballot” shall denote either a mail or electronic ballot.**
- D. Electronic Ballots: If the ballot is conducted by electronic means, each voter shall receive access to a secure, on-line voting system maintained by the Senate office. The voting system shall be designed to meet the following criteria:**
- 1. The system shall verify each voter’s identity.**
 - 2. It shall not be possible for any person to determine how or whether any individual has voted.**
 - 3. Once a vote has been cast, neither the voter nor any other person shall be able to change the vote.**
 - 4. No person shall be able to determine the results of the election or the number of votes cast until after the voting deadline.**
- E. Mail Ballots: If the ballot is conducted by mail:**
- 1. Each voter shall receive a plain envelope in which to enclose the marked ballot and a second envelope addressed to the appropriate secretary to be used for the return of the sealed ballot. The envelope addressed to the Secretary provides a space for the signature of the voter. Ballots lacking this validating signature are void.**
 - 2. No ballot shall be valid on which more names are marked than the number of vacancies to be filled.**
 - 3. Any voter who spoils a ballot may, by tearing it across once and returning it to the Secretary, obtain another ballot.**
- F. Provisions Applicable When Candidates Are Standing For Election**
- 1. Not less than 30 days prior to any election the Secretary shall initiate such election by sending to each member of the Davis Division a notice that nominations for the office in question will be accepted during the next ten days and specifying the number of terms to be filled and the date and time after which nominations will no longer be accepted. Each nomination shall be in writing, shall contain a statement that the nominee will accept the nomination and a brief biography of 120 words or less, and shall be signed by five members of the Davis Division.**

- 2. Not less than ten days after the time for receiving nominations has expired, the Secretary shall send to the members of the Division a ballot containing, in alphabetical order, the names of those persons who have been nominated as herein before prescribed. This ballot shall be accompanied by a list of the nominees, together with the names and departmental affiliations of those nominating each, a statement that the ballot is to be completed (or, in the case of a mail ballot, returned to the Secretary) within fourteen calendar days, and instructions concerning the proper method of recording the ballot.**
- 3. Election to an office shall be determined by a plurality. The candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected. In elections to fill vacancies with different length terms, the candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be declared elected to the longer terms of office in the order of their total votes. In case of tie votes, the ranking of candidates shall be determined by lot.**
- 4. In case the number of persons nominated as herein above prescribed is not in excess of the number of places to be filled, the election by ballot shall be omitted and the Secretary of the Davis Division shall, if so instructed by the Representative Assembly, declare all nominees elected. The candidates who are to serve terms of different lengths, if any, shall be determined by lot.**

Conforming Changes in Other Bylaws

In addition, the following conforming changes in other Bylaws shall be enacted.

13. Secretary

- F. Under the supervision of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction, the Secretary shall conduct all elections in the Davis Division for which a ~~postal~~ ballot is required.

14. Divisional Representatives

- A. The Davis Division shall be represented in the Assembly of the Academic Senate by the Chairperson of the Division ex officio and by the number of Divisional Representatives authorized by the University Academic Senate.
- B. Not later than February 1 each year the Secretary shall initiate the election of the Divisional Representatives. **Election of Divisional Representatives shall be by ballot in accordance with Bylaw 16.** ~~by sending to each member of the Davis Division a notice that nominations for the position of Representative to the Assembly will be accepted during the next ten days and specifying the number of terms to be filled and the date and time after which nominations will no longer be accepted. Each nomination shall be in writing and shall contain a statement that the nominee will accept the nomination and a brief biography (of 120 words or less). Each nomination shall be signed by five members of the Davis Division.~~ If the total number of nominations received is not equal to at least twice the number of positions to be filled, the Committee on Committees shall make nominations, if any, up to at least the number of positions to be filled.
- C. As many Divisional Representatives as there are terms to be filled shall be elected each year, and elected Representatives shall serve for terms of two years. The Committee on Committees of the Davis Division shall appoint Divisional Representatives as necessary to complete any unfulfilled term or terms. No member of the Senate shall serve as a Divisional Representative for more than two consecutive terms, but he or she shall become eligible to serve again after the lapse of two or more years following conclusion of his or her second consecutive term.
- ~~D. Election of Divisional Representatives shall be by postal ballot in accordance with the applicable provisions of Bylaw 16. The ballot shall contain a brief biography of each nominee.~~
- ~~E.D.~~ First, second and third alternate Divisional Representatives to serve in the absence or disability of any regular Representative of the Assembly shall be selected by the Committee on Committees immediately following the election of the regular Divisional Representatives. Each alternate Divisional Representative shall serve for a two-year term.

