

**NOTICE OF MEETING LOCATION****REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

To: Representative Assembly Members of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Davis Division of the Academic Senate Office

Re: Notice of Meeting Location

---

The **February 24, 2014** Representative Assembly meeting will be held at the **Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**. Directions to the building can be found at the following website: <http://campusmap.ucdavis.edu/?b=223>. The room is located on the second floor of the Student Community Center.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at **2:10pm**.

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

**Monday, February 24, 2014**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**

Page No.

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Approval of the October 28, 2013 Meeting Summary                                      | 3  |
| 2. Announcements by the President – None   |    |
| 3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None   |    |
| 4. Announcements by the Chancellor   |    |
| a. State of the Campus – Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi                                    |    |
| b. Discussion of Campus Initiatives with the Chancellor                                  |    |
| 5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None              |    |
| 6. Special Orders  |    |
| a. Remarks by the Academic Senate Chair  |    |
| 7. Reports of standing committees  |    |
| a. Committee on Committees   |    |
| i. Confirmation of Academic Senate Chair Elect for 2014-2016                             |    |
| b. Faculty Research Lecture (To be honored during the Spring quarter)                    |    |
| i. Confirmation of the 2013-2014 Faculty Research Lecture Award Recipient                | 9  |
| c. Public Service (To be honored during the Spring quarter)                              |    |
| i. Confirmation of the 2013-2014 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award Recipients | 10 |
| d. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel: Oversight Subcommittee          | 12 |
| 8. Petitions of Students   |    |
| 9. Unfinished Business   |    |
| 10. University and Faculty Welfare   |    |
| 11. New Business   |    |
| 12. Informational Item   |    |
| a. *College/School Bylaw and Regulation Update: School of Medicine                       | 29 |

Abigail Thompson, 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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

1. Transcript of the June 7, 2013 Meeting  
**Motion to accept June 7<sup>th</sup> transcript**  
**Action: Motion approved**
2. Announcements by the President – None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None
4. Announcements by the Chancellor – None
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
  - a. Remarks by the Divisional Vice Chair – André Knoesen  
**Welcome to New Faculty**  
**Fall Student Enrollment**  
**Update on 2013-2014 Faculty Hiring**  
**Academic Senate Priorities**
    1. **General Education – Examination of graduate education structural, policy and funding issues**
    2. **New Budget Model – Continue monitoring implementation of the new budget model. The highest priority remains development of a graduate education funding model**
    3. **Undergraduate Program Review – Streamlining of the Undergraduate Program Review Process is underway. Inclusion of an external reviewer effective 2013-2014 will be accomplished by incorporation of Review Teams in the existing Cluster 7 reviews**
    4. **Advising – Academic – Examination of the role of faculty in the academic advising process**
    5. **Course Review Process Streamlining – The Division recommended changes to the course approval process necessary to streamline review. The course review system managed by the Registrar's Office is being replaced creating an opportunity for the identification of software to facilitate streamlining measures**
    6. **WASC Site Visit – WASC is scheduled to visit UC Davis spring 2014. The Division must make progress on a number of initiatives before the spring visit**
    7. **General Education Assessment – Develop a process for assessment of the general education requirement**

\*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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

8. **Recognition of innovation and achievement in teaching – A small workgroup has been asked to review and recommend strategies to highlight innovation and achievement in teaching through the current merit and promotion processes**
  9. **Academic Organization – Working with the Joint Senate/Administration Academic Organization Task Force examine the academic organizational structure**
- b. Remarks by ASUCD President – Carly Sandstrom
- ASUCD manages an \$11.8 million budget, mainly a student run organization that provides various services on campus including the Bike Barn, Coffee House, etc.
  - Student association concerns
    - Renovations to MU
    - Program review of 24 units
  - Held student forum with President Napolitano to determine what students needs/concerns were
    - Napolitano agreed to quarterly meetings with all AS Presidents across system
    - Office is looking into Blue Ribbon Committee Report created by over 100 faculty, staff, and students
    - Mental Health
    - Orientation
    - Advising
    - First Year Experience
  - Created student advisory committee to look at various mental health issues
    - Better outreach for CAPS
    - Orientation
    - More Aggie Pride
    - Happiness Class
  - Passionate about getting Aggie Pride to campus, re-publicizing Aggie Pride Fridays
  - Many new hiring's in student affairs
  - Looking to partner with CA endowment
  - Picnic day event for ASUCD alumni
  - Trying to collect more data on how to enhance student experience
  - Jobs initiative:

\*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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

- How to get more jobs on campus and life after college (ICC and Cal Aggie Association)
  - Nov 21 12 – 4 pm campus job event
  - Noticed that you are focusing on advising
    - Senate candidate is looking to have Faculty Mentors around campus
    - Mentors are available, but students don't always reach out to them
      - Suggestion: change culture to encourage more students to reach out for the faculty mentor relationships.
  - Budgets/financial aid: Looking at how Calfresh can be incorporated into financial aid package making it easier for the student to enroll
  - Freedom of Expression policy
    - Students have had input on the new policy being developed
  - Negative feedback on freedom of expression:
    - “Time, Place, and Manner”
    - regulation vs. promotion of freedom of expression
    - complicated issue
    - finding boundary and putting a policy for that
    - limiting vs. having the freedom
- c. Remarks by GSA Chair – Juan Miranda
- Freedom of expression:
    - To add to the “Time, Place, and Manner Regulation” previously addressed by Carly Sandstrom:
      1. “The University, as an educational institution, has various core goals and interests, the protection and promotion of which are essential to its effective functioning. They include: (1) the opportunity of all members of the University community to attain their educational objectives; (2) the generation and maintenance of an appropriate intellectual and educational atmosphere throughout the University community; and (3) the protection of the health, safety, welfare, property, and civil and human rights of all members of the University community, and the safety and property interests of the University. Although endorsing freedom of expression, this policy does not relieve the University from its obligations to protect the right of students, staff, and

\*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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

faculty to learn, live, and work in an environment free from unlawful harassment and intimidation.”

2. The following seems to only apply to students and we forget that students don't have a say when university structure takes place, which can lead to disruption to the campus during protests.
    - “Public spaces, including sidewalks, lobbies, courtyards, hallways, and other paths, thoroughfares, and open areas must be maintained to permit orderly and safe access and travel for pedestrians, and, where appropriate, bicycles and other vehicles.”
    - “No person on University property or at official University functions may: Engage in the production of excessive sound or noise that significantly disrupts campus activities;”
  - Meeting with President Napolitano
    - Faculty supported graduate students
    - Protestors were concerned for undocumented students
      - A suggestion to protestors is to change the message in order for it to be more effective.
  - IGPS is looking to hire a coordinator
    - Interdisciplinary Graduate and Professional Symposium (IGPS) is a conference where grad students present their work. It is usually held in April.
  - GSA met with Chief of Police
    - Chief of police started an Initiative to give lights to students
  - GSA will be meeting regularly with the Chief of Police to address concerns from graduate and undergraduate students
    - They have already responded to some of their concerns. They put signs on campus, where there were no signs before, letting motorized vehicles know they should use other routes rather than entering campus in restricted zones.
  - Previous GSA member feared closure of Environmental College
    - If the Experimental College is closing is there a way to prevent it from happening
  - GSA is hiring a new Office Assistant.
- d. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel:
- i. Oversight Committee – Trish Berger [Not able to attend](#)

\*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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

- e. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel:  
i. Appellate Committee – Dennis Styne  
**Motion:** To accept Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel Appellate Committee.  
**Action:** Motion passed

*Annual Reports on Consent Calendar:*

- f. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility  
g. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
h. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
i. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction  
j. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards  
k. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction  
l. \*Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee  
m. \*Annual Report of the Faculty Research Lecture Award Committee  
n. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare  
o. \*Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee  
p. \*Annual Report of the Graduate Council  
q. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Information Technology  
r. \*Annual Report of the Committee on International Education  
s. \*Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel  
t. \*Annual Report of the Library Committee  
u. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget  
v. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
w. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service  
x. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Research  
y. \*Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council  
i. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on General Education  
ii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Preparatory Education  
iii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Special Academic Programs  
iv. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review  
z. \*Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

\*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.

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

**Monday, October 28, 2013**  
**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Student Community Center, Multi-Purpose Room**  
**Meeting Summary**

Page No.

7. Reports of standing committees
  - a. Faculty Welfare – Lori Lubin
    - New health care changes
      - Recommendation to look at plans (UC Care), they have been changing prior to open enrollment
    - Town Hall Meeting
      - There is an issue concerning the availability of physicians locally if access to Sutter Davis physicians is lost
    - Concerns about access and plans have been expressed
      - Timescale for addressing these issues may be extended
8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business
12. Informational Item
  - a. Committee on Courses of Instruction – Course Evaluation Policy (Effective Winter 2014)
 

Discussion: The proposed Course Evaluation Policy does not require evaluations of courses with five or fewer students due to concerns about inability to preserve students' anonymity. There were questions from the floor about this aspect of the policy, and it was suggested that the policy might result in many graduate courses not being evaluated. However, it was also pointed out that the policy, as written, does not preclude administering student evaluations of these courses; it just says they are not required. The Committee on Courses of Instruction is going to revisit the policy.

## Meeting Adjourned

Abigail Thompson, 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.

**Faculty Research Lecture Committee**  
**Recommendation that Professor HOWARD J. SPERO**  
**Be the Recipient of the 2014 Academic Senate Faculty Research Lecture Award**

The Faculty Research Lecture Committee unanimously recommends Professor Howard J. Spero, Professor in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, as the 2014 Faculty Research Lecturer.

Professor Spero is a world-renowned scientist whose groundbreaking research has transformed the way scientists reconstruct past climatic conditions from the marine fossil record. By increasing knowledge about ocean circulation and climate change during the last 500,000 years of the Earth's history, Professor Spero's work provides important insights into the causes of contemporary environmental conditions. The FRL committee was particularly impressed by the degree to which his research is broadly conceived and integrative, crossing boundaries between geology, oceanography, climatology, chemistry, and archeology.

Professor Spero is a highly productive and accomplished scientist. His work appears regularly in high profile journals, including eight articles in *Nature* and *Science*, and he has received numerous prestigious awards and honors that recognize his many contributions to science, including the Alexander von Humboldt Research Award from Germany, the Director's Award from the National Science Foundation, the Emiliani Lecturer of the American Geophysical Union, and being elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the California Academy of Sciences, and the Geological Society of America. His enthusiasm and dedication to research have inspired his students and colleagues.

Professor Spero's distinctive scholarly research, outstanding accomplishments, and widely recognized leadership in his discipline, both nationally and internationally, make him a highly deserving candidate for the 2014 UC Davis Faculty Research Lecture Award. We believe the Faculty Research Lecture by Professor Spero would be of great interest to the campus and the local community alike.

## **Nominations for the 2014 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award**

The University of California has a long tradition of service to the state and the people of California. The Academic Senate Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award offers the opportunity to honor exceptional faculty who continue that tradition and demonstrate the commitment of the Davis campus to public service. Faculty members who perform scholarly public service use their expertise in teaching, research or professional competence to make unpaid contributions to local, statewide, national, or international public arenas.

The Senate Public Service Committee submits the names of the following four individuals in nomination for the 2014 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award:

### **Jamal Abedi**, Professor in the School of Education

Professor Abedi is a leading advocate for improving the fairness of standardized measures of achievement, particularly on behalf of children whose first language is not English and on behalf of students with disabilities. For many years, he has sought to make standardized testing practices more equitable. Professor Abedi, through his outreach activities, has influenced the design of standardized assessments throughout the country and thus improved educational opportunities for thousands of children. His contributions to scholarship and to putting research into practice have led to numerous honors, including the American Educational Research Association Professional Service Award in 2003, the California Educational Research Association Lifetime Achievement Award in 2008, and, most recently, the National Association of Test Directors Award for Outstanding Contributions to Educational Assessment in 2013.

### **Randi Hagerman, M.D.**, Endowed Chair in Fragile X Research and Medical Director of the MIND Institute

Dr. Hagerman is an internationally recognized leader in the field of neurodevelopmental disorders and is recognized as a pioneer in characterizing the phenotype and developing new targeted treatments for Fragile X Syndrome. Dr. Hagerman has taken a very active outreach role to build an international community of investigators, patients, and elected officials to advance the awareness of the condition and to promote treatment. Some examples of her outreach include membership in an NIH Advisory committee to plan the future for Fragile X research and starting the National Fragile X Foundation (NFXF) in 1984. Dr. Hagerman has also been very active in developing Fragile X clinical programs in many other countries including development of the Colombia Project of Hope in partnership with the Universidad del Valle to bring better treatment and diagnostic techniques to these patients.

### **Professor James Sanchirico**, Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Policy

Professor Sanchirico is a world-renowned scholar who has dedicated a substantial amount of time and effort to improving the management of ocean and coastal policy. He was invited in 2009 to present his ideas on coastal and ocean planning to President Obama's Interagency Ocean

Policy Task Force, and his advice contributed directly to the body of knowledge used to write the first ever US National Ocean Policy. His most long-standing public service activity has been his membership on the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) science advisory board (SAB), to which Professor Sanchirico brings his social science perspective and expertise on ocean and coastal policy. During the course of his career, he has also been involved in advising other states on their management of coastal and ocean resources.

**Professor J. Edward Taylor, Professor** in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

Professor Taylor has used his expertise as a development economist to make an exceptional number of significant contributions to formulating policy in international migration, farm labor, and trade reforms, particularly concerning US relations with Latin America. One of Professor Taylor's biggest accomplishments has been co-founding PRECESAM, a network of 15 universities across Mexico, which is the major center of research, training, and policy analysis on rural economic development in Mexico. Professor Taylor also spearheaded a 4-country study to prepare governments for the Central American Free-Trade Area Agreement's impacts in rural areas, on agricultural production, and on welfare in poor households. Professor Taylor's work on the economics of eco-tourism in the Galápagos Islands has become the basic economic reference on the Galápagos and has led to a number of presentations and collaborations with government officials, conservation agencies, and scientific groups in Ecuador.

**UC DAVIS  
ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL –  
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
2012-2013**

**ANNUAL REPORT**

**John R. Hall (Chair), Trish Berger, Daniel Gusfield, Jim Jones, David Simpson, Martin Usrey, Andrew Vaughan, Richard White, and Xiangdong Zhu.**

The Committee of Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on matters concerning academic personnel advancement. These include promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals of assistant professors. The committee appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise Deans on personnel actions redelegated by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to academic units (Appendix D). A list of CAP's principal tasks is included in Appendix E.

**Faculty Advancement Criteria:** CAP evaluates the files of candidates according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-210). CAP's mandate is to make recommendations based on fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of academic endeavor are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply objective and uniform criteria of evaluation across disciplines and interdisciplinary initiatives, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline or interdisciplinary initiative to another.

In its review of academic personnel, CAP bases a recommendation on materials provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in the candidate's dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the chair, commentaries from the dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. CAP also may appoint an *ad hoc* committee of three faculty members if it determines such a committee to be necessary for the appropriate review of a personnel action; the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs then handles the appointment process for such committees and organizes their meetings.

CAP's evaluation is guided by the APM statement that the "indispensable qualification" for advancement at all levels is "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement." CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member at the end of the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP may recommend advancement when it finds that a faculty member's performance is well above expectations in one category even though the record is below expectations in another category. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. Except for deferrals, CAP does not use time in service or health or personal issues in assessing the grounds for merit advancements.

