

November 1982: Academic Progress Evaluation, Academic Standing, and Appeals Procedures for Graduate Students

Approved by Graduate Council, November 1982

1. Introduction

Graduate study at Berkeley is expected to be both a rewarding and a highly demanding academic experience. Its rewards are obvious, whether they take the form of increased opportunities for employment or professional advancement, or of a sense of personal achievement in mastering a broad field of knowledge and practice, or of collegial relationships established between the student and his or her faculty mentors. At the same time, graduate study is extremely demanding of a student's time and abilities. The work is intense and often quite difficult and the standards of performance high. This is to be expected. The value of a graduate degree exists in proportion to the standards that govern its award; if those standards are low, then the worth of the degree to all its recipients is reduced accordingly.

The rigors of a graduate education place burdens on students and faculty alike. On the part of the student, there is the expectation that technical requirements for the award of the degree will be met in a timely manner and in accordance with the standards of performance established by the Graduate Council and program faculty. On the faculty's part, there is the expectation that recommendations for admission to graduate standing will be limited to applicants who show a reasonable likelihood of being able to complete successfully a rigorous program of graduate study, that each student's progress will be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis, and that students will be afforded reasonable advice and counsel regarding the content of their programs and the quality of their work.

Despite the best efforts of program faculty and the Graduate Division to limit admission to those who show promise of successful completion, and despite all reasonable attempts at review and counseling, situations will inevitably arise in which students encounter academic problems serious enough to call into question either their ability to complete requirements for the degree, or their ability to meet the standards of academic performance established for graduate students in general or for a given program in particular. In many cases, persistence of the problem may lead to probation, to lapsing or termination of candidacy for a higher degree, or to eventual disqualification and dismissal from graduate standing. While it is hoped that such measures will not become necessary, the Council recognizes the need for their existence, both to protect

the quality of graduate education at Berkeley and to protect students against the added time and expense of prolonging an ultimately unsuccessful period of study.

In the sections to follow, the Graduate Council sets out policies regarding academic progress for graduate students at Berkeley, general standards for the award of graduate degrees, the conditions and procedures that govern academic standing and degree candidacy, and the procedures to be followed by students, faculty, the Graduate Division, and the Graduate Council in cases of dispute over actions that impede or terminate a student's progress toward his or her degree goal. This document **does not** address itself to grades received in approved courses of instruction, nor does it consider matters of student employment, discipline, sexual harassment, or faculty misconduct, except as provided for in Section 10, below. These issues are addressed in separate publications available from the Office of the Academic Senate and the Office of the Chancellor. Additional information on policies and procedures regarding graduate standing and graduate student progress can be found in the General Catalog and in the Graduate Studies Handbook (available for review in most department offices, in the Graduate Division, and in the offices of the Graduate Assembly) .

2. General Requirements for Higher Degrees

While there is considerable variation among graduate programs with regard to the specific requirements for award of a graduate degree, all degree programs have in common: (a) a period of pre-candidacy studies, typically focused on intensive coursework and a training in the basic skills of research, scholarship, and professional practice appropriate to the discipline, (b) a period of post-candidacy studies in which pre-candidacy work is applied toward the completion of final degree requirements, and (c) a final demonstration, either through submission of an acceptable thesis or dissertation, or the passing of a final comprehensive examination, that the student has met the scholarly, research, and/or professional standards necessary for award of the degree in question. The transition from the first to the second of these stages is referred to as "advancement to candidacy" for the degree; achievement of the final stage will be referred to as "completion of degree requirements." The following sections describe the basic steps involved in progressing through these stages as laid down in policies of the Academic Senate, the Graduate Council, and the Graduate Division. Technical details pertaining to unit and residency requirements, specific course requirements, and so forth, are spelled out in the

General Catalog and in the program descriptions of individual departments, schools, colleges, and graduate groups.

A. The Master's degree:

In the case of students working toward a Master's degree, advancement to candidacy normally requires that the student's record be reviewed by the Graduate Adviser and the Graduate Division and that the student be certified as ready to proceed toward the completion of final degree requirements. In other than exceptional circumstances, only students in good standing may be advanced to candidacy for the Master's degree (see section 9.A., below). This should be regarded as a critical point in the student's progress through the degree program; a student with outstanding deficiencies (e.g., below minimum GPA, incomplete grades in required courses, or inadequate preparation for the thesis, Master's project, or comprehensive examination) should not be advanced until such deficiencies are corrected. Graduate Division policy requires that a student apply for and receive advancement to candidacy prior to completion of degree requirements (i.e., before admission to the comprehensive examination or submission of the thesis or project). Completion of requirements for the Master's degree is subject to review by a committee of faculty members who act on behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. In the case of committees appointed to conduct the final comprehensive examination, membership will normally consist of at least two members of the faculty, one or more of whom will be members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. Master's thesis committees will normally consist of three members, at least two of whom will belong to the Berkeley Academic Senate.