17. **Ballots on Issues**

Any ~~matter~~ **issue** must be submitted to a ballot of the Division at the request of (1) the President of the Academic Senate or (2) the Chief Campus Officer, acting through the Chair of the Division with the consent of the Executive Council (3) the Executive Council, (4) the Representative Assembly by resolution adopted at a duly called meeting or (5) 50 voting members of the Division presented in a written petition. Upon receiving a petition or other request, the Secretary shall promptly verify the validity of the request, immediately notify the members of the Division of the nature of the impending ballot, and prepare the ballot. The ballot shall be distributed to the voters not less than ten days nor more than 20 days after the members of the Division are notified of the impending ballot, and ballots must be completed or returned if a mail ballot by the members within ~~seven~~ **fourteen calendar** days. Balloting shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures of Bylaw 16 insofar as these are applicable. When ballots are distributed to the voters, they shall be accompanied by arguments for or against the proposal submitted by any member or group of members of the Division. The Secretary of the Division may, but need not, restrict each pro and con argument circulated with the ballot to two sides of an 8.5" x 11" document or sheet, **in paper or electronic form**. Additional arguments submitted to the Secretary shall be posted on the Divisional Web page, and the address of the Web page shall be clearly indicated on the ballot. The additional pro and con arguments shall remain posted on the Web page until the final return date balloting ends. In certifying the results, the number of affirmative votes, the number of negative votes, and the number of invalid ballots shall be reported.

28. General Provisions

- B. All committees of the Davis Division shall report to the Representative Assembly of the Division and are subject to its jurisdiction on all matters of policy. All committees shall implement, within the limits of Senate authority, any policy or direction adopted by a majority vote of the Representative Assembly or the Division ~~through a mail~~ **by** ballot.
- F. Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in divisional committees when those agencies or committees are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Davis Division. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions. Members of the Davis Division appointed or elected to represent the Division on joint committees, taskforces, or to other non-Senate agencies may not abridge the duties or powers of any standing committee or take a final action in the name of the Division unless by reference to, and with the advice and consent of, the relevant standing committee, the Representative Assembly, or the Division ~~through a mail~~ **by** ballot.

33. Powers and Responsibilities of Committees

- C. Except as otherwise provided in the Standing Orders of the Regents or Academic Senate bylaws, additional duties may be imposed on a divisional committee by the Regents, the President of the Senate, or the Chief Campus Officer only through the Chair of the Davis Division with the advice and consent of the Executive Council. No action with respect to any such additional duties shall be regarded as an action of the Davis Division unless reported to, and approved by, the Representative Assembly (subject to substantiation or refutation ~~in a~~ **by** mail ballot, according to the provisions of Davis Division Bylaw 35 B).

Title II. The Representative Assembly

35. Responsibilities and Functions

- B. Upon petition by 50 voting members of the Division, submitted within forty days after the date of the meeting at which a specific action was taken by the Representative Assembly, a ~~mail~~ ballot of the Division members must be conducted to substantiate or refute the action in question. The ~~mail~~ ballot shall be in accordance with the procedures of Bylaws 16 and 17.