CAP evaluates research reported in peer-reviewed publications and other venues and creative work presented in a variety of forms and venues principally on the basis of the originality and creativity of the work as judged by peers. The primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate's command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities as well as student evaluations are given substantial weight in assessing teaching performance. CAP also considers the amount, variety, and challenges of teaching endeavors. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the effort, impact, and outcome. In general, there is an expectation that service will increase in amount and leadership as faculty members advance in rank.

### **Academic Personnel and Other Actions**

During the 2012-2013 academic year (September through August), CAP met 43 times out of 52 weeks and considered 484 agenda items, of which 449 were academic personnel actions. The committee provided advice on numerous issues related to academic personnel. These include:

- 3 TOE requests for search waivers,
- 48 appraisals,
- 12 Change-of-Title actions (1 of them with a merit increase),
- 11 Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers
- 7 merit actions for Continuing Lecturers and Senior Lecturers
- 11 Endowed Chair actions,
- 10 Third-Year Deferrals,
- 16 Five-Year Reviews,

- 10 Emeritus Status actions.

CAP also reviewed 1 file for a reappointment of a Department Chair and made recommendations concerning Chancellor's Fellows.

In addition to recommendations listed above, CAP made recommendations concerning 310 actions that involved appointment, promotion, or merit advancement for Academic Senate faculty. In relation to these actions, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Provost, or the Chancellor made decisions in disagreement with CAP 28 times (in about 9% of cases considered).

For 2 cases on which CAP voted positively, the Vice Provost's decisions were different from the proposed actions; in one of these cases, the Vice Provost denied a promotion recommended by CAP and decided instead in favor of merit advancement; in the other case, the Vice Provost approved a further acceleration beyond what CAP had recommended.

In 3 cases, CAP had a split vote; in 2 of these cases, the Vice Provost (1) or the Provost (1) affirmed the recommendation of CAP members who voted positively; in the other case, the Vice Provost made a decision for a lesser advancement than the split CAP vote but greater advancement than a CAP vote on an alternative advancement.

For 23 cases, the Vice Provost (16), the Committee on Academic Personnel-Appeals Committee (1), the Provost (2), or the Chancellor (2) approved cases on which CAP voted negatively, or the Vice Provost made a modified decision (2). Thirteen of these cases involved proposed accelerations.

Overall, CAP and FPCs that considered redelegated actions made negative recommendations on appointment, merit, and promotion actions in less than 6.7% of the cases. This low percentage of negative recommendations reflects the high-quality research and teaching done by the vast majority of the faculty at UC Davis.

CAP's weekly agenda for consideration of proposed academic personnel advancements is determined by a rank ordering that gives highest priority to appointments, tenure cases, and appraisals; other proposed advancements are considered in clusters of similar actions (e.g., promotion to Professor, Step VI) as time permits. Once an item is placed on a weekly CAP agenda, unless CAP nominates an *ad hoc* committee to provide a recommendation, the normal completion time is two weeks.

Appendix A provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year.

### **Appointments**

CAP made recommendations concerning 36 appointments and 6 POP appointment screening requests. It recommended appointment in all of the POP cases and 33 of the regular cases; in 6 of these latter cases, it recommended appointment at a different step than that proposed by the academic unit. In no case did the Vice Provost not approve appointment of a candidate recommended by CAP. In 3 cases, CAP did not recommend appointment; for 1 of these cases, the Vice Provost approved the appointment; another was approved as an acting position.

### **Promotions**

CAP considered 118 promotion actions, 67 of them for promotions to Associate Professor, and 51 for promotions to Professor. CAP recommended promotion in 100 of 118 cases. CAP did not recommend advancement in rank in only 10 cases concerning promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (for one of these cases, CAP recommended advancement to an overlapping step at the lower rank), and 8 cases concerning promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (for one of these cases, CAP recommended advancement to an overlapping step at the lower rank). In one case, the CAP vote was evenly split. Overall, in 21 cases, CAP made recommendations that differed from those proposed at other levels of review, including merits to an overlapping step at the lower rank, lateral promotions, normal promotions instead of accelerated ones, accelerated promotions, and retroactive promotions. One promotion case remains pending.

### **Merit Advancements, Professor, Step VI, Step IX, and Above Scale**

Overall, CAP made recommendations concerning 160 merit cases, including 4 for Continuing Lecturers. For ladder academic senate faculty, 77 actions were for "barrier steps," i.e., Professor, Step VI, and Professor, Above Scale. For the 53 Professor, Step VI, cases, CAP made positive recommendations in 33 cases, modified recommendations in 5 cases, and negative recommendations in 15 cases. For the 24 Professor, Above Scale, cases, CAP made positive recommendations in 15 cases, a modified recommendation in 1 case, and negative recommendations in 8 cases.

### **Accelerated Actions**

Appendix B lists the cases for accelerations that came to CAP (accelerations involving a promotion, a merit increase to Professor, Step VI, and to Above Scale or within Above Scale, a merit increase for an FPC member, department chair or administrator, as well as all accelerations that entailed skipping a step at any level).

Faculty for whom CAP made favorable recommendations for a multi-year acceleration generally had received some major recognition nationally or internationally, established a record of unequivocally superior scholarly achievements, and maintained excellent records of teaching and service. At the upper levels of the professoriate, the expectation of excellence in all areas grows with each step. In a number of cases for which CAP did not recommend a proposed acceleration, CAP instead recommended an alternative acceleration (e.g., a one-year retroactive advancement to the next merit step instead of an acceleration skipping a merit step, i.e., from Professor II to Professor IV). Salary and retention are beyond the charge of CAP, which is expected to make recommendations solely on the basis of APM standards, as discussed above.

### **Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV or V**

As a collaboration, in 2012-2013 Academic Affairs and CAP initiated the first year of a two-year pilot program in which “regular” merits to Associate Professor, Step IV and V were redelegated, and therefore considered by the FPCs and not CAP. To be redelegated as a “regular” merit under this pilot program, a proposed action had to meet the following criteria: (1) the faculty member had been at rank for 4 years or less, (2) the faculty member moved into rank at Associate Professor, Step II or above, and (3) the faculty member had not had any deferrals in the Associate rank. In response to questions about several cases, the Vice Provost for Academic affairs has simplified the criteria for redelegation for 2013-2014 as follows: faculty appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor rank for 6 years or less will have their merits reviewed as a redelegated action, whereas, faculty who have been at the Associate rank for more than 6 years will have their merit actions reviewed as non-redelegated.

During 2012-2013, CAP reviewed requests for advancement to Associate Professor, Steps IV and V, under the guidelines described above, i.e., for faculty for whom advancement to either of these steps would result in a non-normative period of time as an associate professor. As the APM indicates, the normal action for such faculty involves promotion to full

Professor. For such faculty, CAP typically recommends advancement to an overlapping merit step at the Associate Professor rank (Associate Professor, Step IV – overlapping with Professor, Step I, or Associate Professor, Step V – overlapping with Professor, Step II) only when a faculty member has an overall record of substantial scholarly accomplishments – potentially including demonstrated progress on uncompleted projects – that does not warrant promotion, yet demonstrates promise that such promotion will occur in the near future. Such a merit advancement, rather than promotion, may be appropriate if, for example, a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it will be considered “in press.” Non-normative advancements to an overlapping step are unusual in the Associate ranks.

### **Retroactive Merit Actions**

Retroactive merit actions may be requested by Deans or FPCs. When a retroactive action is considered, the review period ends the year before the proposed merit date (e.g., for an action retroactive to July 1, 2012, the creative work/research publications are counted to December 31, 2011, and teaching/service until June 30, 2011). Thus, retroactive recommendations should specifically discuss the record for this review period and explain in detail why that record supports the retroactive merit. In 2012-2013, CAP reviewed 1 retroactive request initiated at other levels of review; it did not recommend retroactive advancement; the Vice Provost approved a merit acceleration.

### **Career Equity Reviews**

A formal *Career Equity Review* (CER) considers the entire career record of the individual to determine if the current placement in rank and step is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. The purpose of a CER is to address potential inequities that are products of rank and step at the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement. CERs occur coincident with a merit or promotion action and only a faculty member who (1) has held an eligible title, and (2) has not been reviewed by CAP during the previous four academic years, can be considered for a CER. In 2012-2013, CAP conducted 1 CER that was initiated at a lower level of review; this review resulted in an adjustment of rank and step. Even in the absence of a formal Career Equity Review request, CAP considers a candidate’s career pattern of advancement and the overall appropriateness of rank and step whenever it reviews a file, i.e., for every major advancement.

### **Five-Year Reviews**

Of the 16 five-year reviews that CAP conducted, it recommended merit advancement in 1 case, “no advancement, performance satisfactory” in 10 cases and recommending “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 5 cases. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs agreed with the merit advancement recommendation and the recommendations of “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 3 cases; as of this writing, decisions are still pending on all other five-year review cases.

### **TOE Screenings**

CAP considered 3 requests for search waivers for Target of Excellence recruitment proposals and approved all 3 of them.

### **Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers**

Teaching excellence is the overriding requirement for a non-Senate continuing appointment. Of the 11 initial continuing appointments in 2012-2013 that CAP reviewed, it recommended continuing appointments in 10 cases and recommended against a continuing appointment in 1 case. The Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs made decisions in all 11 cases that concurred with CAP’s recommendations.

### **Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers**

For Continuing Lecturers, normal merit advancements are redelegated to the deans, and CAP considers requests for accelerations. To recommend accelerations (one or two steps beyond the normal two-step advancement), CAP looks for evidence of teaching accomplishments that go beyond teaching excellence, which is the minimum standard for normal advancement. Such evidence may come in the form of prestigious teaching awards or publication of books (and other creative works) that have substantial pedagogical impact. In 2012-2013, CAP considered 5 requests for accelerations. It recommended normal merits in 4 cases; one case was remanded to an FPC; the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs concurred with all these recommendations. One other case – a Lecturer, SOE, was remanded to an FPC. In addition, CAP recommended one merit advancement for a Senior Lecturer, and the Vice Provost followed that recommendation.

### **Faculty Personnel Committee Actions**

Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) of the colleges and schools advise deans on personnel actions redelegated to them (they do not, in most cases, make recommendations on first actions after a promotion or appointment). In 2012-2013, the actions reviewed by FPCs included:

appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor, Steps I to III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step up to and including Professor, Step IX (with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI); most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). Information on FPC actions is reported in Appendix C.

### **Ad Hoc Committees**

Review by an *ad hoc* committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotions to the Associate Professor and full Professor rank, and merit advancements to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. CAP's membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus and is guided by external reviewers' evaluations, but on occasion the committee looks to campus *ad hoc* committees for highly specialized expertise. In 2012-2013, CAP proposed *ad hoc* committees in six cases; thanks are due to the faculty members who served on these committees for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

CAP appoints the nine Faculty Personnel Committees of the Colleges and Schools based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. At the end of the academic year, CAP also performs post-factum audits of FPC actions and writes memos to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs summarizing those actions. CAP appreciates the dedicated effort and hard work of all FPC members.

### **Other CAP Agenda Items**

CAP also gave opinions on 15 Requests for Consultation from the Academic Senate and reviewed 11 sets of voting procedures from departments or programs for their conformity to Academic Senate bylaw 55.

### **Clarification of Appeals versus Reconsiderations**

CAP decisions are subject to either reconsideration or appeal. The distinction is clarified in a flow chart, available at: <http://academicssenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf>. As described there, a candidate for advancement who wishes to appeal is expected to provide evidence of a personnel committee's failure to apply established

standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure. When there is no issue concerning whether a personnel committee applied established standards of merit or procedure appropriately, a reconsideration can be initiated on the basis of new information concerning the candidate's record that has not previously been provided to a committee. Such information is expected to concern the candidate's record during the period under review: e.g., publications or other creative works, awards, teaching evaluations, new grants, or original requested extramural letters that arrived late.

In 2012-2013, CAP received 7 requests for reconsideration based on new information; in 3 of these cases, CAP's reconsideration resulted in a change of its original recommendation.

### **Criteria of Scholarship**

In 2002, CAP solicited criteria of scholarship documents from campus departments. The intent was that these documents could provide disciplinary context that CAP could utilize during review of cases from departments. CAP received documents from some but not all departments.

CAP does not approve such documents, the contents of which do not fall within its jurisdiction. They are treated as departmental policy statements that do not preempt the peer review process, but which provide CAP with context for faculty records and discussions in departmental letters. CAP evaluates cases on the basis of standards set forth in the APM. Departments are welcome to provide new or revised criteria-of-scholarship documents as they deem appropriate.

To ensure that criteria of scholarship are considered at all levels during review, CAP suggests that the Criteria be attached to the dossier, or at least referred to in the Department Chair letter. Doing so will call attention to their appropriate use during review by the Faculty Personnel Committee, Dean's Office, and/or CAP.

### **University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP)**

Martin Usrey served as CAP's representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), which held several meetings during the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was

regularly informed of UCAP discussions and, through its representative, provided input into such discussions, when appropriate.

Particular items that were discussed this year by UCAP include the following:

### **Proposed Revisions to APM 210**

The existing wording of APM 210.1-d can be read to say that those whose academic endeavors involve diversity and equity should be given some sort of “extra credit” in the review process because the University has taken a position that involvement of the faculty in diversity and equity issues is to be encouraged. APM 210 was revised in 2004-2005 because faculty with diversity and equity aspects to their work had complained that these aspects were not taken seriously; they inferred that at least some campus CAPs considered such endeavors as inferior, thus making them the objects of discrimination. The language in APM 210.1-d was supposed to eliminate any basis for discrimination. However, its wording suggested to some that the University took the opposite position – that such endeavors should be favored during merit review. In the wording for this paragraph, there is a tension between making clear that research into issues of diversity and equity is to be treated equally to other academic disciplines (not favored or disfavored) and at the same time stating that the University is in favor of all faculty members actively advancing diversity and equity. This issue remains unresolved.

### **Proposed Open Access Policy**

In its letter to Council, UCAP outlined a variety of concerns about the open-access publication policy, including that the policy is going to have a differential impact/burden on faculty from different disciplines. UCAP recommended that compliance with the policy should not be a criterion for personnel reviews/evaluations and that a funding mechanism should be available to faculty who incur added costs of publication by agreeing to open access.

### **Negotiated Salary Plan (Proposed APM 668)**

In fall 2012, UCAP participated in a systemwide review of the proposed Negotiated Salary Plan Trial Program to be offered to eligible faculty on the general campuses. The committee commented on the original proposal in October 2011. This year, in a November 2012 memo to Council, UCAP raised multiple objections and noted that the trial of the plan, as described, failed to address the problems with the proposal delineated in UCAP’s October 2011 comments. UCAP expressed concern

about UCOP's failure to collect data to determine if there is a pressing recruitment and retention issue, instead of relying on anecdotal information. Connected to this is the report's lack of clarity regarding how the success or failure of this program will be judged. The committee continued to have concerns about the impact the negotiated salary plan would likely have on the CAPs' workloads. UCAP recommended that the trial address all the objections that UCAP has raised or it should not be implemented. UCAP will monitor the results of the trial program.

### **Salary Equity Surveys**

UCAP reviewed the campus salary equity survey plans during the March and May 2013 meetings. Committee members agreed that, while many of the CAPs do not look at salaries, all CAPs should be concerned about merit equity. UCAP members also agreed that even if CAPs do not look at salaries, the impact of merit step advances should be taken into consideration, and CAPs should know about any systematic biases. UCAP was critical of those campuses that did not provide comprehensive plans and suggested that the campuses that have developed metrics and conducted some analyses could provide consultation. UCAP asked that the campuses share any issues related to equity that they uncover as well as how they might respond if they do find a lack of equity. The committee also suggested that the campuses should be asked to look at both the rate at which faculty members progress through merit steps as well as how well they are paid as they advance. UCAP also requested that the campuses provide firm dates and deadlines for when salary equity analyses will be completed.