B. The Doctoral degree:

In the case of Doctoral students (those working toward the Ph.D. or a professional Doctorate), advancement to candidacy takes place only when the student has taken and passed an oral qualifying examination conducted by a committee of four faculty members (at least one of whom is from outside the student's major discipline) appointed by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. Admission to the qualifying examination requires (a) that the student be in good academic standing, (b) that all language requirements have been fulfilled, (c) that the student be registered, and (d) that at least one term of academic residence has been completed.

The purpose of the Qualifying Examination is to test the student's general mastery of his or her field of study. At the time the Application for Admission to the Qualifying Examination is prepared for submission to the Graduate Division, the Adviser and the student should decide which general areas of the student's discipline will be covered during the oral examination. Although the exam should give the student an opportunity to demonstrate his or her ability to synthesize the factual information and training in techniques learned through course work and seminar research, it should also be designed to reveal the extent of the student's knowledge as to breadth, depth, and sophistication of reasoning. The faculty should determine whether the candidate is ready to enter the research phase of graduate studies, **but the exam is not to be concerned solely with the proposed dissertation research.**

Once the examination has been passed and the report of the examining committee has been received by the Graduate Division, the student should apply for advancement to candidacy. This should be done as soon as possible following the examination, but in no case later than the end of the regular academic term following the one in which the examination was conducted. (Delays in advancement could jeopardize the student's eligibility for Fee Offset Grants under the Normative Time Program or, if sufficiently prolonged, render the results of the examination invalid.)

At the time of advancement to candidacy, a committee for guidance of the dissertation will be appointed by the Graduate Division on behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. The Dissertation Committee will normally consist of three members of the Berkeley Academic Senate (five members for students held to a final defense of the dissertation), at least one of whom must be from outside the student's major discipline. Once the student has submitted an acceptable dissertation, has obtained the necessary signatures, and has passed the final defense (if required), he or she will ordinarily be assumed to have completed all requirements for the Doctorate. (This assumption will not pertain if it is determined that specific technical requirements for the Doctorate have not been met.)

The names of students who have completed all preliminary requirements for Master's or Doctoral degrees will be forwarded to the Academic Senate Committee on Graduation for final voting and award of degrees. While the Graduate Division will ordinarily honor requests for a Certificate of Completion once preliminary requirements have been fulfilled, actual award of the degree will not take place until it has been formally approved by the Committee on Graduation.

No student should expect the Master's or Doctoral degree to be awarded simply in recognition of his or her having met the technical requirements for a degree program. The completion of specific courses, satisfaction of residence requirements, and maintenance of a minimally acceptable record of course work and independent study are certainly preconditions for award of the degree; but they are not sufficient for such an award in and of themselves. In each case there is the additional requirement that the student demonstrate, **in a context other than that of ordinary coursework**, mastery of a broadly defined field of knowledge and the scholarly methods, research techniques, or professional practice appropriate to it. At the Master's level, this is the principal function of the comprehensive examination, the thesis, or the Master's project.

At the Doctoral level, such mastery is demonstrated through the qualifying examination, which should also attest to the student's critical abilities and powers of analysis and synthesis within his or her chosen field. The dissertation that culminates a program of Doctoral study should provide a final demonstration of the student's scholarly, research, and/or professional abilities; it should provide an original contribution to knowledge in the student's field; and it should accord with the canon of method and presentation appropriate to that discipline.

In brief, completion of the technical requirements of a degree program certify that the groundwork for advanced study has been properly laid; the further requirements of examinations, a thesis or project work, and the dissertation are intended to attest to the quality of what has been built upon this groundwork and as such represent the most crucial points in the evaluation of graduate student progress.