Title III. The Committee on Committees

39. Election and Term of Office

- A. The elected members shall take office immediately after their election is determined by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction. They shall serve until the succeeding committee members are elected.
- B. The nine elected members of the committee shall be chosen in the following manner:
 - 1. Three members shall be elected each year to serve for three years. Replacement members shall be elected to complete any unfilled term as may be necessary. (En. 6/6/00; effective 9/1/00; Am. 6/5/01)
 - 2. Election shall be ~~posted~~ **by** ballot in accordance with Bylaw 16. The election shall be initiated by the Secretary during the first week in Spring Quarter each year. (En. 6/6/00; effective 9/1/00; Am. 6/5/01)

42. Committee on Academic Personnel

- B. Oversight Committee. This subcommittee shall have the following duties:
 - 7. To receive and implement within the limits of Senate authority any policy regarding academic personnel adopted by a majority vote of the Representative Assembly or the Division ~~through a mail~~ **by** ballot.

71. Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

- A. This committee shall consist of three members.
- B. The committee shall have the following responsibilities:
 - 8. To supervise, in accordance with such rules as the Davis Division may determine, all elections of the Division. The committee shall also supervise the voting on propositions submitted to the Davis Division by ~~mail~~ ballot. In the exercise of this function, the committee may engage the assistance of the Secretary of the Division and such tellers, as the committee deems necessary.

191.

Bylaws may be added to, amended, or repealed by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast ~~in a mail~~ **by** ballot of the Division conducted in accordance with Bylaws 16 and 17. (En. 6/7/83)

192.

Regulations may be added to, amended, or repealed by a majority of the votes cast ~~in a~~
~~mail~~ **by** ballot of the Division conducted in accordance with Bylaws 16 and 17. (En.
10/19/71, effective 12/21/71; Am. 6/7/83)

193.

Business other than enactment, amendment or repeal of Bylaws or Regulations requires a
simple majority of the votes cast at a Representative Assembly meeting or ~~on a mail~~ **by**
ballot conducted in accordance with Bylaws 16 and 17. (En. 4/25/83)

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 520(C):

Doctor of Philosophy: Dissertation and Final Examination

May 17, 2007

Submitted by the Graduate Council.

Endorsed by the Executive Council.

Rationale: Davis Division Regulation 520(C) spells out the dissertation and final oral examination requirements for the PhD. Unfortunately, the current wording is complicated and unclear, causing needless confusion to graduate programs. The Graduate Council's Educational Policy Committee (EPC) has therefore recommended the following changes in format and wording to enhance the clarity of this regulation. Graduate Council subsequently discussed and endorsed the recommendations and approved a motion to make this request.

The changes involved using outline format rather than narrative format consistently for all three Plans for the Ph.D. degree. It also clarifies how the three plans are similar and how they are different by adopting identical wording and a parallel presentation of the three plans, while separating out the common element of the final oral examination into a separate paragraph.

In addition, references to the "final oral examination" are revised to use that term consistently throughout; the Dissertation Committee is consistently referred to as the "Dissertation and Final Examination Committee" when it is charged with conducting the final oral examination; and references to the "Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council" are replaced with references to the Graduate Council itself because the Administrative Committee derives its authority from the Graduate Council and is not directly provided for in Senate legislation.

This revision does not involve any substantive changes for any of the currently authorized plans.

In addition to presenting the proposed revision (with changes indicated), we have also provided the text as it would appear before and after the proposed changes.

Proposed Revision of Regulation 520(C)

Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

520. Doctor of Philosophy

(C) Dissertation and Final Examination. (Renum. 12/80)

- (1) A dissertation on a subject chosen by the candidate, bearing on the principal subject of study and of such character as to show ability to prosecute independent investigation, must receive the approval of the special committee in charge of the dissertation and of the Graduate Council before the degree is recommended. Special emphasis will be placed upon this requirement, and the degree will in no case be given merely for the faithful completion of a course of study, however extensive.
- (2) The dissertation must be in a form acceptable to the Graduate Council.
- (3) Not later than three weeks before the proposed date of the final **oral** examination under Plan A (~~see (4) below~~) or not later than three weeks before the end of the quarter in which the degree is to be conferred under Plan B or Plan C the candidate shall file with the Dean of Graduate Studies one copy of the dissertation (the original if typewritten) approved by the committee in charge. An abstract of the dissertation must be filed by the same date. The ~~Administrative Committee of the~~ Graduate Council may, in special cases under Plan A, authorize the taking of the final **oral** examination before the dissertation is completed. (Am. 02/25/05)