### **APM 075**

The proposed revision of APM 700 resulted in UCAP's review of APM 75, the policy regarding termination for incompetent performance. APM 75 refers to making a determination that a faculty member has been incompetent for several years. UCAP suggests that the phrase "several years" should be defined. Currently, there is no policy that indicates when a CAP can notify a faculty member that a serious lack of performance in teaching or research needs to be addressed. UCAP members noted that there may be differences at the campuses that require flexibility, such that "several years" might best be defined in each campus's yearly published academic review procedures. The committee also agreed that from a legal perspective concerning due process, it might be helpful for campuses to be able to point to guidelines and a clear timetable.

### **Academic Personnel Dossier Logistics**

Because a considerable portion academic personnel action materials have migrated from physical to electronic files, CAP is increasingly dependent on ready access to materials via computers and tablets via the internet. The transition has been less than seamless. This year, CAP undertook a number of discussions concerning relevant issues, and engaged in further discussions with Academic Senate staff and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and her office staff. A variety of minor improvements were suggested for MyInfoVault, and CAP hopes that the VPAA's office will implement these suggestions as time and resources permit. The more formidable problem concerns access to academic personnel files, which are now almost completely archived in the campus's Electronic Database Management System (EDMS). This system was originally designed for mainframe and associated terminal use. The EDMS software is old-fashioned, and because it is not designed as an internet platform, it is not easily adopted to the proliferation of alternative computers and tablets. Substantial efforts undertaken this year improved EDMS access for members of CAP. The antiquated character of the EDMS, however, is not likely to see near-term improvement, and its present version undermines the effective use of CAP members' time reviewing cases.

### **Acknowledgments**

CAP would like to express appreciation to the Academic Senate staff – in particular, CAP staff analyst Solomon Bekele for his excellent professional service. We are also grateful to Kimberly Pulliam for providing staff support during Solomon Bekele's absence for vacation. CAP also thanks Gina Anderson and Edwin Arevalo for their management efforts, especially in relation to issues concerning data access. CAP would also like to thank Vice Provost Maureen Stanton and her staff. It has been a real pleasure to work with all of these people.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Hall  
Chair, 2012-2013

APPENDIX A: CAP ACTIONS

	Recommended Positive	Modified Actions @	Recommended Negative	Pending
<b>Appointments (68)</b>				
Assistant Professor (10)	8	2	0	
Associate Professor (12)	7	3	2	
Professor (14)	12	1	1	
Via Change in Title (10)	9	1	0	
Initial Continuing Non-Senate (11)	10	1	0	
Endowed Chair	11	0	0	
<b>Promotions (118)</b>				
Associate Professor (67)	49	9	9	
Professor (51)	31	12	7	1
<b>Merit Increases (160)</b>				
Continuing Lecturer (4)	0	3	1*	
Assistant Professor (2)	0	2	0	
Associate Professor (21)	15	2	4	
Professor, Step V to VI (53)	33	5	15	
Professor, Step IX to Above Scale (24)	15	1	8	
Professor, Above Scale (19)	12	1	4	2
**Other Merits (37)	22	12	2	1*
<b>Miscellaneous Actions (103)</b>				
Reconsiderations (7)	3	1	3	
Lecturer, SOE (1)	0	1	0	
Senior Lecturer, SOE (1)	1	0	0	
Career Equity Reviews (1)	0	1	0	
Emeritus (10)	10	0	0	
TOE Screenings (3)	3	0	0	
POP Screenings (6)	6	0	0	
Appraisals*** (48)	16+	29^	1-	2~
Five-Year Reviews (16)	10	1++	5	
Third-Year Deferrals (10)	5	0	5	
<b>Grand Total = 449</b>				

\* Split (4:4, w/one absent).

\*\* Merit increase for FPC members, Deans, Assoc. Deans, and Dept. Chairs.

\*\*\* + = positive; ^ = Mixed; - = Negative; ~ = Guarded.

@ Modified actions are those CAP recommendations that differed from what was proposed, i.e., instead of a promotion a merit increase was recommended.

++ Advancement recommended.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCELERATED ACTIONS (not including retroactive merits)

Acceleration Proposed	Yes	No	Other	Split	Pending	Total
1-yr	31	10	8	1	1	51
2-yr	3	5	7	0	0	15
3-yr	3	2	8	1	0	14
4-yr	0	1	3	0	0	4
5-yr	1	0	1	0	0	2

APPENDIX C: REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

College/Div/ School [total]	FPC			Dean's Decision		Actions w/o FPC Input	
	Yes	No	Split	Yes	No	Yes	No
CAES [54]	49	5		51	3	0	0
CBS [21]*	15	2		15	2	3	0
EDU [8]*	4	0		4	0	3	0
ENG [48]*	33	7		36	4	7	0
GSM [13]	8	0		7	1	5	0
HArCS [38]	20	2		20	2	16	0
MPS [45]^	5	9		35	4	6	0
SS [44]	26	6	1	32	1	11	0
LAW [6]	4	0		4	0	2	0
SOM [118]&	103	12		103	12		
VM [41]*	32	3		33	2	5	0
<b>Total [429]</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>

\* One action was reviewed by CAP as candidate was an FPC member.

^ Data on FPC vote unavailable for 25 cases.

& Three cases are pending.

**APPENDIX D:  
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES 2012-2013**

**COLLEGE OF AG. & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES**

Rachael Goodhue (A&RE)- Chair  
Patricia Oteiza (Nutrition)  
Thomas Adams (Animal Science)  
John Largier (Env. Science & Policy)  
Wendy Silk (LAWR)  
Emilio Laca (Plant Sciences)

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

Zhaojun Bai (Computer Sci) - Chair  
Ken Giles (Biol. & Ag Eng)  
Pieter Stroeve (Chem Eng & Materials Sci)  
Laura Marcu (Biomedical Eng)  
Timothy Ginn (Civil & Environ Eng)  
Rida Farouki (Mechanical & Aerospace Eng)  
Chen-Nee Chuah (Electrical & Computer Eng)

**COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE**

***Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies - HARCS***

Scott Shershow (English) - Chair  
Yvette Flores (Chicana/o Studies)  
Peter Lichtenfels (Theatre & Dance)  
Alexander Soshnikov (Math)  
Mike Saler (History)

***Social Sciences - SS***

Lynne Isbell (Anthropology) - Chair  
Gregory Clark (Economics)  
Mike Saler (History)  
Peter Lichtenfels (Theatre & Dance)  
Dean Tantillo (Chemistry)

***Mathematical & Physical Sciences - MPS***

Motohico Mulase (Mathematics) - Chair  
Alexander Soshnikov (Math)  
Dean Tantillo (Chemistry)  
Yvette Flores (Chicana/o Studies)  
Gregory Clark (Economics)

**COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES**

Richard Grosberg (Evol & Ecol) - Chair  
Raymond Rodriguez (Cell & Molecular Biol.)  
Stacey Harmer (Plant Biology)  
Mitchell Singer (Microbiology)  
Gregg Reconzone (NPB)

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT**

Vicki Smith - Sociology - Chair  
Chih-Ling Tsai (GSM)  
David Woodruff (GSM)

**SCHOOL OF LAW**

Gail Goodman (Psychology) - Chair  
Lisa Pruitt  
Miguel Mendez  
Tom Joo  
Andres Resendez (History)

**SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

Deborah Diercks (Emergency Medicine) - Chair  
David Rocke (Public Health Sciences)  
Kermit Carraway (Biochemistry & Molecular Medicine)  
Stuart Cohen (Internal Medicine)  
Shirley Luckhart (Microbiology & Immunology)  
Neal Fleming (Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine)  
Edward Pugh (Cell Biology & Human Anatomy)  
Susanna Park (Ophthalmology)  
Philip Wolinsky (Orthopedic Surgery)

**SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**

Birgit Puschner - Molecular Biosciences - Chair  
Mark Anderson - CAHFS/PMI  
Larry Cowgill (Medicine & Epidemiology)  
Peter Pascoe (Surg. & Radiological Sci.)  
Clare Yellowley-Genetos (Anatomy, Phys. Cell Biol)

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

Keith Widaman (Psychology) - Chair  
Cristina Gonzalez (Education)  
Peter Mundy (Education)

## APPENDIX E:

### PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.
2. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.
3. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.
4. Reviewing proposed skip-step accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.
5. Reviewing appraisals for mid-career assistant professors.
6. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.
7. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.
8. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.
9. Conducting annual post-factum audits of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.
10. Approving departmental voting procedures.
11. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.
12. Conducting career equity reviews when requested by faculty or Deans.
13. Reviewing first continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers and accelerated merits for continuing lecturers.

## School of Medicine Bylaw and Regulation Revisions

1. Regulation 60(A)(3): Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine, Exceptions to the Required Clinical Curriculum  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: November 15, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**
2. Bylaw 4.224: Committee on Educational Policy, Membership and Authority  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: November 15, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**
3. Bylaw 4.225: Committee on Student Progress (CSP), Streamline Processes  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: February 16, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**
4. Bylaw 4.225: Committee on Student Progress (CSP), revisions to Grade Change Appeals  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: February 16, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**
5. Regulation 60 and Regulation 76: Clarification on Courses and Credit Units  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: February 16, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**
6. Bylaw 4.223: Admissions Committee, Membership, Duties and Responsibilities  
**Approved by School of Medicine Faculty: February 16, 2013**  
**Reviewed and approved by CERJ: February 4, 2014**

PROPOSED REGULATION CHANGES  
SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY (CEP)

PROPOSAL #1: EXCEPTIONS TO THE REQUIRED CLINICAL  
CURRICULUM

General Faculty Meeting  
on October 23, 2013

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) recommends revisions to Regulations 60(A)(3), “Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine,” of the SOM Bylaws and Regulations.

**Rationale:** Our curriculum is undergoing revitalization and the door has opened to an evolutionary process as new specialized clinical tracks or programs are introduced. One of CEP’s responsibilities is to ensure that the new tracks satisfactorily address all our graduation competencies and milestones, and we can do that. The challenge is conforming to Regulation 60(A)(3) which refers to a “required clinical curriculum” with the implication that there is one standard. The new clinical tracks variously have had different time frames and different packaging to achieve the graduation competencies and external regulatory requirements. CEP proposes that the attached revision to Regulation 60(A)(3) will allow CEP the latitude to assess new tracks in a facile and effective manner.

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

60. Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine.

(A) Academic requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine are:

- (1) Students are expected to adhere to a schedule that will result in graduation 4 years after matriculation. Requests for exception to this 4-year rule require approval by the Committee on Student Promotions. Standing exceptions include approved leaves and approved dual degree programs/research tracks which require a modified curriculum. Committee on Student Promotions’ recommendations that involve/require extensions of the 4-year rule are de facto approval of the extension of time. (Am. 11/5/85, 12/31/94, 3/26/07, 11/19/10, 2/17/13)
- (2) The candidate must have completed and successfully passed the “Pre-Clerkship Curriculum” before beginning the “Required Clinical Curriculum.” The candidate must have taken and passed Step I of the United States Medical Licensing Examination before continuing the courses of the “Required Clinical Curriculum” unless a specific exception is granted by the Committee on Student Promotions for extenuating circumstances. The candidate must have taken and passed Step II, both Clinical Knowledge and Clinical Skills components, prior to graduation. (Am. 6/22/81, 5/27/92, 6/14/99, 6/27/02, 3/26/07, 2/17/13)
- (3) The candidate must have satisfactorily completed the “Required Clinical Curriculum”, including clerkships and courses. Exceptions to this require specific approval by the Committee on Educational Policy. Standing exceptions include approved dual degree programs and clinical tracks which require a modified curriculum. (Am. 8/22/80, 12/31/94, 3/26/07, 2/17/13)
- (4) The candidate must have behaved and performed in a manner consistent with professional standards necessary for the practice of medicine, and must have achieved the general competencies required by the School of Medicine, including established competencies in patient care, medical knowledge, interpersonal and communication skills, professionalism, system-based practice, and life-long learning skills. (En. 7/1/82, Am. 11/5/85, 3/26/07, 2/17/13)

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES  
SUBMITTED BY THE FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

General Faculty Meeting  
on October 23, 2013

PROPOSAL #2: COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (CEP)  
MEMBERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

**Rationale for the changes:**

LCME ED-33 states that a school of medicine's curriculum committee should be empowered "through bylaws or decanal mandate, to work in the best interests of the institution without regard for parochial or political influences or departmental pressures." Dean Servis made a strong case to the FEC that our current bylaws are likely to be found unacceptable during the upcoming LCME site visit since they do not give sufficient authority to the CEP to make changes to the curriculum. In particular, section 4.22425 states that any significant changes must be approved by a faculty vote:

4.22425 To prepare for the vote of the Faculty pursuant to articles 4.22122 and 5.1 proposals for major changes in the curriculum or course structure involving a change of more than one credit unit of a required course or change of the year a required course is offered, or the addition of a new required course. (En. 3/20/98)

One option considered by the FEC was to delete this section all together. This would give our CEP total authority over curriculum changes, not unlike the CEP at our sister institution in San Francisco. However, this proposed change was met with significant opposition when presented to IORs from the first and second years. The sampled IORs were leery of changes to their courses being made without their input by a CEP that may be chaired by someone influenced by a personal, decanal or departmental agenda. A compromise was then reached to amend section 4.22425 by requiring CEP to gain the approval of the FEC prior to changing the curriculum (as opposed to a school-wide Senate vote). Similar safeguards are in place at other UC medical schools; as the voting members of the FEC are all members of the Academic Senate, this assures that curriculum changes proposed by CEP, which will have Federation members, are approved by a body that represents the Senate. In addition, CEP itself will be composed of the IORs of the required courses as well as a representative from the fourth year. This will guarantee the participation of IORs in the decision making processes underlying future proposed changes to the medical curriculum. Other changes to section 4.224 concern terms of service that no longer apply. The FEC approved this version of the bylaws by a unanimous vote. The FEC would also like to see a two-step implementation of this change: Section 4.22425 would go into effect as soon as a positive vote and the language of the bylaws are approved by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction, and the remainder of the changes would go into effect on July 1, 2014, so that the current CEP can finish out its regular term. This plan was also approved by the FEC by a unanimous vote.