3. Committees for Higher Degrees

All committees appointed to conduct the Master's comprehensive or Doctoral qualifying examination and to pass upon the merits of the Master's thesis, Master's project, and Doctoral dissertation (including the committee for final defense) are in principle ad hoc committees acting on behalf of, and reporting to, the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. In practice, the Administrative Committee delegates the authority to appoint such committees to the Dean of the Graduate Division, who is in turn asked to insure that such committees are constituted in accordance with Graduate Council policy. In the case of Master's committees (for examination, thesis, and project), the Dean has in turn delegated substantial authority to Graduate Advisers in making the necessary appointments.

Notwithstanding the delegation of authority in committee appointments, the basic principle remains that such committees act on behalf of the Graduate Council, and **the decisions made by such committees are decisions made on behalf of the Council, not the instructional unit in which the student is enrolled.**

The appointment of faculty committees for higher degrees is initiated within the student's home department, school, or graduate group. Except where examination procedures preclude such consultation, it is normally anticipated that student preferences regarding the constitution of committees will be solicited and taken into account by the Graduate Adviser before appointments are made (in the case of certain Master's committees) or before a recommendation for appointment is forwarded to the Graduate Division. That the student's preferences are normally solicited is not to say that the student has the authority to appoint members to a committee or to veto such appointments. If the Graduate Adviser judges that a particular appointment would be appropriate or inappropriate on academic grounds, he or she has the responsibility to act in accordance with such judgement, and to make or recommend appointment of a committee that meets the legitimate academic intent underlying its formation.

It is normally expected that any committee for a higher degree will remain in service until its obligations to the student and to the Graduate Council are fully discharged. On occasion, however, it may become necessary or desirable to alter the composition of a committee because one or more of its members become unavailable for continued service, because of major changes in the direction of the student's thesis or dissertation research, or because of other legitimate factors unforeseen at the time of the committee's original appointment (e.g., the development of irreconcilable differences between the student and a member of his committee). Any reconstitution of a committee for a higher degree must ordinarily be agreed to by the member(s) being released from service, by the new member(s) being recommended for appointment, and by the Graduate Adviser, as being in the best academic interests of the student and the program involved. Reconstitution must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division, acting on behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council.

Under extraordinary circumstances, the Administrative Committee may act to reconstitute a committee for a higher degree without the formal concurrence of the faculty member(s) being replaced and/or the Graduate Adviser, if it deems such action to be in the best interests of the student and program involved. Such

a step will normally be taken only upon consideration of a formal appeal for reconstitution, and only after all efforts to remedy the problem have been exhausted at the departmental, school, college, or group level.

4. Normal Progress

Campuswide policies concerning the progress of graduate students in meeting specific requirements are intentionally flexible. While the Graduate Division has established upper limits on time in candidacy for different programs, and for the validity of course work offered in satisfaction of degree requirements, the definition of adequate progress is to a great extent left in the hands of program faculty. It is the policy of the Graduate Council that faculty expectations concerning satisfactory progress, whether applied to a program in general or to individual student programs in particular, be made known to those students affected through departmental publications, through written evaluations of student progress, or both.

For students in professional and academic Doctoral programs, the schedule for normal completion of degree requirements submitted by program faculty under the Normative Time and Fee Offset Grant Program may be used as a guideline for expectations of normal progress.

5. Departmental Requirements

Apart from general, campuswide degree requirements, individual departments, schools, colleges, or graduate groups may, with the approval of the Graduate Council, institute additional progress requirements for students in programs under their jurisdiction. Such requirements may include, but need not be limited to:

- (a) Maintenance of a cumulative grade point average (GPA) in excess of the 3.00 minimum required by Academic Senate legislation;
- (b) Completion of specific courses at or above a given level of performance;
- (c) Completion of requirements for a specified Master's degree **enroute** to the Doctorate;
- (d) Passage of departmental "preliminary" or "permission to proceed" examinations before admission to the Qualifying Exam;

- (e) Submission of an acceptable thesis or dissertation prospectus prior to advancement to candidacy;
- (f) Acceptance of the student by a regular faculty member from the department, school, or group able and willing to supervise the student's dissertation research and to serve as Chair of the dissertation committee;
- (g) Completion of certain general requirements (e.g., passage of the Qualifying Examination, completion of the Master's thesis, etc.) within a clearly specified period of time.

These requirements, which may have specific time limits attached to their completion, are under the jurisdiction of program faculty. Prior approval by the Graduate Council must be obtained before instituting such requirements.