(D) Dissertation Committee and Plan

- ~~(4)~~ The candidate shall be subject to the provisions of either Plan A, ~~or~~ Plan B or Plan C as outlined below, depending upon the department or group primarily concerned with his or her field of study. Each department or group is required to adopt one of ~~the two~~ **these three** plans. (Am. 02/25/05)

- (1) Plan A. The ~~Administrative Committee of the~~ Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of ~~five~~ **5** members, **including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee and Final Examination Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee,** which shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure: (Am. 06/01/06)

- (a) A minimum of ~~three~~ **3** of the members of the committee shall be designated at **the time of appointment** to guide the candidate in his or her research and to pass on the merits of the dissertation. (Am. 06/01/06) **This portion of the committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee. This Committee and the candidate shall arrange for such conferences as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.**
- (b) ~~The entire committee shall conduct a final oral examination, which shall deal primarily with questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the~~

~~general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies. A final oral examination, as described below in section (E), shall be required.~~

- (c) ~~Admission to the final examination may be restricted to members of the committee, members of the Academic Senate, and guests of equivalent rank at other institutions. There is no exit seminar requirement for this plan.~~

- (2) Plan B. ~~The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of three~~ **3 members, including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure:**

- (a) ~~The committee members, which~~ shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. ~~This committee and the candidate shall arrange for such conferences with the candidate as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.~~
- (b) ~~After presentation of the dissertation, but before the final action has been taken on it, the candidate may, at the discretion of the committee, be required to defend it in a formal oral examination. (App. 1/26/71)~~ **At the discretion of the Dissertation Committee, a final oral examination, as described below in section (E), may be held. If the Dissertation Committee decides to hold a final oral examination, it will assume the role of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee.**
- (c) ~~At the discretion of the graduate program, Graduate program degree requirements may require an exit seminar of each student~~ **may be required of all candidates.** Satisfaction of this requirement shall be verified by the chair of the ~~d~~Dissertation ~~e~~Committee. (Am. 02/28/05; 06/01/06)

- (3) Plan C. ~~The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of three~~ **3 members, including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure:**

- (a) ~~The committee members which~~ shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. ~~This committee~~ **The committee and the candidate** shall arrange for such conferences ~~with the candidate~~ as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.
- (b) ~~The entire committee shall conduct a final oral examination, which shall deal primarily with questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies. Admission to the final examination may be restricted to members of the committee, members of the Academic Senate, and guests of equivalent rank at other institutions.~~

~~(Am. 02/28/05; 06/01/06)~~ A final oral examination, as described below in section (E), shall be required.

(c) There is no exit seminar requirement for this plan.

(E) Final Oral Examination

A final oral examination, where required under the applicable plan, shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedure:

- (1) All members of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee shall conduct a final oral examination of the candidate. This examination shall be held after oral presentation of the dissertation to the Dissertation Committee but before final action has been taken on it. The final oral examination shall consist primarily of questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies.
- (2) Admission to the final oral examination may be restricted, wholly or in part, at the discretion of the Graduate Program. If admission is restricted, it shall include all members of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee and may include other members of the Academic Senate and/or guests of equivalent rank at other institutions.

Regulation With Proposed Changes Incorporated

520. Doctor of Philosophy

(C) Dissertation.

- (1) A dissertation on a subject chosen by the candidate, bearing on the principal subject of study and of such character as to show ability to prosecute independent investigation, must receive the approval of the special committee in charge of the dissertation and of the Graduate Council before the degree is recommended. Special emphasis will be placed upon this requirement, and the degree will in no case be given merely for the faithful completion of a course of study, however extensive.
- (2) The dissertation must be in a form acceptable to the Graduate Council.
- (3) Not later than three weeks before the proposed date of the final oral examination under Plan A or not later than three weeks before the end of the quarter in which the degree is to be conferred under Plan B or Plan C the candidate shall file with the Dean of Graduate Studies one copy of the dissertation (the original if typewritten) approved by the committee in charge. An abstract of the dissertation must be filed by the same date. The Graduate Council may, in special cases under Plan A, authorize the taking of the final oral examination before the dissertation is completed. (Am. 02/25/05)