## 4.224 Committee on Educational Policy

### 4.2241 Membership

4.22411 The Committee shall consist of ~~at least nine faculty members representative of the courses of all four years. At least two thirds of the Committee's members, including its chair, shall be members of the Academic Senate. At least one member shall also be a member of the Faculty Executive Committee.~~ **the Instructor of Record (or a co-Instructor of Record) from each of the courses and clerkships required for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine, and the Chair of the Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee. Instructors of Record with Dean-level appointments are to serve without vote.** (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98, 6/22/01, 11/19/10)

4.22412 One or two Dean-level administrative officers whose portfolios include medical education and the curriculum, to serve *ex officio* and without vote. (Am. 1/19/79; 12/31/94; 11/30/07)

4.22413 One medical student representative and one alternate from each class, selected by that class and appointed by the Committee on Committees, to serve without vote. (Am. 12/14/76; 11/5/85; 12/31/94, 3/20/98, 11/19/10)

4.22414 ~~Faculty membership on the Committee shall be for a term of three years. (Am. 12/31/94)~~ **The Chair of the Committee shall be a member of the Academic Senate, and will be selected annually from the voting membership of the Committee by the Committee on Committees.**

4.22415 The Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee shall be composed of at least three Instructors of Record or department representatives of clinical clerkships. Faculty members of the Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years. One faculty member who serves on the Committee on Student Progress shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee on Student Progress to serve on the Subcommittee. One Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes medical education or student affairs shall also serve on the Subcommittee *ex officio* and without vote. The Chair of the Subcommittee shall be nominated **annually** by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22416 The Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee will be composed of at least two current Committee faculty members familiar with the curriculum, one from Basic Science and one from Clinical Science courses. ~~Faculty members of the Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years.~~ The Subcommittee shall include at least one medical student representative from each medical school class, if feasible. The Chair of the Subcommittee shall be a member of the Committee, and shall be nominated **annually** by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22417 The Block Council shall be composed of at least one Instructor of Record from each of the first three curricular years. In addition, the Chair of the Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee shall serve on the Block Council. ~~The Block Council is appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years.~~ The Chair of the Block Council shall be a member of the Committee, and shall be nominated **annually** by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22418 The Curriculum Review Subcommittee shall be composed of at least two members of the Committee, one member of the Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee, and at least one Instructor of Record from each of the first three curricular years. A Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes medical education shall serve *ex officio* and without vote. A faculty representative of the School of Nursing and an extramural faculty member with expertise in medical education shall serve in an advisory capacity and without vote. In addition, the Subcommittee shall include two medical student representatives selected by the Chair. Faculty members of

the Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee. The Chair of the Subcommittee shall be a member of the Committee, and shall be nominated **annually** by the Chair for approval by the Committee on Committees.

#### 4.2242 Duties and Responsibilities

4.22421 To define and implement, with the consent of the Faculty Senate, the goals, objectives, and structure of the curriculum including the competencies, attitudes, skills, and knowledge expected of each student. (En. 3/20/98)

4.22422 To oversee curricula and evaluate course content on the basis of definitions derived per 4.22421, to identify areas of deficiency and redundancy in the curriculum, and to work with instructors to correct these where appropriate. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98)

4.22423 To assign, with the consent of the departments involved, the responsibility for teaching of curricular areas. (En. 3/20/98)

4.22424 To assess teaching and student evaluation methods and to establish teaching and student evaluation guidelines for instructors. (En. 3/20/98)

4.22425 To prepare for the vote of the Faculty **Executive Committee** pursuant to ~~articles 4.22122 and 5.1~~ proposals for major changes in the curriculum or course structure involving a change of more than one credit unit of a required course or change of the year a required course is offered, or the addition of a new required course. (En. 3/20/98)

4.22426 To report to the Faculty Executive Committee unresolved problems in the teaching of the curriculum. (En. 3/20/98)

4.22427 To consult with the Admissions Committee on the academic prerequisites for admission, and to recommend any changes to the Faculty Executive Committee. (Am. 12/31/94)

4.22428 To recommend to appropriate faculty criteria for the evaluation and promotion of students. (Am. 12/14/76; 3/20/98)

4.22429 To recommend to appropriate faculty criteria for student evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Am. 12/14/76; 12/31/94; 3/20/98)

4.22430 The Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee is responsible for approval of fourth year curriculum programs submitted by students and their advisors and making recommendations for changes to the Committee in fourth year requirements. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22431 The Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee is an advisory subcommittee responsible for periodic, in-depth evaluation of courses and clerkships. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22432 The Block Council is an advisory subcommittee responsible for integration of the curriculum for the first three years. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.22433 The Curriculum Review Subcommittee is an advisory subcommittee responsible for a comprehensive review of the curriculum for the medical degree every two years to evaluate the coherence, coordination and effectiveness of the curriculum.

# **UC DAVIS** *SCHOOL OF MEDICINE*

## **Bylaws and Regulations**

# Table of Contents

## BYLAWS OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Article 1.0	Function	3
Article 2.0	Membership	3
Article 3.0	Officers	3
Article 4.0	Organization	4
4.22	Standing Committees of the School of Medicine	5
4.221	Executive Committee	5
4.222	Committee on Committees	6
4.223	Admissions Committee	6
4.224	Committee on Educational Policy	8
4.225	Committee on Student <a href="#">ProgressPromotions</a>	10
4.226	Committee for Research Affairs	11
4.227	Health Sciences Library Committee	11
4.228	Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization	12
4.229	Committee for Honors and Awards	12
4.230	Committee on Faculty Affairs	13
4.231	Research Space Advisory Committee	13
4.232	Research Space Allocation Appeals Committee	13
Article 5.0	Meetings of the Faculty	14
Article 6.0	Amendment of Bylaws and Regulations	15

## REGULATIONS OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Regulation 50	Admissions	16
Regulation 60	Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine	16
Regulation 70	Grades and Grading	16
Regulation 76	Courses and Credit Units	19
Regulation 80	Remediation, Probation, Dismissal and Appeal	19

# Bylaws of the School of Medicine

## Article 1.0 Function

The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall form and conduct the governance of the School of Medicine, subject to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate of the University of California.

## Article 2.0 Membership

- 2.1 The President of the University *ex officio*. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 2.2 The Chancellor of the Davis campus *ex officio*. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 2.3 The Deans of the Schools, Colleges and Divisions of the Davis campus *ex officio*. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 2.4 Academic Senate Faculty of the School of Medicine. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)
- 2.5 Faculty of the School of Medicine in all other series. (Am. 12/31/94, 6/22/01, 11/19/10)

## Article 3.0 Officers

- 3.1 The officers of the Faculty shall consist of a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, and a Secretary.
  - 3.11 Chairperson
    - 3.111 The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall elect from its elected membership a Chairperson.
    - 3.112 The Chairperson of the Executive Committee shall serve as the Chairperson of the Faculty.
  - 3.12 Vice Chairperson
    - 3.121 The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall elect from its elected membership a Vice Chairperson.
    - 3.122 The Vice Chairperson of the Executive Committee shall serve as the Vice Chairperson of the Faculty, and shall act on behalf of the Chairperson in his/her absence.
    - 3.123 The Vice Chairperson of the Faculty shall serve as an *ex officio* member of the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#).
  - 3.13 Secretary
    - 3.131 The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall elect from its elected membership a Secretary.
    - 3.132 The Secretary of the Executive Committee shall serve as the Secretary of the Faculty.
    - 3.133 The Secretary of the Faculty shall:
      - 3.1331 Maintain minutes of all Faculty and Executive Committee meetings.
      - 3.1332 Maintain a current roster of the membership of the Faculty.
      - 3.1333 Make arrangements for elections and meetings of the Faculty and the Executive Committee.
      - 3.1334 Serve as *ex officio* member of the Admissions Steering Committee. (Am. 3/20/98)

Article 4.0 Organization

4.1 The Faculty shall be organized into three/four Groups in order to facilitate Faculty elections and interaction in areas of mutual concern. These Groups and their constituent departments are:

4.11 **The Preclinical Sciences:**  
Biological Chemistry and Molecular Medicine  
Cell Biology and Human Anatomy  
Physiology and Membrane Biology  
Medical Microbiology and Immunology  
Pharmacology and Toxicology  
(Am. 12/31/94; 3/1/04)

4.12 **The Medical Clinical Sciences:**  
Dermatology  
Emergency Medicine  
Family and Community Medicine  
Internal Medicine  
Neurology  
Pediatrics  
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation  
Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences  
Public Health Sciences  
(Am. 12/31/94; 11/22/96, 6/28/04; 7/1/04)

4.13 **The Surgical Clinical Sciences:**  
Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine  
Neurological Surgery  
Obstetrics/Gynecology  
Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences  
Orthopaedic Surgery  
Otolaryngology  
Pathology and Laboratory Medicine  
Radiation Oncology  
Radiology  
Surgery  
Urology  
(Am. 10/28/83; 11/22/96; 3/1/04; 8/4/04)

4.14 Faculty with appointments in the School of Medicine with Academic Senate titles who also hold appointments in the VA Northern California Health Care System. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)

4.15 Additions or deletions from these groups will be made in accordance with Article 4.22123. (Am. 12/31/94)

4.2 Committees

4.21 Appointments, Tenure, Quorum, and Voting. (Am. 11/19/10)

4.211 Except for the Executive Committee or as otherwise indicated in these Bylaws, all Standing Committees of the Faculty shall be appointed annually prior to July 1. (Am. 12/31/94)

4.212 Ad hoc Committees may be appointed by the Executive Committee, who shall designate chairpersons for these committees, and the duration of the committees. (Am. 12/31/94, 6/22/01, 11/19/10)

4.213 Except for the Executive Committee, all Committees of the Faculty shall have a quorum defined as a simple majority of the voting members. (En. 6/22/01)

4.214 All members of the Standing Committees of the Faculty and Ad hoc Committees appointed by the Executive Committee, unless otherwise indicated in these Bylaws, may vote on questions that will be referred to the Faculty Executive Committee for approval and on

Representative Assembly

2/24/2014 25

questions that will be referred for final Academic Senate action to another Academic Senate agency. Voting rights are extended to Faculty who are non-members of the Academic Senate to the fullest degree permitted by Legislative Ruling 12.75 of the Academic Senate of the University, which states that “Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies when those agencies 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 Senate. 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.” (En.11/19/10)

#### 4.22 Standing Committees of the Faculty

##### 4.221 **Executive Committee**

4.2211 Membership: The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall consist of the following members: (Am. 6/5/78; 7/14/79; 12/31/94)

4.22111 Six faculty, who are members of the Academic Senate and who hold the rank of Associate Professor or above, but do not hold an appointment as dean, shall be elected: two each by the Faculty of the Preclinical Sciences, the Medical Clinical Sciences and the Surgical Clinical Sciences. One member from each group shall be elected each year for a two-year term of office. No individual shall serve more than two consecutive terms. Only one faculty member from a department may represent a Group on the Executive Committee at one time. For the purpose of these elections, organized divisions having three or more faculty members will be considered as departments. (Am. 7/1/83; 12/31/94)

4.22112 The Dean of the School of Medicine *ex officio*, who may delegate his/her proxy, to serve without vote. (Am. 12/31/94; 11/30/07)

4.22113 Two faculty, who are members of the Academic Senate and who do not also hold an appointment as dean, shall be elected at-large from and by the entire faculty. The term of office shall be two years. One at-large member shall be elected each year. (Am. 7/22/80; 7/1/83; 12/31/94)

4.22114 One member of the faculty with appointment in the School of Medicine who also holds an appointment in the VA Northern California System of Hospitals and Clinics at the Associate Professor level or higher, who is a member of the Academic Senate but does not hold an appointment as dean, shall be elected every other year by the members of the faculty who hold appointment in the VA Northern California System of Hospitals and Clinics. (En. 7/1/83; Am. 12/31/94)

4.22115 The Chief of the Medical Staff UCD Medical Center *ex officio*. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 7/14/83)

4.22116 One member from the non-Academic Senate faculty, to be elected by non-Academic Senate faculty every other year, to serve without vote. The term of office shall be two years. (En. 12/31/94)

4.22117 The immediate past Chairperson of the Faculty *ex officio*. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 7/14/83; 12/31/94)

4.22118 Election to the Executive Committee shall be in accord with the following:

4.221181 Each of the constituent groups shall elect one member of the Executive Committee annually. Prior to the last week of April, the Secretary of the Faculty will solicit nominations by mail from all voting members of each

group. No nominations will be accepted after May 10. A ballot will be prepared by the Secretary listing all nominees and distributed to voting members of the appropriate group by mail. Ballots shall be returned within 14 working days to be valid. In the event of no nominee gaining a plurality of votes, election shall be determined by a runoff election between the 2 persons receiving the largest number of votes. (Am. 7/1/83; 12/31/94)

4.2212 Duties and Responsibilities. This Committee shall:

- 4.22121 Consider all matters of general concern to the Faculty.
- 4.22122 Bring before the Faculty any recommendations generated by it, by the other Standing Committees and by Special Committees of the Faculty.
- 4.22123 Make recommendations to the Faculty concerning the disposition of existing or new departments and organized divisions into groups defined in Article 4.0.
- 4.22124 Circulate to the Faculty all important motions at least two days in advance of the regular meeting of the Faculty.
- 4.22125 Act for the Faculty within the Bylaws and Regulations of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. All actions taken on behalf of the Faculty shall be reported to the Faculty at the next meeting. (En. 6/5/78)
- 4.22126 Appoint ad hoc committees as necessary. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22127 Approve for the Faculty all questions voted on by the Standing Committees of the Faculty and Ad hoc Committees appointed by the Executive Committee, and to submit the approved questions to the Dean of the School of Medicine and/or his/her proxy as indicated in the Bylaws. (En.11/19/10)

4.2213 The quorum for the Executive Committee shall be one-half plus one of the elected voting members. (En. 6/5/78; 12/31/94; 11/22/96)

4.222 **Committee on Committees**

4.2221 Membership: The members of the Executive Committee.

4.2222 The Chairperson of the Executive Committee shall act as Chairperson of the Committee on Committees.

4.2223 Duties and Responsibilities

- 4.22231 Appointment of all Standing Committees of the Faculty.
- 4.22232 Appointment of other committees. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22233 Selection of chairpersons of all Standing and other committees except as specified otherwise in the Bylaws.
- 4.22234 Appointment of replacements for the Executive Committee from the appropriate Group and for members elected at-large in the event of a vacancy. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 11/75; 12/31/94)

4.223 **Admissions Committee**

4.2231 Membership

4.22311 Each member of the Admissions Committee will belong to one or  
Representative Assembly

more of the subcommittees described below. (Am. 6/5/78; 7/14/79; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06)

- 4.22312 The Committee and subcommittees shall be chaired by an Academic Senate faculty member, with some of the subcommittees chaired by the Chair of the Admissions Committee (where noted). (Am. 12/31/94; 11/17/06; 11/30/07; 6/25/08)
- 4.22313 Unless specifically stated otherwise below, membership on the Committee shall be for a term of three years with a renewal option by the Committee on Committees. Members shall represent the diversity of the faculty with participation from both basic and clinical sciences. The subcommittees may include volunteer clinical faculty and other non-Senate faculty. Housestaff officer/fellow and medical student terms will be conditional based on feasibility, being one year with the option of renewing twice. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22314 All appointments will be carried out by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Dean-level administrative officer with the most appropriate portfolio (hereafter referred to as the “Dean of Admissions”). (Am. 6/25/08)
- 4.22315 A Steering Subcommittee shall include the chairs of all subcommittees described below (Screening, Selection, Interview, and Policy). The Secretary of the Faculty and the Dean of Admissions shall serve ex officio, the latter without vote. The Chair of the Admissions Committee shall chair the Steering Subcommittee. (En. 11/5/85; Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06; 11/30/07; 6/25/08)
- 4.22316 A Screening Subcommittee will consist of at least seven faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. It shall also include, if feasible, one or more senior housestaff officers/fellows and a medical student. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22317 The Interview Subcommittee will consist of at least seven faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. It shall include, if feasible, one or more housestaff officers/fellows and a medical student. The subcommittee will be chaired by the Chair of Admissions. (Am. 6/25/08)
- 4.22318 One or more Selection Subcommittees will consist of at least four faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. The Subcommittees shall also include two student representatives and a housestaff officers/fellow, if feasible. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22319 A Policy Subcommittee with at least four faculty members, two of whom belong to the Academic Senate, shall be convened from Admission Committee members from above, ad hoc. The subcommittee will also have a student and housestaff officer/fellow representative from above, if feasible. The subcommittee will be chaired by the Chair of Admissions. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22320 A Rural-PRIME (Program in Medical Education) Admission Subcommittee will consist of at least four faculty members, two of whom belong to the Academic Senate. It shall also include two student representatives and a housestaff officer/fellow, if feasible. (Am. 6/25/08)
- 4.2232 Duties and Responsibilities
  - 4.22321 The Committee shall evaluate the credentials of applicants for admission to the School of Medicine. It will meet at least once each Representative Assembly

year (a joint meeting of all of the subcommittees) to hear reports from each subcommittee chair. It will also provide an annual report to the Faculty Executive Committee. (Am. 6/5/78; 11/17/06)