6. Evaluation of Student Progress and Performance

It is the policy of the Graduate Council that the progress of each student actively pursuing a graduate degree be evaluated formally by program faculty at least once during each academic year. The evaluation process may serve a variety of functions, but its primary goals should be: (a) to give program faculty a formal opportunity to review the performance and progress of each student in the program, and (b) to provide each student with timely information concerning the faculty's evaluation of his or her progress, performance, and standing within the program. The Council suggests that the results of all such evaluations, favorable as well as unfavorable, be communicated **in writing** to the students concerned.

If the faculty reviewing a student's record determines that there exists a particularly serious deficiency in the rate of progress or in the quality of work performed—that is, a deficiency which, if left uncorrected, could lead to a recommendation for dismissal, refusal of permission to proceed to the Doctorate, lapsing or termination of candidacy, or other action of similar severity—then the Council **requires** that the student be informed in writing of:

- (a) The nature of the problem or deficiency;
- (b) Steps that should be taken to correct the deficiency;
- (c) A reasonable period of time in which the student is expected to correct the problem or to show improvement acceptable to program faculty; and

(d) The approximate date at which the student's record will next be reviewed.

Except under the most unusual circumstances, the Dean of the Graduate Division will not approve a recommendation for dismissal, for termination of candidacy, or other action of similar severity, unless the foregoing requirements have been met. It is the opinion and policy of both the Council and the Graduate Division that no student should be subject to action of such a drastic nature unless he or she has been given adequate written warning and a reasonable opportunity to correct the deficiency. (Exceptions may be made in the case of failed preliminary, comprehensive, or qualifying examinations in which the examining committee recommended unanimously that the student not be permitted a second attempt. (See Section 7.B., below.)

7. Evaluation of Performance on Graduate Examinations

The following sections briefly summarize the policies and procedures adopted by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Division to govern the evaluation of student performance on Master's comprehensive examinations, Doctoral qualifying examinations, and those examinations required by individual departments, schools, colleges, or graduate groups as part of an approved program of graduate study. (Additional information is available in the Graduate Studies Handbook.)

A. Membership of Examination Committees:

The Master's Comprehensive Examination: The Master's comprehensive examination is normally administered by a committee of three, at least two of whom should be members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. In the case of departments, schools, colleges, or groups that have been given permission by the Graduate Council to substitute a Master's project or equivalent work for the comprehensive examination, it is expected that a committee of at least two members of the regular faculty will be appointed to review and approve the student's project.

The Doctoral Qualifying Examination: The Doctoral qualifying examination is normally administered by a committee of four members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. At least one of the four (the so-called "outside" member) serves as the Senate's representative on the committee and **may not** be from the student's major, department, school, or graduate group. When adequate justification exists, the Graduate Adviser may recommend appointment of one non-Senate member to serve as an "inside" member of the committee. Such appointments require explicit approval by the

Dean of the Graduate Division. The chair of the examination committee and the “outside” representative must be members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. Exceptions to the above have been granted to a few special programs, such as the Interdisciplinary Degree Program, and alternative arrangements have been made available to graduate groups that find it difficult or impossible to meet the usual “outside member” requirement. (See the Graduate Studies Handbook for details on such exceptions.)

Examinations in Defense of the Dissertation: Students completing a program of Doctoral studies under Plan A are required to stand for an examination in defense of the dissertation following its submission. The committee to conduct the examination is appointed at the time of the student’s advancement to candidacy. It will normally consist of five members, three of whom are appointed to review and pass upon the dissertation in accordance with rules governing the constitution of dissertation committees. The remaining two members will normally be drawn from the student’s major department, school, or graduate group.

Departmental Examinations: As described above in Section 5(d), examinations that form part of the requirements for specific degree programs are under the jurisdiction of the instructional unit involved. **The Graduate Council nevertheless requires that such examinations, especially if passage is a prerequisite to continuation in a program, be administered by a committee of at least three members of the regular faculty, and that the general policies of the Council regarding re-examination following a first failure be followed by the department or group concerned.**

B. Evaluation and Re-examination:

A single policy governs most matters pertaining to the evaluation and reporting of student performance on examinations for higher degrees. In general, the result of any such examination is determined by vote of the committee appointed to administer the examination. (Differences in voting requirements are discussed below.) If, on the first attempt at an examination administered under the auspices of the Graduate Council, the committee vote is for a “not pass” or “failure,” this outcome is reported to the Graduate Division along with a recommendation for or against re-examination. If the committee recommends against re-examination, the student becomes subject to dismissal at that point. If it is recommended that the student be permitted a re-examination, and if this recommendation is approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division, then the student will be permitted to stand for a second examination following a

reasonable delay for additional preparation (normally, no less than three months). If the second examination is also voted a failure, then the student becomes subject to dismissal. A third attempt is not permitted.

