CCGA is proposing a change to a provision in SR 682 specifying the interval between the filing of advancement to candidacy for a Master’s degree and the conferral of the degree. The revision would allow individual graduate divisions to decide the timeframe for advancement to candidacy.

Current version:
Except as provided in SR 694, no graduate student will be recommended for any degree except upon completing at least one year of residence at the University of California, devoted to such a course of study as the Graduate Council concerned regards as a proper year's work, and upon complying with such other regulations as may apply. A minimum period of study of one term in the case of the Master's degree must intervene between formal advancement to candidacy and the conferring of the degree. [See SRs 610, 612, 690.] (Am 9 Mar 83)

Proposed revision:
Except as provided in SR 694, no graduate student will be recommended for any degree except upon completing at least one year of residence at the University of California, devoted to such a course of study as the Graduate Council concerned regards as a proper year's work, and upon complying with such other regulations as may apply. A minimum period of study of one term in the case of the Master's degree must intervene between formal advancement to candidacy and the conferring of the degree. In the case of the Master’s degree, the Graduate Council may set the terms and deadline for formal advancement to candidacy in anticipation of the conferring of the degree. [See SRs 610, 612, 690.] (Am 9 Mar 83)

An inquiry from the San Diego campus asked CCGA to explain the rationale of the interval specified for the filing of advancement to candidacy for the Master’s degree. Strict adherence to the terms of the regulation requires frequent requests for exceptions at San Diego, requests that can potentially be denied (leading to the need for the student to register for an additional semester in order to receive the degree). At at least one campus, the interval is treated with some discretion and is actually less than one full term; but the regulation does not authorize such discretion.

CCGA has found no reason for the one-term interval to be enforced by the Academic Senate. It is possible that this provision is an accidental remnant of partially revised obsolete practices. At one time, it seems, most graduate students were in a class described as not candidates for degrees until they formally advanced to candidacy for a specific degree shortly before completion of the degree. Nowadays faculty (and funding agencies) consider all regular graduate students to be pursuing a specific degree in a specific program.

CCGA consulted two Graduate Deans about why advancement to candidacy for the Master’s degree mattered at all. They persuaded us that it is indeed useful to have a formal verification of compliance with requirements at some point in advance of adding a student to the degree list for a particular term. But they could suggest no reason why the minimum interval of “one term” was needed. CCGA believes that the mechanism and the timing for advancement to candidacy for the
Master’s degree should be left to the discretion of the divisional Graduate Council (in consultation with their Graduate Division).