- 4.22322 The Steering Subcommittee will provide oversight and integration of the admissions process, inform changes as necessary, and make the final recommendation regarding admissions taking into consideration the advice of the Selection Subcommittee(s) (see 4.22324). Its recommendations for admissions will be submitted to the Executive Committee for expeditious approval, who in turn will submit approved recommendations to the Dean of Admissions and the Dean of the School of Medicine. It will also provide advice to the Selection Subcommittee(s) on questions raised. The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly. (Am. 11/17/06, 11/19/10)
- 4.22323 The Screening Subcommittee will conduct initial screening of applications and prioritize applicants for interviews by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. (En. 11/17/06)
- 4.22324 The Interview Subcommittee will undergo training on methods, conduct interviews and prioritize applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. (Am. 6/25/08)
- 4.22325 The Selection Subcommittee(s) will review all data available during the admissions process and assemble a list of applicants whose acceptance is recommended, ranked numerically in order of overall preference, and present this information to the Steering Subcommittee and the Dean of Admissions. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22326 The Policy Subcommittee shall assess, review, and enhance the admissions process in coordination with the other admissions subcommittees. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)
- 4.22327 The Rural-PRIME (Program in Medical Education) Admission Subcommittee will screen, interview and prioritize applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. Applicants will need to be accepted for MD and Rural-PRIME criteria sets, with the Selection Subcommittees determining the former and the Rural-PRIME Subcommittee determining the latter. (Am. 6/25/08)

4.224 **Committee on Educational Policy**

4.2241 Membership

- 4.22411 The Committee shall consist of at least nine faculty members representative of the courses of all four years. At least two-thirds of the Committee's members, including its chair, shall be members of the Academic Senate. At least one member shall also be a member of the Faculty Executive Committee. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98, 6/22/01, 11/19/10)
- 4.22412 One or two Dean-level administrative officers whose portfolios include medical education and the curriculum, to serve *ex officio* and without vote. (Am. 1/19/79; 12/31/94; 11/30/07)
- 4.22413 One medical student representative and one alternate from each class, selected by that class and appointed by the Committee on Committees, to serve without vote. . (Am. 12/14/76; 11/5/85; 12/31/94, 3/20/98, 11/19/10)

- 4.22414 Faculty membership on the Committee shall be for a term of three years. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22415 The Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee shall be composed of at least three Instructors of Record or department representatives of clinical clerkships. Faculty members of the Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years. One faculty member who serves on the Committee on Student ~~Progress~~ Promotions shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee on Student ~~Progress~~ Promotions to serve on the Subcommittee. One Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes medical education or student affairs shall also serve on the Subcommittee *ex officio* and without vote. The Chair of the Subcommittee shall be nominated by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)
- 4.22416 The Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee will be composed of at least two current Committee faculty members familiar with the curriculum, one from Basic Science and one from Clinical Science courses. Faculty members of the Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years. The Subcommittee shall include at least one medical student representative from each medical school class, if feasible. The Chair of the Subcommittee shall be a member of the Committee, and shall be nominated by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)
- 4.22417 The Block Council shall be composed of at least one Instructor of Record from each of the first three curricular years. In addition, the Chair of the Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee shall serve on the Block Council. The Block Council is appointed by the Chair of the Committee for a term of three years. The Chair of the Block Council shall be a member of the Committee, and shall be nominated by the Chair of the Committee for approval by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 2/23/09)
- 4.2242 Duties and Responsibilities
- 4.22421 To define and implement, with the consent of the Faculty Senate, the goals, objectives, and structure of the curriculum including the competencies, attitudes, skills, and knowledge expected of each student. (En. 3/20/98)
- 4.22422 To oversee curricula and evaluate course content on the basis of definitions derived per 4.22421, to identify areas of deficiency and redundancy in the curriculum, and to work with instructors to correct these where appropriate. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98)
- 4.22423 To assign, with the consent of the departments involved, the responsibility for teaching of curricular areas. (En. 3/20/98)
- 4.22424 To assess teaching and student evaluation methods and to establish teaching and student evaluation guidelines for instructors. (En. 3/20/98)
- 4.22425 To prepare for the vote of the Faculty pursuant to articles 4.22122 and 5.1 proposals for major changes in the curriculum or course structure involving a change of more than one credit unit of a required course or change of the year a required course is offered, or the addition of a new required course. (En. 3/20/98)
- 4.22426 To report to the Faculty Executive Committee unresolved problems in the teaching of the curriculum. (En. 3/20/98)

- 4.22427 To consult with the Admissions Committee on the academic prerequisites for admission, and to recommend any changes to the Faculty Executive Committee. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22428 To recommend to appropriate faculty criteria for the evaluation and promotion of students. (Am. 12/14/76; 3/20/98)
- 4.22429 To recommend to appropriate faculty criteria for student evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Am. 12/14/76; 12/31/94; 3/20/98)
- 4.22430 The Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee is responsible for approval of fourth year curriculum programs submitted by students and their advisors and making recommendations for changes to the Committee in fourth year requirements. (Am. 2/23/09)
- 4.22431 The Level Two Course Evaluation Subcommittee is an advisory subcommittee responsible for periodic, in-depth evaluation of courses and clerkships. (Am. 2/23/09)
- 4.22432 The Block Council is an advisory subcommittee responsible for integration of the curriculum for the first three years. (Am. 2/23/09)

4.225 **Committee on Student Progress Promotions**

4.2251 Membership

- 4.22511 Eight members of the Academic Senate will be named by the Committee on Committees for four-year-staggered terms, and members may be re-appointed for consecutive terms. Initial appointments shall be for a term of from one to four years to accommodate future four-year staggered terms. Members shall be faculty who ~~has~~ have been major contributors to the teaching of medical students. There shall at all times be at least two representatives of ~~the~~ basic science departments. Additionally, up to two non-Academic Senate faculty may be appointed. (En. 3/20/98, Am. 6/22/01, 11/19/10)
- 4.22512 One or two Dean-level administrative officers whose portfolios include curriculum and student affairs, *ex officio* and without vote, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty, *ex officio*. (Am. 1/19/79; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 11/30/07)
- 4.22513 The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Progress Promotions shall ~~be members who have been members of~~ have served on the Committee for at least one year and will be selected annually by the Committee on Committees. (En. 3/20/98; 3/26/07)

4.2252 Duties and Responsibilities (Am. 3/20/98)

- 4.22521 The Committee on Student Progress Promotions shall ensure the formulation and application of effective procedures for the evaluation of student performance, which is defined to include both academic achievement and professional competence, as stated in Regulation 70 (A).
- 4.22522 The Committee shall review the progress of all students and shall certify that each student has met the stated criteria for academic advancement in all phases of the curriculum. Academic advancement must be certified by the Committee for the promotion of students into the “Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses” (formerly years 3 & 4). (Am. 3/26/07)

- 4.22523 The Committee shall determine, in coordination with Instructors of Record, a course of remediation for each student for whom performance deficiencies have been identified, and shall notify those students with performance deficiencies, in writing, of the required course of remediation. (Am. 3/26/07)
- 4.22524 The Committee, at its discretion, may communicate with the appropriate Instructors of Record about the status of any student who is ~~on academic probation for performance deficiencies and/or professional competence experiencing academic difficulty and/or professional competence challenges~~. The Committee shall assist in determining a course of remediation (when appropriate) and monitoring of the students' performance or professional competence. (Am. 11/30/07)
- 4.22525 The Committee shall provide an opportunity for the student with performance deficiencies to bring a School of Medicine faculty member for personal support and the student's ~~academic career~~ advisor to meet with the Committee prior to a decision as to remediation or dismissal. (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- 4.22526 The Committee shall have the authority in accord with Regulation 80 to: 1) place a student on academic probation or warning, 2) establish the duration of warning or probation, 3) prescribe appropriate steps for the remediation of a student's performance deficiencies, 4) remove a student from academic probation or warning, and 5) to recommend dismissal of a student to the Executive ~~Committee~~ Associate Dean of the School of Medicine, who will be responsible for notifying the Dean of the School of Medicine of dismissals of which they approve in a timely fashion. (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- 
- 4.22527 Only if the majority of the Academic Senate members of the Committee on Student Promotions vote to dismiss, will the recommendation for dismissal be considered to have passed.
- ~~4.22527-22528~~ The Executive Associate Dean shall notify the student of the Executive Associate Dean's decision regarding dismissal within 10 working days of receiving the ~~approved recommendation of the Executive Committee~~ recommendation for dismissal from the Committee on Student Promotions. (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- ~~4.22528-9~~ The Committee shall consider and may meet with any students whose academic progress, although not failing, is such as to be a cause of concern that future difficulties may ensue, and ~~will provide the student guidance as to possible ways to be more successful may require the student to modify his/her curriculum to ensure a greater chance of success.~~
- ~~4.22529~~ 30 Annually, the Committee shall recommend to the Executive Committee the candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine. (Am. 11/19/10)
- ~~4.22530~~ 31 In the case of a successful appeal of dismissal from the School of Medicine or a reversal of the Committee's dismissal recommendation by the Executive Associate Dean, the Committee shall determine and approve the course of study required of the student in order to graduate from the School of Medicine. (Am. 3/26/07)
- ~~4.22531~~ 32 The Committee shall seek to ensure that course grades are reported to the student and to the School of Medicine Registrar in a timely manner. (Am. 3/26/07)

4.2261 Membership

4.22611 Nine or more individuals of any professorial category and may include individuals in the Professional Research Series. At least two-thirds of the Committee, including its chair, shall be members of the Academic Senate. The term of office normally shall be for three years. (Am. 12/31/94, 6/22/01, 11/19/10)

4.22612 The Dean-level administrative officer or officers (up to two) whose portfolios include research affairs *ex officio* and without vote. (Am. 12/31/94; 11/30/07)

4.2262 Duties and Responsibilities

4.22621 To review applications for research support awarded within the School of Medicine and UCDMC. (Am. 12/31/94)

4.22622 To advise the Executive Committee on matters relating to research. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)

4.22623 To review and recommend to the Executive Committee candidates from any of the medical classes or from the medical faculty for research awards. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)

4.227 **Health Sciences Library Committee**

(A joint committee with the School of Veterinary Medicine)

4.2271 Membership

4.22711 Six members, of any professorial category, shall be appointed; three from the School of Veterinary Medicine and three from the School of Medicine. Committee members from the School of Medicine shall be members of the Academic Senate. Additionally, two non-Academic Senate faculty members, one each from the School of Medicine and School of Veterinary Medicine may be appointed to serve without vote. The term of office normally shall be for three years. (Am. 1/19/79, 6/22/01, 11/14/08)

4.22712 One medical student representative from each class, if feasible, who shall be an associate member without vote, selected by that class and appointed by the Committee on Committees. (Am. 12/14/76; 12/31/94, 11/14/08)

4.22713 Up to two UC Davis Medical Center or UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine housestaff representatives, if feasible, may be appointed by the Committee on Committees. They shall be associate members without vote. The term of office normally shall be for one year. (Am. 11/14/08)

4.22714 The Health Sciences Librarian, *ex officio* and non-voting. (Am. 11/14/08)

4.22715 The Chair shall alternate between the two schools annually. (Am. 11/14/08)

4.2272 Duties and Responsibilities

To recommend on acquisitions, operating policy, capital improvements and personnel of the Health Science Libraries. (Am. 11/14/08)

4.228 **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization**

4.2281 Membership: Three or more members of the Academic Senate, (Am. 12/31/94)  
Representative Assembly

#### 4.2282 Duties and Responsibilities

- 4.22821 Upon request of the Faculty Executive Committee to view recommendations of Committees of the Faculty in order to assure consistency with existing rules and regulations of the School of Medicine. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22822 To assure due process for the consideration and adjudication of requests for grade changes in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 540(E) of the Davis Division. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 11/5/85; 12/31/94)

~~4.22823 To act as a Committee to evaluate and recommend action on formal appeals of dismissal as allowed by Regulation 80(D). (Am. 12/31/94, 3/20/98)~~

#### 4.229 Committee for Honors and Awards

##### 4.2291 Membership

- 4.22911 Two or more members of the Academic Senate and one or more members of the non-Senate faculty. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)
- 4.22912 Two student representatives, preferably from the third and fourth year medical classes, to be selected by the Chair and appointed by the Committee on Committees, to serve without vote. (Am. 12/31/94, 6/22/01, 2/23/09)

##### 4.2292 Duties and Responsibilities

- 4.22921 To develop and maintain an effective system for the distribution of honors and awards to students. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.22922 To select as recipients of awards those students in the senior class who have demonstrated consistent excellence. To recommend to the Executive Committee the distribution of such awards. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)
- 4.22923 To select and recommend to the Executive Committee recipients from any of the medical classes or medical faculty for specifically defined awards. (Am. 11/19/10)
- 4.22924 To advise on criteria for the establishment of new awards and guidelines for selecting recipients. (En. 8/22/80)

#### 4.230 Committee on Faculty Affairs

4.2301 Membership: At least four faculty at the full Professor rank, with appointment of emeriti faculty encouraged. At least three of the four shall be members of the Academic Senate... The term of office normally would be three years. (Am. 6/22/01, 11/19/10)

##### 4.2302 Duties and Responsibilities

- 4.23021 To act as an ombudsman.
- 4.23022 To advise the Executive Committee on publication matters such as plagiarism, censorship and right of authorship. (Am. 11/19/10)
- 4.23023 To advise the Executive Committee in matters involving academic freedom, including issues related to discrimination. (Am. 11/19/10)

4.23024 To consider appeals and special problems relating to faculty appointments and promotions.

4.23025 To consider other matters pertinent to faculty welfare. (Am. 6/14/96; 11/22/96)

**4.231 Research Space Advisory Committee**

4.2311 Membership

4.23111 Three or more faculty members with appointments in the School of Medicine with Academic Senate titles or adjunct professor titles at the associate or full professor rank. At least two-thirds of the Committee shall be members of the Academic Senate. Those with adjunct professor titles shall serve without vote. Deans are excluded from service on this committee. At least one member shall have a primary appointment in a preclinical department and at least one member shall have a primary appointment in a clinical department. The term of office normally shall be for three years. (Am. 6/22/01)

4.23112 The Dean-level administrative officer of officers (up to two) whose portfolios include research space, *ex officio* and without vote. (Am. 11/30/07)

4.2312 Duties and Responsibilities

4.23121 To advise the Executive Committee, who in turn will vote to approve and communicate this advice to the Dean or Deans with portfolios including research space on the setting of policy for allocation of research space to the Faculty of the School of Medicine, both preclinical and clinical, and to advise the Executive Committee, who in turn will vote to approve and communicate this advice to Dean or Deans with portfolios including research space regarding the implementation of these policies. (En. 11/22/96, 11/30/07, 11/19/10)

**4.232 Research Space Allocation Appeals Committee**

4.2321 Membership: Three or more faculty members with appointments in the School of Medicine with Academic Senate titles at the associate or full professor rank as defined in Standing Order of the Regents, 105.1. Department chairs and deans are excluded from service on this committee. At least one member shall have a primary appointment in a preclinical department and at least one member shall have a primary appointment in a clinical department. The term of office normally shall be for three years.