In certain cases, a first examination may be ruled a “partial failure” by the committee in charge. In this instance, the committee may request that the re-examination (if recommended) cover only the material for which the student was judged deficient on the first attempt. The first examination will nevertheless be ruled a “first failure”; a failure on the re-examination, even if it is restricted to a subset of the original topics, will be regarded as a second and final failure of the examination in question.

In general, reconstitution of examination committees following a failure is not permitted. Exceptions may be made only when circumstances render it impossible for one or more of the original members to serve on the committee at the time of re-examination.

The following sections describe aspects of voting and reporting procedures specific to the different types of examinations required by the Graduate Councilor by individual departments, schools, colleges, or graduate groups.

The Master’s Comprehensive Examination: The result of the Master’s comprehensive examination should be determined by vote of the committee appointed to administer the examination. The voting procedure to be used (majority vote or unanimous decision) is determined by program faculty; the Council requires only that the procedure be uniform in its application. In the case of a Master’s project, or equivalent work submitted in lieu of the comprehensive examination, unanimous approval by the committee appointed to review the project (or other work) is required.

The Doctoral Qualifying Examination: The Graduate Council expects a unanimous vote by the examining committee concerning the student’s overall performance on either the first or second attempt at the Doctoral qualifying examination. For further information on voting procedures and reporting requirements, please refer to the Graduate Council’s “Policy on Doctoral Qualifying Examinations,” issued during the Fall Quarter 1982.

Examination in Defense of the Dissertation: The requirements are the same as for the Doctoral qualifying examination, except that the delay between a first and second attempt at the defense need not be as long as three months if the committee and the student agree that a shorter delay would be adequate for preparation of a successful defense.

Departmental Examinations: Voting and reporting procedures used in conjunction with examinations specific to individual departments, schools, colleges, or graduate groups are determined by the instructional units. The Graduate Council requires, however, that students failing such examinations on the first attempt be provided an opportunity for re-examination following a reasonable delay for additional preparation, unless the quality of the student's performance was so low as to preclude any reasonable possibility of passing the examination within an acceptable period of time. If a student is recommended for dismissal on the basis of a first failure of a departmental examination, the Graduate Division will request that the Graduate Adviser indicate in his or her recommendation to the Dean why a second attempt was not permitted.

C. Use of Examinations for More than One Degree

It is the policy of the Graduate Council that a single examination for a higher degree may not be used to satisfy the requirements for more than one degree, nor for a degree other than that for which the examining committee was originally appointed. Exceptions to this general principle may be made only under the following circumstances: A student who has passed the qualifying examination and has been advanced to candidacy for the Doctorate may petition for withdrawal of Doctoral candidacy and for retroactive reconstitution of the examining committee as a committee for the Master's comprehensive examination. Such a petition should be accompanied by an application for advancement to candidacy for the Master's degree and a detailed justification from the Graduate Adviser in support of this action. If approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division, and assuming that all other requirements for the Master's degree have been met, the student may then be recommended for award of that degree. In general, such a step will be approved only in the case of students who, for one reason or another, must discontinue their studies for the Doctorate. If the student later decides that he or she wishes to continue Doctoral studies, then a new qualifying examination and readvancement to candidacy will be required.

Under no circumstances, however, may a **failed** qualifying examination be offered in fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree.

Following a petition to, and approval by, the Graduate Council, a department, school, or graduate group may be permitted to conduct **concurrent** examinations for the Master's degree and the Doctorate. Committees appointed to conduct such examinations are constituted as committees for both the Master's comprehensive and the doctoral qualifying

examinations. Such an arrangement will be permitted only if the Council is fully convinced that the academic intent of both examinations can be met by committees sitting in single session, and only if there are distinct **academic** advantages to be obtained through a concurrent examination procedure. If such an examination is voted a “pass,” the student will be judged as having met the examination requirements for both degrees. If the examination is voted a failure, then the student will be judged to have failed the examination for both degrees. Re-examination, if permitted, may take the form of a Master’s comprehensive, a doctoral qualifying, or a concurrent examination, as recommended by the committee and approved by the Dean. A student must be advanced to candidacy for the Master’s degree before he or she will be admitted to a concurrent examination.