(D) Dissertation Committee and Plan

The candidate shall be subject to the provisions of either Plan A, Plan B or Plan C as outlined below, depending upon the department or group primarily concerned with his or her field of study. Each department or group is required to adopt one of these three plans. (Am. 02/25/05)

- (1) Plan A. The Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of 5 members, including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee and Final Examination Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure: (Am. 06/01/06)
 - (a) A minimum of 3 of the members of the committee shall be designated at the time of appointment to guide the candidate in his or her research and to pass on the merits of the dissertation. (Am. 06/01/06) This portion of the committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee. This Committee and the candidate shall arrange for such conferences as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.
 - (b) A final oral examination, as described below in section (E), shall be required.
 - (c) There is no exit seminar requirement for this plan.

- (2) Plan B. The Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of 3 members, including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure:
 - (a) The committee members shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. This committee and the candidate shall arrange for such conferences as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.
 - (b) At the discretion of the Dissertation Committee, a final oral examination, as described below in section (E), may be held. If the Dissertation Committee decides to hold a final oral examination, it will assume the role of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee.
 - (c) At the discretion of the graduate program, an exit seminar may be required of all candidates. Satisfaction of this requirement shall be verified by the chair of the Dissertation Committee. (Am. 02/28/05; 06/01/06)
- (3) Plan C. The Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of 3 members, including its chair. This committee will be designated as the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee and the chair of this committee will be the candidate's major professor. This Committee shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure:
 - (a) The committee members shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. The committee and the candidate shall arrange for such conferences as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation.
 - (b) A final oral examination, as described below in section (E), shall be required.
 - (c) There is no exit seminar requirement for this plan.

(E) Final Oral Examination

A final oral examination, where required under the applicable plan, shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedure:

- (1) All members of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee shall conduct a final oral examination of the candidate. This examination shall be held after oral presentation of the dissertation to the Dissertation Committee but before final action has been taken on it. The final oral examination shall consist primarily of questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies.
- (2) Admission to the final oral examination may be restricted, wholly or in part, at the discretion of the Graduate Program. If admission is restricted, it shall include all members of the Dissertation and Final Examination Committee and may include other members of the Academic Senate and/or guests of equivalent rank at other institutions.

Original Text of the Regulation

520. Doctor of Philosophy

(C) Dissertation and Final Examination.

- (1) A dissertation on a subject chosen by the candidate, bearing on the principal subject of study and of such character as to show ability to prosecute independent investigation, must receive the approval of the special committee in charge of the dissertation and of the Graduate Council before the degree is recommended. Special emphasis will be placed upon this requirement, and the degree will in no case be given merely for the faithful completion of a course of study, however extensive.
- (2) The dissertation must be in a form acceptable to the Graduate Council.
- (3) Not later than three weeks before the proposed date of the final examination under Plan A (see (4) below) or not later than three weeks before the end of the quarter in which the degree is to be conferred under Plan B or Plan C the candidate shall file with the Dean of Graduate Studies one copy of the dissertation (the original if typewritten) approved by the committee in charge. An abstract of the dissertation must be filed by the same date. The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council may, in special cases under Plan A, authorize the taking of the final examination before the dissertation is completed.
- (4) The candidate shall be subject to the provisions of either Plan A or Plan B or Plan C as outlined below, depending upon the department or group primarily concerned with his or her field of study. Each department or group is required to adopt one of the two plans.

Plan A. The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of five members, which shall determine whether the candidate has met the requirements for the degree, in accordance with the following procedure.

- (a) A minimum of three of the members of the committee shall be designated to guide the candidate in his or her research and to pass on the merits of the dissertation.
- (b) The entire committee shall conduct a final oral examination, which shall deal primarily with questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies.
- (c) Admission to the final examination may be restricted to members of the committee, members of the Academic Senate, and guests of equivalent rank at other institutions.