4.2322 Duties and Responsibilities

4.23221 To hear complaints and appeals of individual faculty members with regard to intradepartmental assignment of research space, and to transmit their findings and recommendations regarding such appeals to the Executive Committee, who in turn will vote to approve and communicate these findings and recommendations to the Dean or Deans with portfolios including research space and the department chair. (En. 11/22/96; 11/30/07, 11/19/10)

**Article 5.0 Meetings of the Faculty**

5.1 Ordinarily, the Faculty will meet quarterly with a minimum of two week's notice prior to each meeting. A meeting can conduct business with 10 percent of the Academic Senate Faculty, but all actions and/or decisions regarding substantive issues, including changes in Bylaws or Regulations and changes in the medical curriculum, shall be determined by a ballot of the Faculty. On those occasions when the Faculty vote on any matter for the Academic Senate or advising in the name of the Academic Senate, votes of Academic Senate and non-Academic Senate members shall be recorded separately. The specific votes of Academic

Senate members will be transmitted, together with the overall approval or disapproval of issues by the non-Senate members of the Faculty. (Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)

5.2 The agenda of a regular meeting of the Faculty shall include, in the following order:

Consideration of the minutes of the preceding Faculty meeting  
Announcements by the President of the University of California  
Announcements by the Chancellor of the Davis Campus  
Announcements by the Dean of the School of Medicine  
Announcements by the Director of Hospitals and Clinics  
Announcements by the Chairperson of the Faculty  
Reports of Standing Committees  
Reports of Special Committees  
Petitions of Students  
Unfinished Business  
New Business

5.3 The Chairperson of the Faculty shall preside. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson shall preside. Should the Vice Chairperson also be absent, the Secretary shall preside.

5.4 All Faculty members of the School of Medicine shall have the privilege of the floor. (Am. 12/31/94)

5.5 Robert's Rules of Order shall govern meetings of the Faculty and all meetings and activities of Committees herein allowed or specified. (Am. 12/31/94)

5.6 The Faculty may meet in special session with at least 24 hours notice, under the following circumstances:

5.61 After a call to meeting by the Chairperson.

5.62 After delivery to the Secretary of a written request.  
The request must:

5.621 Include the subject of the meeting and any resolutions proposed by those requesting the meeting.

5.622 Be signed by eight members of the Faculty. (Am. 11/19/10)

5.623 Be acted upon within 48 hours by the scheduling of a meeting to occur within five calendar days from receipt of the request.

5.63 The call to meeting shall include the subject of the meeting and any resolutions proposed by those requesting the meeting.

5.64 The agenda of a special session shall be confined to the subjects announced in the call to meeting and will not follow the provisions of Article 5.2 unless desired by a majority of those present.

Article 6.0 Amendments of Bylaws and Regulations

6.1 These Bylaws and Regulations may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Academic Senate Faculty casting ballots. A written notice of the proposed change must be transmitted to each member of the Faculty at least five calendar days before the meeting at which the change is considered. Voting shall be by ballots transmitted by the Secretary of the Faculty within ten calendar days after the meeting. Voting shall close 14 calendar days after transmission of the ballot. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 12/31/94, 11/19/10)

6.2 No change in the Bylaws may be made that will be in conflict with the Bylaws, Regulations, or Legislative Rulings of the Academic Senate of the University

## Regulations of the Faculty of the School of Medicine

50. (A) Admission to Regular Status. To be admitted to the School of Medicine, students must have completed successfully at least three academic years at the university level, and must have met other requirements prescribed by the Faculty of the School of Medicine. The Faculty may recommend to the Dean limiting the enrollment of students to a number consistent with the facilities available for instruction. (Am. 12/31/94)
- (B) Waiver of Academic Criteria for Admission. Waivers of the minimum academic criteria for admission to the School of Medicine are granted only by the Faculty of the School through the action of the Executive Committee. Waivers are considered only for individual applicants and upon request by the Chairperson of the Admissions Committee.
- (C) Admission to Advanced Standing. A student may be admitted by action of the Admissions Committee at a level more advanced than the regular entering level, but not beyond the beginning of Year Three, provided that the applicant meets the entrance requirements for regular status in the School of Medicine, the applicant has satisfactorily completed courses elsewhere that are substantially equivalent to those offered by the School of Medicine, and has met all other requirements necessary for the advanced status requested. An applicant for advanced standing may be required to pass a special examination to establish his/her qualifications for admission to Advanced Standing.

60. Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine.

(A) Academic requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine are:

- (1) Students are expected to adhere to a schedule that will result in graduation 4 years after matriculation. Requests for exception to this 4-year rule require approval by the Committee on Student Progress Promotions. ~~Failure to adhere to the 4-year timetable without written approval from the Committee on Student Progress may result in academic probation.~~ Standing exceptions include approved leaves and approved dual degree programs/research tracks which require a modified curriculum. Committee on Student Progress Promotions' recommendations that involve/require extensions of the 4-year rule are de facto approval of the extension of time. ~~Extension of the time allowed for satisfaction of the requirements for graduation beyond six years from time of matriculation will require specific action by the Committee on Student Progress.~~ (Am. 11/5/85; 12/31/94; 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- (2) The candidate must have completed and successfully passed the "Pre-Clerkship Curriculum" (formerly years (1 & 2) before beginning the "Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses" (formerly years 3 & 4). The candidate must have taken and passed Step I of the United States Medical Licensing Examination before continuing the courses of the "Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses," ~~unless a specific exception is granted by the Committee on Student Promotions for extenuating circumstances.~~ The candidate must have taken and passed Step II, both Clinical Knowledge and Clinical Skills components, prior to graduation. (Am. 6/22/81; 5/27/92; 6/14/99; 6/27/02; 3/26/07)
- (3) The candidate must have satisfactorily completed the required clinical clerkships at either the University of California Davis Medical Center (UCDMC) or other training sites in programs approved by the clerkship Instructors of Record and the Committee on Educational Policy. (Am. 8/22/80; 12/31/94; 3/26/07)
- (4) The candidate must have behaved and performed in a manner consistent with professional standards necessary for the practice of medicine, and must have achieved the general competencies required by the School of Medicine, including established

competencies in patient care, medical knowledge, interpersonal and communication skills, professionalism, system-based practice, life-long learning skills, and practice-based learning. (En. 7/1/82; Am. 11/5/85; 3/26/07)

- (B) Prior to graduation the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#) shall present to the Executive Committee of the Faculty the list of recommended candidates for their presentation to the Faculty for action. (Am. 12/31/94)

70. Grades and Grading.

- (A) The Instructor of Record of each course shall on or before the first day of instruction have provided to each student the goals and objectives of the course, including knowledge and performance standards, how the student is to be evaluated, and criteria for specific grades. The performance of a physician requires competency in interpersonal relations, integrity, dependability, communication and English language skills, as well as knowledge and technical skills. Therefore, the academic standards of every course, to the extent the course requires and can assess, shall include, but not be limited to: reliability in attendance and participation; respect for individuals; demeanor which engenders confidence by patients and colleagues; interaction and procedures with patients which are within legal and ethical bounds and meet requirements of professional supervision; ability to work effectively with classmates, faculty, and in clinical courses with housestaff, other health professionals and patients. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 3/26/07; Am. 6/19/09)
- (B) The work of all students in any of the required courses in the “Pre-Clerkship Curriculum” for the M.D. degree shall be reported only in terms of two grades, P (Pass) or F (Failure), or as one of three provisional marks: I (incomplete but work of passing quality), Y (provisional, work of non-passing quality), and IP (in progress). For the “Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses” the work shall be reported in three grades, H (Honors), P, or F, or as one of three provisional marks: I, Y, and IP. (Am. 12/2/88; 1/7/92; 12/31/94; 6/14/99; 11/20/00; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)
- (C) The provisional mark of Incomplete (I) shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete for good cause, as determined by the Instructor of Record. The student is entitled to replace the I by a P grade and to receive unit credit provided he/she satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the Instructor of Record. If course requirements have not been completed within the time limit specified by the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#), the Instructor of Record will submit an F grade. (Am. 7/1/83; 12/31/94; 3/26/07; 02/20/08)
- (D) The numerical scores for courses in the “Pre-Clerkship Curriculum”, which use quantitative measures of performance, will be retained by the Office of Medical Education for at least as long as a student remains in medical school. This information is for advising purposes, remediation plans, awards and honors, or for IRB-approved educational research purposes, and will not be recorded in official transcripts. (En. 11/20/00; Am. 3/26/07)
- (E) The Y is a provisional mark that will be assigned to allow a student the opportunity to remediate a deficiency and improve a failing grade. A P grade will be awarded with remediation of the Y. Failure to remediate the Y will result in an F grade. [Failing the remediation of an F grade will result in a 2<sup>nd</sup> F grade.](#) (Am. 7/1/83; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 6/14/99; 11/20/00; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

[\(1\)](#) Each student during the course of their School of Medicine training may be assigned the Y and given the opportunity to remediate this provisional mark for a maximum total of three courses. After three Ys are accumulated, further non-passing performance according to course criteria must be assigned the F grade. [Students who fail a Credit by Examination are not eligible to receive a Y mark \(see 76\(D\)\(c\)\).](#) (Am.

6/27/03; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

(2) For courses in the “Pre-Clerkship Curriculum”, ~~until the maximum number of three Ys allowed per student has been reached,~~ a student will be assigned a Y if they otherwise would have received an F grade following the completion of all required examinations, ~~with the exception of failure of a course taken by Credit by Examination [70(I)(3)].~~ This student is to be given the opportunity for reexamination within 30 days after grades are available to the student. The Instructor of Record must assign the final grade within 45 days of the original grade. The grade assigned following completion of the reexamination is to be based either solely on the results of the reexamination or on some aggregate of all examinations as specified by the Instructor of Record at the beginning of the course. If the student decides not to take the reexamination, the Instructor of Record must submit an F grade. (Am. 6/27/02; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

(3) For “Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses”, ~~until the maximum number of three Ys allowed per student has been reached,~~ the student is to be assigned ~~the a Y mark if:~~ a) they otherwise would have received an F grade ~~and if the Instructor of Record believes that the student might be able to meet satisfactorily the requirements of the clerkship by repeating part but not all of the clerkship.~~ For “Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses”, each student assigned the Y must complete the clerkship requirements as specified by the Committee on Student Progress in response to the recommendations of the Instructor of Record of the clerkship. ~~— he/she fails at least one graded component of the course, but not all; b) he/she fails to successfully complete at least one required element of the clerkship, but not all; c) she/he receives a composite numeric score less than the passing threshold prescribed by the clerkship.~~ An F grade is to be assigned directly by the Instructor of Record if the student ~~fails all graded components of the clerkship.~~ Receipt of an F grade for failing all graded components of a clerkship means the student is ~~to be~~ required to repeat the clerkship in its entirety. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 6/14/99; 11/20/00; 6/27/03; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

(4) For “Additional Courses” (4<sup>th</sup> year electives), a Y mark is to be assigned if there is an academic deficiency in part but not all components of the course and an F grade is to be assigned when the student fails all components of the course.

(5) When a student receives an F because the student has 3 prior Ys, then for purposes of remediation ~~only,~~ the F grade may be treated as a Y ~~student does not necessarily have to repeat the course in its entirety.~~ (En. 11/19/10)

(F) For a course extending over more than one quarter, where the evaluation of a student's performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, the provisional mark of IP (in progress, grade deferred) shall be assigned in the intervening quarters. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 2/20/08)

~~— (G) Repetition of courses is subject to the following conditions:~~

~~— (1) A student may repeat only those courses in which he/she received a grade of F, except in circumstances of G (3) below regarding students eligible for dismissal. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/20/00; 3/26/07)~~

~~— (2) Degree credit for a course may be given only once, but the final grade assigned at each enrollment must be entered into the permanent record.~~

~~(3) The Committee on Student Progress may require that a student, who is eligible for dismissal, to repeat a course or courses for which the student has received a passing grade. (En. 3/20/98; 3/26/07)~~

(GH) All grades are final when filed by the Instructor of Record. A grade may be changed only for the correction of clerical or procedural error. The petition of a student or Instructor of Record seeking to have a grade in a professional course changed must be submitted to the School of Medicine Registrar by the end of the fifth week of instruction of the succeeding quarter after the student has been notified of the grade. Routine, uncontested grade changes requested may be recorded by the School of Medicine Registrar and be reported to the Main Campus Registrar. Contested petitions for grade changes shall be considered by the Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization Committee, who within 30 days will review the matter to ascertain whether clerical or procedural error has occurred. The decision of the Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization Committee shall be final and without appeal within the Faculty of the School of Medicine. The Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes student affairs shall be responsible for reporting the decision to the parties involved and shall report any change in grade to the Main Campus Registrar. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

~~The Instructor of Record may establish a course-specific policy that governs the student's option to drop that course. Where a course-specific drop policy is established, it must be made available to the student in the course syllabus or in writing at the time of course enrollment. If a course-specific drop policy has not been established then the drop policy for the course defaults to the School of Medicine drop policy. Exceptions to the course-specific or School of Medicine drop policy may be granted only with the approval of both the Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes curriculum and the Instructor of Record. The default School of Medicine policy allows students to drop a course at or before:~~

~~(1) 40% of the scheduled course hours have been completed (scheduled course hours is defined as the number of all scheduled contact hours for that student, in that course. This includes, but is not limited to laboratory, discussion, and lecture); or,~~

~~(2) 40% of the available course credits have been assigned (e.g., a course that includes ten 5-point quizzes and a 50-point final would permit a drop up to the eighth 5-point quiz); if this occurs before 40% of the scheduled course hours have been completed. (Am. 6/25/08)~~

~~(I) Credit by Examination is available to students registered in the School of Medicine under the following rules:~~

~~(1) Students may apply to obtain Credit by Examination in any required course of the medical curriculum in which such credit is offered by the responsible department.~~

~~(2) Application, which must occur prior to any examination that is to be used for assignment of credit, shall be presented on a form obtained from the School of Medicine Registrar and must be approved by the Instructor of Record, the Department Chairperson and the Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes curricular affairs. (Am. 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~

~~(3) The grade shall be recorded for the academic quarter in which the examination for credit was taken. The Y is not permitted. (Am. 12/31/94; 2/20/08)~~

~~(4) Credit by examination for a course previously taken in which a student received F as the final grade (recorded in the transcript) requires approval of the Instructor of Record and, for students on probation, approval of the Committee on Student Progress. For such students, Credit by Examination is a repetition of the course, for which degree credit will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be~~

entered into the permanent record. (Am. 12/31/94)

76. Courses and Credit Units.

(A) Repetition of courses is subject to the following conditions:

(1) A student may repeat only those courses in which he/she received a grade of F, except in circumstances of A (3) below regarding students eligible for dismissal. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/20/00; 3/26/07)

(2) Degree credit for a course may be given only once, but the final grade assigned at each enrollment must be entered into the permanent record.

(3) The Committee on Student Progress Promotions may require that a student, who is eligible for dismissal, to repeat a course or courses for which the student has received a passing grade. (En. 3/20/98; 3/26/07)

(B) Course Credit Units

(1) For other than clinical clerkships, course credit units shall be assigned at the rate of one unit for 30 hours of programmed work on the part of the student (i.e., faculty-student contact time, time required to acquire professional skills, and additional study time).