8. Review of Dissertations and Theses

A committee of three faculty members, acting on behalf of the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council, is appointed to review and pass upon the merits of each Doctoral dissertation and Master’s thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a higher degree. A detailed discussion of the Council policies governing the constitution of such committees is contained in the Graduate Studies Handbook.

At least two of the individuals appointed to each dissertation or thesis committee should be members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. Under certain circumstances, a non-Senate member may be appointed if the Graduate Adviser determines that the individual in question offers expertise not otherwise available among the regular faculty, and if the Dean of the Graduate Division concurs in that judgement. At least one member of the committee should be drawn from a unit other than the student’s major department, school, or group. On occasion, a non-Senate member may be appointed to co-chair a thesis or dissertation committee if this assignment is shared with a Senate member. The chair of a dissertation committee **may not** be the same individual who chaired the qualifying examination committee.

It is intended that the conduct of research leading to the thesis or dissertation and the actual reporting of the results that follow from such research be conducted in a collegial manner, with regular consultation between the student and the committee appointed to guide his or her work. The entire purpose of this phase of graduate training is defeated when the student works in isolation from his or her committee. The more serious problems that arise when committee approval is finally sought typically arise through a lack of adequate

consultation. While it is the committee's responsibility to offer advice, criticism, suggestions for improvements in the research or the written document, and to provide the necessary opportunities for consultation, it is largely the student's responsibility to initiate and maintain regular contact with his or her committee members. Failure to maintain such contact, unless it is clearly the fault of the committee itself, cannot be accepted as grounds for appealing the committee's judgement of the quality of the work performed.

The Graduate Council requires the committee's unanimous approval of the dissertation or thesis before it can be accepted in fulfillment of degree requirements. When a near-final draft of the thesis or dissertation is submitted to the committee, it is to be expected that final approval may be withheld pending editorial changes, the inclusion of additional material, and other modifications that can be accomplished with relatively little added time and effort. So long as the committee finds the work to be basically sound in nature, in terms of content, the research or scholarly methods employed, and the mode of presentation, the process of revision and re-submission may continue through several rounds without calling into question the student's ability to complete an acceptable piece of work within a reasonable period of time. Eventual approval of the document is typically not an issue in this situation.

On occasion, however, the committee may find in the student's work problems of such severity as to raise doubts about his or her ability to complete an acceptable thesis or dissertation given a reasonable amount of additional time and effort. If, upon submission of a near final draft of the document, the committee concludes that the work is not likely to be accepted without major alterations in either the research or the written presentation, then the Graduate Council requires that the following steps be taken:

(a) The committee members, either individually or as a group, should meet with the student and attempt to reach an understanding as to the nature of the changes that will be required before the work can be accepted.

(b) The results of these discussions should be communicated to the student in writing, with informational copies forwarded to the program's Graduate Adviser and to the Graduate Division.

(c) The student should be provided a reasonable period of time in which to make the requested changes and to submit a draft acceptable to the committee (i.e., a draft in need of no more than the usual editorial revisions). The definition of "reasonable time" is left to the committee, but it should take into account the magnitude of the changes being requested, the amount of additional

research, if any, that may be required, and so on. In general, six to twelve months should be adequate. The deadline for re-submission should be communicated to the student in writing, as part of the communication mentioned in (b), above.

(d) If, upon re-submission, the draft is still judged unacceptable (barring minor revisions), or if the student fails to submit a revised draft within the period specified, then the committee may request the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council, via the Graduate Adviser and the Dean of the Graduate Division, to rule the committee's obligations fulfilled and to discharge it from further responsibility to the student. If approved by the Administrative Committee, such action will normally result in termination of the student's candidacy for the degree.

In the event that the committee is divided in its opinion concerning the eventual acceptability of the thesis or dissertation (on the grounds described above), and if the committee is unable to come to a consensus on the changes to be requested, then the matter should be referred, via the Graduate Adviser and the Dean of the Graduate Division, to the Administrative Committee for a decision. In such cases, the Dean will request a written evaluation of the student's work from each of the committee members involved, as well as the Graduate Adviser's recommendation for disposition of the case.

9. Academic Standing

In general, any graduate student may be classified as (a) **in good standing**, (b) on some form of **probation**, or (c) as **subject to dismissal**. The nature of these statuses depends in large part upon the type of program in which the student is enrolled, and the stage to which his or her studies have progressed. This section describes the three basic classifications, the conditions leading to a student being assigned to one or another classification, and the implications of such assignment.