Plan B. The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of three members, which shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. This committee shall arrange for such conferences with the candidate as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation. After presentation of the dissertation, but before the final action has been taken on it, the candidate may, at the

discretion of the committee, be required to defend it in a formal oral examination. (App. 1/26/71) Graduate program degree requirements may require an exit seminar of each student. Satisfaction of this requirement shall be verified by the chair of the dissertation committee.

Plan C. The Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council shall appoint a committee of a minimum of three members, which shall guide the candidate in his or her research and shall pass upon the merits of the dissertation. This committee shall arrange for such conferences with the candidate as may be necessary for the complete elucidation of the subject treated in the dissertation. The entire committee shall conduct a final oral examination, which shall deal primarily with questions arising out of the relationship of the dissertation to the general field of study in which the subject of the dissertation lies. Admission to the final examination may be restricted to members of the committee, members of the Academic Senate, and guests of equivalent rank at other institutions.

DDR 520C

Plan B

- Three member dissertation committee.
- Dissertation committee members may require an oral presentation which precedes oral final examination.
- The Graduate Program may require an exit seminar for all students.



Plan C

- Same as Plan B + Oral presentation which precedes oral final examination - Exit Seminar



Plan A

- Same as Plan C + 2 Additional members on the Final Examination Committee who participate in the presentation which precedes oral final examination.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

Previously Proposed Amendments to APM 220-18.b(4)

A. The 2005 Amendment

Proposed Amendment to APM 220-18 Approved by the Academic Council July 27, 2005

APM 220-18 b.

(4) Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI **involves a career review**, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of ~~highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching, sustained excellence~~ **In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching and service, and, University teaching. In addition, with respect to scholarly or creative achievement or teaching, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required. in** ~~scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching.~~ Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI or Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are paid on the special Law School scale which has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is **involves a career review that is** reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. **whose work of sustained excellence has attained international recognition and broad acclaim, reflective of its wide impact across the field; whose teaching performance is excellent, and whose service is meritorious.** Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which **previous** ~~advancements~~ **to Step IX was have been** based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

B. The 2006 Amendment

UCAP Copy-edited Proposed Revision of APM 220-18b (4) Advancement to Professor Step VI and to Above Scale June 12, 2006

APM 220-18b

(4) Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after ~~less~~ **fewer** than three years of service at Step V, **involves a career review**, and will be granted on evidence of ~~highly distinguished~~ **sustained excellence in scholarship or creative achievement**, ~~highly meritorious service and evidence of excellent University teaching, and service. In addition, great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required in at least one of these three categories.~~ In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching, and service, and, in addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after ~~less~~ **fewer** than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are paid on the special Law School scale which has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale salary **involves a career review that** is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work **of sustained excellence** has **attained** been internationally recognized **international recognition** and acclaimed **broad acclaim** and whose teaching performance is excellent **reflective of its significant impact across the field; whose teaching performance is excellent; and whose service is meritorious.** Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after ~~less~~ **fewer** than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. ~~There must be~~ Demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which **previous** advancements to Step IX was **have been** based **is required**. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is **based on** strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

UCAP's 2007 Amendment Adopted by the Academic Council on March 28, 2007

APM 220-18.b

(4) Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, **involves an overall career review**, and will be granted on evidence of **sustained excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) highly distinguished scholarship or creative achievement; (2) highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching; and (3) service.** ~~In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching and service and, in addition, great academic distinction, recognized nationally or~~

internationally, will be required in at least one these three categories. ~~in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching.~~ Service at Professor, Step VI₁ or higher, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII, to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are paid on the special Law School scale which has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale salary involves a career review that is reserved for ~~scholars~~ distinguished faculty whose (1) work of sustained excellence has attained international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact ; ~~and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed~~ (2) whose teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be ~~Ddemonstration~~ of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which previous ~~advancements have been~~ to Step IX was ~~based is required.~~ A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good ~~service-~~ performance in each of the three categories is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases ~~based on~~ where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.