(2) (4a) The calculation of credit units for courses other than clinical clerkships shall be based on the formula that one unit shall be awarded for each 10 hours of lecture, or each 20 hours of discussion, or each 30 hours of laboratory. (Am. 12/31/94)

(2b) In establishing courses for which student-patient contact is required other than clinical clerkships, additional credit units may be assigned by the Committee on Educational Policy in accordance with Regulation 76(A).

(3) (C) For clinical clerkships, one week of full-time clerkship shall equal 1.5 credit units.

(4) Credit for all courses shall be assigned only as integer or half-integer values. If for a course the calculated value in accord with Regulation 76(B)(2) or 76(B)(3) is not an integer or half-integer value, the course is to be assigned the next lowest such value.

(C) Drop Policy

(1) The Instructor of Record may establish a course-specific policy that governs the student's option to drop that course. Where a course-specific drop policy is established, it must be made available to the student in the course syllabus or in writing at the time of course enrollment. If a course-specific drop policy has not been established then the drop policy for the course defaults to the School of Medicine drop policy. Exceptions to the course-specific or School of Medicine drop policy may be granted only with the approval of both the Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes curriculum and the Instructor of Record. The default School of Medicine policy allows students to drop a course at or before:

(a) 40% of the scheduled course hours have been completed (scheduled course hours is defined as the number of all scheduled contact hours for that student, in that course. This includes, but is not limited to laboratory, discussion, and lecture); or,

(b) 40% of the available course credits have been assigned (e.g., a course that includes ten 5 point quizzes and a 50 point final would permit a drop up to the eighth 5 point quiz), if

this occurs before 40% of the scheduled course hours have been completed. (Am. 6/25/08)

(D) Credit by Examination

(1) Credit by Examination is available to students registered in the School of Medicine under the following rules:

(a) Students may apply to obtain Credit by Examination in any required course of the medical curriculum in which such credit is offered by the responsible department.

(b) Application, which must occur prior to any examination that is to be used for assignment of credit, shall be presented on a form obtained from the School of Medicine Registrar and must be approved by the Instructor of Record, the Department Chairperson and the Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes curricular affairs. (Am. 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

(c) The grade shall be recorded for the academic quarter in which the examination for credit was taken. The Y is not permitted. (Am. 12/31/94; 2/20/08)

(d) Credit by examination for a course previously taken in which a student received F as the final grade (recorded in the transcript) requires approval of the Instructor of Record, the Department Chairperson, the Dean-level administrative officer whose portfolio includes curricular affairs and, approval of the Committee on Student Promotions. For such students, Credit by Examination is a repetition of the course, for which degree credit will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be entered into the permanent record. (Am. 12/31/94)

(D) Credit for all courses shall be assigned only as integer or half integer values. If for a course the calculated value in accord with Regulation 76(B) or 76(C) is not an integer or half integer value, the course is to be assigned the next lowest such value.

80. Deficiencies, Remediation, Academic Warning, Probation, Dismissal and Appeal.

(A) Deficiency

(1) A deficiency is a failure of a course or USMLE Step exam. The remedial path for course failures is separate from the path of USMLE Step exam failures.

(2) A Y mark received in the preclinical years is not considered a deficiency when a recommendation of dismissal is being considered. A Y mark received in the clinical years is considered at deficiency.

(BA) Remediation

(1) -The term "remediation" shall be taken to mean converting a Y as specified, mark to a P grade, ~~or~~ retaking and passing a course for which an F grade has been received, or passing a previously failed USMLE I or II (either component) by following the directives of the Committee on Student Promotions. The Committee on Student Promotions' directives incorporate recommendations of Instructors of Record (if appropriate) and/or school policy. ~~correcting other deficiencies as specified by the Committee on Student Promotions, or passing previously failed USMLE I or II (either component).~~ (Am. 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

(2) Remediation of an F grade requires that the course be retaken either at the next time offered in the regular schedule or by means of Credit by Examination or at a time in

accord with other recommendations by the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#). If a student fails United States Medical Licensing Examination Step I or II, he or she must take and complete the retake on or before the date set by the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#), ~~typically the end of the following quarter.~~ (Am. 6/14/99; 3/26/07, 11/19/10)

- ~~(2) The term “remediation” shall be taken to mean converting a Y as specified, or retaking and passing a course for which an F grade has been received, correcting other deficiencies as specified by the Committee on Student Progress, or passing previously failed USMLE I or II (either component). (Am. 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~
- (3) The Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#) may require the student to modify his/her curricular pace, if judged necessary to increase probability of academic progression.  
(En. 7/1/98)
- (4) The Committee may recommend assessment and remediation of study skills, test-taking skills, or clinical skills, or may recommend evaluation for learning, or other disability. The Committee may also recommend psychiatric evaluation and/or counseling/psychotherapy. The Committee may require a written clearance from a Committee-approved, qualified professional before the student is allowed to return to duty. (En. 7/1/98; Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- (5) A student who has an unremediated F grade or Y in a required clinical course, or who is on [academic warning or academic probation](#) ~~as described below~~, may not participate in rotations outside [the course catalog of UC Davis](#) unless approved by the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#). (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 6/14/99; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)
- ~~(6) Under all circumstances, the deficiencies of a student who otherwise would be subject to dismissal must be removed within one calendar year of being placed on academic probation. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98)~~

**(BC) [Academic Warning and Academic Probation](#):**

(En. 7/1/98)

- (1) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine ~~must~~ will be placed on [academic warning or probation](#) by the Committee on Student [Progress Promotions](#) for ~~the following deficiencies:~~ [academic \(includes required USMLE Step exams\) or professional deficiencies as outlined in the Committee’s policies and procedures published on the School of Medicine website.](#) (Am. 11/19/10)
  - ~~—(a) A student receives an F grade. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/20/00; 3/26/07)~~
  - ~~—(b) A student in the “Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses” receives a Y. (En. 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~
  - ~~—(c) A student fails the United States Medical Licensing Examination, Step I or Step II (either component). (En. 12/31/94; Am. 3/26/07)~~
  - ~~—(e) A student fails to fulfill the terms of a remediation plan approved by the Committee on Student Progress. (En. 11/19/10)~~
- ~~(2) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine may be placed on academic probation by the Committee on Student Progress for performance deficiencies indicating lack of professional competence.~~

~~(a) Performance deficiencies indicating a lack of professional competence include, but are not limited to the following:~~

~~(i) professional dishonesty;~~

~~(ii) failure to take adequate responsibility for patient care;~~

~~(iii) inability to work effectively with patients;~~

~~(iv) inability to work effectively with classmates or other health professionals;~~

~~(v) exceeding the authority of a student in matters of patient care;~~

~~(vi) behavior that is disruptive to class or to clinical team performance; or~~

~~(vii) other behavior of equal gravity sufficient to compromise his/her professional competence. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 3/26/07)~~

~~(viii) failure to consistently meet administrative deadlines (En. 11/19/10)~~

~~(viii) failure to abide by the Principles of Community (En. 11/19/10)~~

~~(b) A student who is deemed to exhibit any of the deficiencies stated in (a) may be considered for placement on academic probation by the following procedures: (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07)~~

~~(i) An Instructor(s) of Record shall, in writing, apprise the Dean level administrative officer whose portfolio includes student affairs of the student's name and the performance deficiency(ies) indicating a lack of professional competence and/or (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~

~~(ii) Two or more members of the faculty or staff may submit to the Dean level administrative officer whose portfolio includes student affairs a written petition documenting their observations and concerns relative to the student. (Am. 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~

~~(iii) The Dean level administrative officer whose portfolio includes student affairs shall refer the matter to the Committee on Student Progress. The Committee may place the student on probation and prescribe appropriate remediation to be achieved within a specified period of time, or recommend dismissal of a student if deemed appropriate. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)~~

~~(32) Students who are placed on academic warning or probation will be informed in writing of the specific deficiency(ies) for which warning or probation is being imposed, the specific steps to be taken to remediate the deficiency(ies), and the duration of academic warning or probation, within two weeks of notification of warning/probation. The specific steps will include a plan that delineates the courses in which a student can and cannot enroll before the deficiency is remediated. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 06/19/09)~~

~~(4) Removal from Probation (Am. 6/14/99; 3/26/07)~~

~~(a) Any student who has received a single F grade or a Y on a clinical clerkship will be placed on probation at the time of receipt of the deficiency and be removed from probation when that deficiency is remediated. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 11/20/00; 2/20/08)~~

~~(b)~~ Any student who is placed on probation for defined lack of professional competence, rather than academic deficiency will have a defined period of probation established by the Committee on Student Progress, and defined methods whereby the deficiency can be demonstrated to have been removed. (En. 3/20/98; 3/26/07)

~~(c)~~ The Committee on Student Progress may remove a student from probation at an earlier time than initially defined but cannot extend probation unless a second circumstance occurs that is alone a sufficient cause for a student to be placed on probation. (En. 3/20/98)

~~(53)~~ Promotion While on Academic Warning and Academic Probation

~~(2)~~ If, in the judgment of the Committee on Student Progress Promotions, a student on academic warning or probation can remove his/her deficiency while enrolled in the curriculum of the subsequent year, the student may be promoted provisionally on a case-by-case basis, but will remain on academic warning or probation until all deficiencies have been corrected. (Am. 3/26/07)

(C) Academic Dismissal:

~~(1)~~ Dismissal of a student from the School of Medicine may be recommended to the Executive Associate Dean by the Committee on Student Progress Promotions for one or more of the following reasons:

~~(a)~~ ~~(4)~~ A student on academic warning and/or probation has failed to remove his/her deficiency within the period of time specified by the Committee on Student Progress Promotions (Am. 11/19/10)

~~(2)~~ ~~(b)~~ A student who, while on academic warning or probation, accumulates another deficiency. Receiving a Y in the "Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses" is considered a deficiency. A student who is placed on warning or probation (see section 80.B.b) because of a Y and subsequently fails to remediate and receives an F grade in that course is considered to have failed a single course and has not accumulated another deficiency. (Am. 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

~~(3)~~ ~~(c)~~ A student receiving a total of two F grades is subject to dismissal whether or not he/she is on warning or probation at the time this criterion is met. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 6/14/99; 11/20/00; 6/27/03; 3/26/07; 2/20/08)

~~(d)~~ ~~(4)~~ A student fails to pass the United States Medical Licensing Examination Step I or Step II (either component) after three attempts. (En. 6/22/81; Am. 5/27/92; 12/31/94; 3/26/07)

~~(e)~~ ~~(5)~~ A student on academic warning or probation for defined lack of professional competence, ~~other than failure in a course or clerkship~~, fails to demonstrate that the conduct has been corrected within the time and by the methods specified by the Committee on Student Progress Promotions. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 3/26/07)

~~(f)~~ A student engages in egregious violations of University policies or campus regulations (inclusive of the UCD School of Medicine's Bylaws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures.

(g) A student fails to meet the requirements and expectations in the remediation plan developed by the Committee on Student Promotions.

(h) In accord with UC policy, students are subject to dismissal as a disciplinary action for misconduct in violation of University, Campus, and School of Medicine rules governing student conduct. (En. 3/20/98.

(2) Notice of the dismissal will be sent by certified mail and email to the student with a copy to the Committee on Student Promotions Chair and School of Medicine Registrar.

(3) No student dismissed from the School of Medicine may be enrolled in and attend School of Medicine courses.

(D) Dismissal Appeal: Any student who has been dismissed by the Executive Associate Dean, may appeal in writing to the Dean of the Executive Committee of the School of Medicine in accord with School dismissal appeal policy. (See CSP section of the "Medical Student Policies" on the UCD School of Medicine website.) The only valid basis of appeal shall be assertion of procedural error, or of failure to have received due process. The student must submit his/her appeal to the Dean-Executive Committee of the School of Medicine within 30 days of receiving notification of the dismissal, which is the date of the Dean's letter. Notice of the dismissal will be sent by certified mail to the student. The Dean must, within 14 days of receipt of the appeal, refer the written appeal and any related information to a Board of Appeal composed of the members of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization. This Board will examine the record and will recommend by majority vote of its entire membership, after full and fair evaluation of the appeal and the record, whether the student should remain dismissed or be reinstated. The Board shall take no longer than 60 days after its receipt of the appeal and submit its recommendation directly to the Dean. The Executive Committee must, within 21 days of receipt of the appeal, determine whether the student should remain dismissed or be reinstated and forward its recommendation to the Dean of the School of Medicine. No dismissed student can be enrolled in School of Medicine courses after receiving the Dean's dismissal letter. The Dean shall act to notify the student in writing of his or her final decision within 10 days of receiving the decision of the Executive Committee, with a copy to the Committee on Student Progress Promotions Chair, the Executive Committee Chair and School of Medicine Registrar.

(1) Students readmitted after dismissal by the Executive Associate Dean must remediate any unsatisfactory grades, the outstanding deficiencies which led to the dismissal, and their course of study shall be solely determined by the decision of the Committee on Student Progress Promotions. (Am. 1/7/82; 7/1/83; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07)

(E) Students are also subject to dismissal as disciplinary action for misconduct in violation of University, Campus, and School of Medicine rules governing student conduct. (En. 3/20/98)

# **UC DAVIS** *SCHOOL OF MEDICINE*

## **Bylaws and Regulations**

#### 4.225 **Committee on Student Progress**

##### 4.2251 Membership

- 4.22511 Eight members of the Academic Senate will be named by the Committee on Committees for four-year-staggered terms, and members may be re-appointed for consecutive terms. Initial appointments shall be for a term of from one to four years to accommodate future four-year staggered terms. Members shall be faculty who has been major contributors to the teaching of medical students. There shall at all times be at least two representatives of basic science departments. Additionally, up to two non-Academic Senate faculty may be appointed. (En. 3/20/98, Am. 6/22/01, 11/19/10)
- 4.22512 One or two Dean-level administrative officers whose portfolios include curriculum and student affairs, *ex officio* and without vote, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty, *ex officio*. (Am. 1/19/79; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 3/26/07; 11/30/07)
- 4.22513 The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Progress shall be members who have been members of the Committee for at least one year and will be selected annually by the Committee on Committees. (En. 3/20/98; 3/26/07)

##### 4.2252 Duties and Responsibilities (Am. 3/20/98)

- 4.22521 The Committee on Student Progress shall ensure the formulation and application of effective procedures for the evaluation of student performance, which is defined to include both academic achievement and professional competence, as stated in Regulation 70 (A).
- 4.22522 The Committee shall review the progress of all students and shall certify that each student has met the stated criteria for academic advancement in all phases of the curriculum. Academic advancement must be certified by the Committee for the promotion of students into the "Required Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses" (formerly years 3 & 4). (Am. 3/26/07)
- 4.22523 The Committee shall determine, in coordination with Instructors of Record, a course of remediation for each student for whom performance deficiencies have been identified, and shall notify those students with performance deficiencies, in writing, of the required course of remediation. (Am. 3/26/07)
- 4.22524 The Committee, at its discretion, may communicate with the appropriate Instructors of Record about the status of any student who is on academic probation for performance deficiencies and/or professional competence. The Committee shall assist in determining a course of remediation (when appropriate) and monitoring of the students' performance or professional competence. (Am. 11/30/07)
- 4.22525 The Committee shall provide an opportunity for the student with performance deficiencies to bring a School of Medicine faculty member for personal support and the student's academic advisor to meet with the Committee prior to a decision as to remediation or dismissal. (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)