A. Good Standing:

A graduate student is judged to be in **good standing** if he or she is making adequate progress toward the completion of degree requirements, has a GPA of at least 3.00, does not have more than the maximum permissible number of incomplete grades, and is not on probation or subject to dismissal for any reason. **Only** students in good standing may be admitted to examinations (Master's comprehensive or Doctoral qualifying), be advanced to candidacy, hold an academic appointment, receive a graduate fellowship, or be eligible to

receive an advanced degree. Students not in good standing are regarded as either on probation or as subject to dismissal.

B. Probation:

Probation is intended to provide a student whose performance is less than fully satisfactory a period of time in which to remove deficiencies and to bring his or her performance up to a level consistent with the minimum standards enforced by the Graduate Division and/or the program in which he or she is enrolled. **A student may be placed in probationary status only by the Dean of the Graduate Division.** Similarly, a student may be removed from probation and returned to good standing (or become subject to dismissal) only by the Dean. A student may not remain in probationary status for an indefinite period of time.

When a student is placed on probation, he or she will be informed of the fact in writing and will be provided a reasonable period of time in which to correct the deficiencies that led to this action. If, at the end of the specified period, all deficiencies have been removed, and no other circumstances warranting probation have developed in the interim, the student will be returned to good standing. If the deficiencies have not been corrected by the end of this period, the student may become subject to dismissal.

Probation may be initiated by the Dean of the Graduate Division, generally through failure of the student to meet the technical requirements of good standing, or by recommendation of the Graduate Adviser in the student's major department, school, college, or graduate group. In all cases, the Dean will consult with the student's Graduate Adviser before taking such action.

Probation may be initiated by the Dean of the Graduate Division, generally for one or more of the following reasons :

- 1) Failure to maintain an adequate level of performance (e.g., as measured by GPA or the quality of written work) in courses central to the student's program of study;
- 2) Failure on departmental "preliminary" or "permission to proceed" examination, or failure to stand for such examinations in a timely manner;
- 3) Failure to proceed to the comprehensive or qualifying examination within a reasonable period of time;

4) Failure to make adequate progress in meeting other stated program requirements (e.g., submission of an acceptable dissertation prospectus, passage of required language examinations, etc.):

5) Failure to make adequate progress in thesis or dissertation research and/or writing.

Students in probationary status may not be admitted to examinations (Master's comprehensive or Doctoral qualifying), nor be advanced to candidacy, nor hold an academic appointment, nor receive a graduate fellowship, nor be eligible to receive an advanced degree.

C. Lapsing of Candidacy:

Lapsing of candidacy is a form of probation applicable only to students who have been advanced to candidacy for the Master's degree or for the Doctorate. At the time of advancement, each student is informed of the amount of time allowed for the completion of degree requirements in his or her program of study. If requirements are not completed within this period of time, the student's candidacy for the degree may be lapsed by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

A student whose candidacy has been lapsed will not be admitted to the Master's comprehensive examination, nor will he or she be permitted to file a Master's thesis or Doctoral dissertation with the Graduate Division. Students whose candidacy has been lapsed are subject to the general restrictions pertaining to students on probation (Section 9.B.). (An exception will normally be made in the case of Doctoral students whose candidacy for a Master's degree has lapsed. So long as such students are in good standing with respect to the Doctoral program, lapsing of candidacy for the Master's degree will not result in probation.)

Students whose candidacy for the Doctorate has been lapsed cannot be awarded the Candidate in Philosophy (C. Phil.) degree, nor will the Graduate Division issue for such students certificates of candidacy for the Doctorate. Candidacy for the degree may be reinstated upon recommendation of the Graduate Adviser if there is clear evidence of renewed progress toward the completion of degree requirements, and if requirements previously completed are judged still to be valid. In the case of Master's students, this will require certification by the Graduate Adviser of the residual validity of course work offered for the degree, submission of a complete draft of the thesis (for students on Plan I), and approval by the Dean of the Graduate Division. For Doctoral students, this will

require submission of a complete draft of the dissertation, certification by the Graduate Adviser that the results of the qualifying examination are still valid, certification of continued competence in any required foreign languages, and approval by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

In the case of both Master's and Doctoral students, the thesis or dissertation draft must be textually complete and sufficiently close to its final form as to permit the committee in charge to certify to the likelihood of its acceptance and formal submission to the Graduate Division by the immediately following deadline for filing of theses or dissertations.

Failure to achieve reinstatement of candidacy within a reasonable period of time after lapsing may result in the student's candidacy for the degree being terminated. Unless otherwise specified in the Graduate Division's formal notice of lapsing, termination will normally take place at the end of the regular academic term in effect two years after the date of notification.

To assist Graduate Advisers in counseling their students, the Graduate Division annually distributes lists of long-time degree candidates whose candidacy is in jeopardy of being lapsed during the current academic year and of those whose candidacy may be lapsed in the following year if degree requirements are not completed in time. For those students in immediate danger of lapsing, the Adviser is asked to recommend extensions of candidacy where academic circumstances warrant or to permit candidacy to lapse where an extension is not justified. Students on the second list (i.e., those whose candidacy may be lapsed in the following year) should, where possible, be reminded of this fact by the Graduate Adviser. Consultation between the Graduate Adviser and the chair of the thesis, project, or dissertation committee (or the student's faculty adviser) would be appropriate in all such instances.

D. Termination of Candidacy:

Termination of candidacy for the Master's degree or Doctorate represents a form of probationary status more severe than that of lapsing, but still short of formal dismissal. Candidacy may be terminated by the Dean following consultation with program faculty, when there is substantial reason to believe that the student in question no longer demonstrates the qualifications regarded as appropriate for award of the degree, or when the continued lack of progress calls into serious question the student's ability to complete an acceptable thesis or dissertation within a reasonable period of time.

In the case of students whose candidacy for the Doctorate has been lapsed, termination may occur upon continued lack of progress on the dissertation (normally two years after formal lapsing of candidacy), or when the qualifying examination was taken so long ago as to render it invalid as an indication of **current** knowledge and skills within the discipline. Faculty administering the various degree programs are to set appropriate time limits and submit this information to the Graduate Council for approval.

Candidacy may also be terminated if the student fails to correct, within the time specified, major deficiencies in a dissertation previously submitted for committee review (see Section 8 above).

Termination of candidacy for the Master's degree may occur when course work offered in fulfillment of degree requirements was taken so long ago as to call into question its validity as an indication of **current** knowledge and skills, or when there is continued lack of progress in completion of the Master's thesis (for students on Plan I).

A student whose candidacy for the degree has been terminated is regarded as on probation and is subject to the restrictions normally applied to such students. In order for candidacy to be restored and probation lifted, the student will have to recertify his or her qualifications for the degree in question. In the case of Doctoral students, this will require a new qualifying examination, recertification of required languages, and a new application for advancement. Master's students will be required to take additional course work sufficient to replace the units judged no longer valid, and to submit a new application for advancement. Doctoral students whose candidacy for a Master's degree has been terminated, so long as they are in good standing with respect to their Doctoral studies, will not be regarded as on probation, although reinstatement of Master's candidacy will still require completion of the steps listed above.

E. Subject to Dismissal:

A student becomes subject to dismissal on academic grounds if, following a reasonable period of probation, the student has not corrected the deficiencies that originally led to probationary status. If, upon review of the case, the Dean of the Graduate Division determines that there is adequate justification for permitting the student to remain in graduate standing, he or she may extend the period of probation by an appropriate amount. If the Dean determines that there is no such justification, he or she may impose formal dismissal and so inform the student and the Office of Admissions and Records (Office of the Registrar). (This will result in a notation to that effect being entered on the student's

transcript of record.) Alternatively, the Dean may recommend to the student that he or she withdraw from graduate studies with the understanding that readmission will be permitted only under exceptional circumstances and only after a thorough review of the student's record by both the Dean and program faculty.

A student who has been dismissed from graduate standing will no longer be permitted to register. Once dismissed, a student is granted access to campus resources, including faculty time, only to the degree that such access is accorded the general public.

Under regulation 904 of the Academic Senate, the "disqualification [dismissal] of graduate students is at the discretion of the Dean of the Graduate Division concerned." While Graduate Advisers may recommend that a student be made subject to dismissal, neither they nor other program faculty are empowered to carry out such action. The Graduate Council interprets Regulation 904 as pertaining to any action that is functionally equivalent to dismissal. In particular, Graduate Advisers are not permitted to prevent registration through refusal to sign a study list that meets the necessary unit requirements and is consistent with the general course requirements of the program involved, unless such action has been specifically approved by the Dean.