- 4.22526 The Committee shall have the authority in accord with Regulation 80 to: place a student on academic probation, establish the duration of probation, prescribe appropriate steps for the remediation of a student's performance deficiencies, remove a student from academic probation, and to recommend dismissal of a student to the Executive Committee, who will be responsible for notifying the Dean of the School of Medicine of dismissals of which they approve in a timely fashion. **The Committee shall have the authority, in accord with Regulation 70(G), to hear grade change appeals.** (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- 4.22527 The Dean shall notify the student of the Dean's decision regarding dismissal within 10 working days of receiving the approved recommendation of the Executive Committee. (Am. 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
- 4.22528 The Committee shall consider and may meet with any students whose academic progress, although not failing, is such as to be a cause of concern that future difficulties may ensue, and will provide the student guidance as to possible ways to be more successful.
- 4.22529 Annually, the Committee shall recommend to the Executive Committee the candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine. (Am. 11/19/10)
- 4.22530 In the case of a successful appeal of dismissal from the School of Medicine the Committee shall approve the course of study required of the student in order to graduate from the School of Medicine. (Am. 3/26/07)
- 4.22531 The Committee shall seek to ensure that course grades are reported to the student and to the School of Medicine Registrar in a timely manner. (Am. 3/26/07)

4.228 **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Organization**

- 4.2281 Membership: Three or more members of the Academic Senate. (Am. 12/31/94)
- 4.2282 Duties and Responsibilities
  - 4.22821 Upon request of the Faculty Executive Committee to view recommendations of Committees of the Faculty in order to assure consistency with existing rules and regulations of the School of Medicine. (Am. 12/31/94)
  - ~~4.22822 To assure due process for the consideration and adjudication of requests for grade changes in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 540(E) of the Davis Division. (En. 6/5/78; Am. 11/5/85; 12/31/94)~~
  - 4.22823 To act as a Committee to evaluate and recommend action on formal appeals of dismissal as allowed by Regulation 80(D). (Am. 12/31/94, 3/20/98)

70. Grades and Grading.

- (H) All grades are final when filed by the Instructor of Record. **A student may appeal a Y mark or an F grade, per the procedures outlined in the Committee on Student Promotions' policies and procedures (see CSP section of the "Medical Student Policies" on the UCD School of Medicine website). Students who decide to appeal will not be considered to have a deficiency until the appeals process has been completed.**

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) recommends revisions to Regulations 60 and 74 of the SOM Bylaws and Regulations. Overall, the changes are for clarity and updating. The specific rationale:

**Regulation 60 (*Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine*)**

For paragraph A.3 regarding CEP approval of off-site clerkship training, there were concerns that the intent was unclear and the paragraph was open to multiple interpretations. Because CEP's authority for the entire curriculum is explicitly defined in the Bylaws, CEP suggests that it isn't necessary to include a somewhat confusing and redundant statement in Regulation 60. The changes to paragraph A.2 are suggested as an updating of current curriculum definitions. The changes to paragraph A.4 reflect the wording of the new SOM graduation competencies.

**Regulation 76 (*Course and Credit Units*)**

For paragraph B.1, the description for calculating credit units does not reflect current practices in educational methodology. For example, the required preparation time for and participation in active learning sessions are not comparable to the less demanding requirements for discussion sessions in the older system. The Davis campus Committee on Courses of Instruction considers the calculation of units as described in B.1 as suggestions or general guidelines and considers the assignment of student efforts within different teaching modalities and study time to be the responsibility of the school curriculum committees. For these reasons, CEP recommends that paragraph B.1 be deleted. Paragraph B.2 is redundant in that CEP's responsibility for assigning course units is defined in the Bylaws. For clarity, 'student-patient contact time' is now included in 76.A in the list of programmed work on the part of the student for the determination of credit units.

**60. Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine.** *(To reference the bylaws, see page 16 of 23 of the 11/19/2010)*

- (A) Academic requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine are:
- (1) Students are expected to adhere to a schedule that will result in graduation 4 years after matriculation. Requests for exception to this 4-year rule require approval by the Committee on Student Progress. Failure to adhere to the 4-year timetable without written approval from the Committee on Student Progress may result in academic probation. Standing exceptions include approved leaves and approved dual degree/research tracks which require a modified curriculum. Committee on Student Progress recommendations that involve/require extensions of the 4-year rule are de facto approval of the extension time. Extension of the time allowed for satisfaction of the requirements for graduation beyond six years from time of matriculation will require specific action by the Committee on Student Progress. (Am. 11/5/85; 12/31/94; 3/26/07, 11/19/10)
  - (2) The candidate must have completed and successfully passed the “Pre-Clerkship Curriculum” ~~(formerly years 1 & 2)~~ before beginning the “Required Clinical Clerkship Curriculum/Additional Courses” ~~(formerly years 3 & 4)~~. The candidate must have taken and passed Step I of the United States Medical Licensing Examination before continuing the courses of the “Required Clinical erkship Curriculum, /Additional Courses.” The candidate must have taken and passed Step II, both Clinical Knowledge and Clinical Skills components, prior to graduation. (Am. 6/22/81; 5/27/92; 6/14/99; 6/27/02; 3/26/07)
  - (3) The candidate must have satisfactorily completed the ~~required~~ Required elinical-Clinical Curriculum, including clerkships and courses, at either the University of California Davis Medical Center (UCDMC) or other training sites in programs approved by the clerkship Instructors of Record and the Committee on Educational Policy. (Am. 8/22/80; 12/31/94; 3/26/07)
  - (4) The candidate must have behaved and performed in a manner consistent with professional standards necessary for the practice of medicine, and must have achieved the general competencies required by the School of Medicine, including established competencies in patient care, medical knowledge, interpersonal and communication skills, professionalism, system-based practice, and life-long learning skills, ~~and practice based learning.~~ (En. 7/1/82; Am. 11/5/85; 3/26/07)
- (B) Prior to graduation the Committee on Student Progress shall present to the Executive Committee of the Faculty the list of recommended candidates for their presentation to the Faculty for action (Am. 12/31/94)

---

**76 Courses and Credit Units.** *(To reference, see page 19 of 23 of the 11/19/2010 bylaws)*

- (A) For other than clinical clerkships, course credit units shall be assigned at the rate of one unit for 30 hours of programmed work on the part of the student (*i.e.*, faculty-student contact time, time required to acquire professional skills, student-patient contact time, other learning activity, and additional study time).
- ~~(B)~~
- ~~(1) The calculation of credit units for courses other than clinical clerkships shall be based on the formula that one unit shall be awarded for each 10 hours of lecture, or each 20 hours of discussion, or each 30 hours of laboratory. (Am. 12/31/94)~~
  - ~~(2) In establishing courses for which student patient contact is required other than clinical clerkships, additional credit units may be assigned by the Committee on Educational Policy in accordance with Regulation 76(A).~~
- ~~(B)~~ For clinical clerkships, one week of full-time clerkship shall equal 1.5 credit units.
- ~~(D)~~ Credit for all courses shall be assigned only as integer or half-integer values. If for a course the calculated value in accord with Regulation 76(~~B~~A) or 76(B) is not an integer or half-integer value, the course is to be assigned the next lowest such value.

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES  
SUBMITTED BY THE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

PROPOSAL #4: ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE CHANGES

Presented at the  
General Faculty Meeting  
on January 23, 2013.

There are four main drivers to the proposed revisions. Most pressing is the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) visit in early 2014. LCME compliant rules should be in place for 1 year prior to the visit. The key area requiring change is that the Admissions Committee has sole responsibility for the Admissions process. Currently, the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and Dean have final say. We introduced a new subcommittee called the Selection Committee that will take over FEC functions. Second, the Admission Committee functions out of compliance with its own Bylaws; of note, there are several sub-committees that no longer exist. Third, we revised the Bylaws to more explicitly identify the breadth of diverse representation on the Committee and the multiple consistencies to be represented on the Steering Subcommittee (which is the central subcommittee, recommending admissions and any changes in the Admission Committee process). Finally, there is a current need for the Bylaws to be compliant with UC Bylaws. Specifically, this means that decisions about admissions and changes in requirements for admission must be made by Academic Senate members. Hence, the requirement that the final admission decision by the new Selection Subcommittee and votes in the Steering committee on admission requirement changes be made by Academic Senate members. This requirement conflicts with our third goal of having a more representative process and appears to minimize the essential contribution of Federation faculty members. Time pressures preclude accomplishing changes to the UC Bylaws while meeting LCME deadlines. But this issue should be revisited.

Peter Franks, M.B.B.S.  
Admissions Committee Chair

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES  
SUBMITTED BY THE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Presented at the  
General Faculty Meeting  
on January 23, 2013.

PROPOSAL #4: ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE CHANGES

~~4.223 Admissions Committee~~

~~4.2231 Membership~~

~~4.22311 Each member of the Admissions Committee will belong to one or more of the subcommittees described below. (Am. 6/5/78; 7/14/79; 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06)~~

~~4.22312 The Committee and subcommittees shall be chaired by an Academic Senate faculty member, with some of the subcommittees chaired by the Chair of the Admissions Committee (where noted). (Am. 12/31/94; 11/17/06; 11/30/07; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22313 Unless specifically stated otherwise below, membership on the Committee shall be for a term of three years with a renewal option by the Committee on Committees. Members shall represent the diversity of the faculty with participation from both basic and clinical sciences. The subcommittees may include volunteer clinical faculty and other non-Senate faculty. Housestaff officer/fellow and medical student terms will be conditional based on feasibility, being one year with the option of renewing twice. (Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22314 All appointments will be carried out by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Dean-level administrative officer with the most appropriate portfolio (hereafter referred to as the "Dean of Admissions"). (Am. 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22315 A Steering Subcommittee shall include the chairs of all subcommittees described below (Screening, Selection, Interview, and Policy). The Secretary of the Faculty and the Dean of Admissions shall serve ex officio, the latter without vote. The Chair of the Admissions Committee shall chair the Steering Subcommittee. (En. 11/5/85; Am. 12/31/94; 3/20/98; 11/17/06; 11/30/07; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22316 A Screening Subcommittee will consist of at least seven faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. It shall also include, if feasible, one or more senior housestaff officers/fellows and a medical student. (En. 3/20/98; Am. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22317 The Interview Subcommittee will consist of at least seven faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. It shall include, if feasible, one or more housestaff officers/fellows and a medical student. The subcommittee will be chaired by the Chair of Admissions. (Am. 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22318 One or more Selection Subcommittees will consist of at least four faculty, including at least two Academic Senate members. The Subcommittees shall also include two student representatives and a housestaff officers/fellow, if feasible. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22319 A Policy Subcommittee with at least four faculty members, two of whom belong to the Academic Senate, shall be convened from Admission Committee members from above, ad hoc. The subcommittee will also have a student and housestaff officer/fellow representative from above, if feasible. The subcommittee will be chaired by the Chair of Admissions. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)~~

~~4.22320 A Rural PRIME (Program in Medical Education) Admission Subcommittee~~

PROPOSAL #4: ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE CHANGES

will consist of at least four faculty members, two of whom belong to the Academic Senate. It shall also include two student representatives and a housestaff officer/fellow, if feasible. (Am. 6/25/08)

~~4.2232~~ Duties and Responsibilities

~~4.22321~~ The Committee shall evaluate the credentials of applicants for admission to the School of Medicine. It will meet at least once each year (a joint meeting of all of the subcommittees) to hear reports from each subcommittee chair. It will also provide an annual report to the Faculty Executive Committee. (Am. 6/5/78; 11/17/06)

~~4.22322~~ The Steering Subcommittee will provide oversight and integration of the admissions process, inform changes as necessary, and make the final recommendation regarding admissions taking into consideration the advice of the Selection Subcommittee(s) (see 4.22324). Its recommendations for admissions will be submitted to the Executive Committee for expeditious approval, who in turn will submit approved recommendations to the Dean of Admissions and the Dean of the School of Medicine. It will also provide advice to the Selection Subcommittee(s) on questions raised. The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly. (Am. 11/17/06, 11/19/10)

~~4.22323~~ The Screening Subcommittee will conduct initial screening of applications and prioritize applicants for interviews by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. (En. 11/17/06)

~~4.22324~~ The Interview Subcommittee will undergo training on methods, conduct interviews and prioritize applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. (Am. 6/25/08)

~~4.22325~~ The Selection Subcommittee(s) will review all data available during the admissions process and assemble a list of applicants whose acceptance is recommended, ranked numerically in order of overall preference, and present this information to the Steering Subcommittee and the Dean of Admissions. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)

~~4.22326~~ The Policy Subcommittee shall assess, review, and enhance the admissions process in coordination with the other admissions subcommittees. (En. 11/17/06; 6/25/08)

~~4.22327~~ The Rural PRIME (Program in Medical Education) Admission Subcommittee will screen, interview and prioritize applicants for the Selection Subcommittees by following the policies and procedures developed by the Policy Subcommittee. Applicants will need to be accepted for MD and Rural PRIME criteria sets, with the Selection Subcommittees determining the former and the Rural PRIME Subcommittee determining the latter. (Am. 6/25/08)

PROPOSAL #4: ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE CHANGES

4.223 Admissions Committee

4.2231 *Membership*

4.22311 The Committee shall be chaired by an Academic Senate faculty member.

4.22312 All appointments to the Committee shall be carried out by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the senior Dean-level administrative officer with the most appropriate portfolio and the Chair of the Committee.

4.22313 Members of the Committee shall be members of the faculty of the School of Medicine or UC Davis medical Trainees. Unless serving ex officio, membership shall be for a term of three years, with an option of reappointment by the Committee on Committees. Members shall represent the diversity of the School of Medicine faculty and trainees. Such representation is defined as including faculty from the basic and clinical sciences, Senate and non-Senate faculty, volunteer clinical faculty and trainees.

4.22314 A Ranking Subcommittee shall consist of at least twenty members of the faculty and represent the diversity of the School of Medicine faculty and trainees. The Subcommittee shall be chaired by an Academic Senate faculty member.

4.22315 A Steering Subcommittee shall consist of at least seven members of the faculty, including one voting member of the Faculty Executive Committee serving ex officio. The faculty shall represent all phases of the admissions process, including screening, interviews, ranking, selection, and School of Medicine Programs. Deans with appropriate portfolios shall serve ex officio and without vote. Voting faculty shall constitute a majority of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee shall be chaired by the Chair of the Committee.

4.22316 A Selection Subcommittee shall consist of at least seven Academic Senate Members of the Admissions Committee, and shall be chaired by the Chair of the Committee.

4.2232 *Duties and Responsibilities*

4.22321 The Committee shall evaluate the credentials of applicants for admission to the School of Medicine. The Committee shall provide an annual report to the Faculty Executive Committee.

4.22322 The Committee and Subcommittees shall meet as necessary to ensure timely disposition of their responsibilities. A quorum at any Committee or Subcommittee meeting shall include at least four members of the UC Davis faculty and the faculty members must constitute a majority of the voting members.

4.22323 The Ranking Subcommittee shall review all data available from the admissions process and submit ranked lists of applicants to the Steering Subcommittee.

4.22324 The Steering Subcommittee shall provide oversight and integration of all phases of the Committee processes, and develop policies necessary to govern the process, including School Of Medicine admissions criteria. The Steering Subcommittee shall make recommendations regarding admissions and submit their recommendations for admissions to the Selection Subcommittee. Proposed changes to School Of Medicine admissions criteria shall be voted on by Academic Senate members of the Steering Subcommittee only.

4.22325 The Selection Subcommittee shall review the recommendations of the Steering Subcommittee and make final decisions regarding offers of admission to the School of Medicine.