February 13, 2018

TO: Cindy Larive, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

FROM: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, Riverside Division

SUBJECT: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

Dear Cindy:

I am writing to provide the results of the Senate consultation on the white paper title “Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans.” While there is a range of responses to the white paper from the consulted Standing Committees, they should be contextualized by the full discussion held by Executive Council at its February 12, 2018 meeting.

During the February 12 Executive Council discussion, committee chairs clarified that they were generally ambivalent about providing a definitive choice between the three outlined “Possible Future Models.” Some committees simply selected one of the three options, others did so with significant qualifications, and still others expressed strong opinions that none of the three models are acceptable in their current form.

In addition to crystallizing their committees’ feedback, members of Council conducted a nuanced and detailed discussion of the financial feasibility of UCR’s longer-range faculty hiring plans (whether or not they encompass cluster hiring), and the need to address the fact that some cluster hiring initiatives were not completed, while others were marred (in process and result) by a lack of infrastructure (e.g., there is no support for the “cluster hires” to actually work as a research cluster after they arrive at UCR), insufficient staff support, and inadequate collaboration and consultation with/between departments. Reflecting the 2017 Cluster Survey, Executive Council affirms that there may be potential benefits to a well-conceived and far more strategic and focused approach to cluster hiring but its recent execution has been seriously flawed.

Members of Council also spoke to the substantive weakness of the white paper as such: multiple members offered detailed criticisms of the white paper’s lack of empirical and analytical rigor, and contended that some of its central assertions were misleading at best (e.g. “cluster hiring is very similar to the departmental hiring [sic] but with some key differences,” pg. 2). There was particular concern about the lack of detailed data that would offer a rationale for the three Possible Future Models. There was some disappointment that the white paper did not attempt to offer a preliminary overview of the cluster hiring outcomes thus far, particularly for the purposes of indicating areas of relative success and particular aspects in need of improvement or repair. A few members of
Executive Council expressed a desire to potentially offer more substantial comments on cluster hiring as more information becomes available, while the majority simply wish to move forward from the cluster hiring initiative altogether.

Importantly, the Chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget (Christian Shelton) offered new information to Council that was not available until after the P&B memo had been submitted. According to P&B’s information, former Provost D’Anieri intended to hire 139 faculty. Of these, 72 have been hired and 67 are pending. $11.4 million in annual expenses has been allocated to cluster hires to date. However, if the remaining 67 positions are to be allocated, the campus will be responsible for another $13 million. A total of $24 million has been allocated for all cluster hires (salary & benefits). The current budget models, which assume no adjustments and no new funding streams, show that UCR is on a trajectory to have a negative operating budget in two to four years. These projection assumptions include funding set aside for MRB1 and the cluster hires. The annual savings of $13M (for the remaining 67 cluster positions) are currently used to fund one-time requests.

I will refrain from summarizing the committee responses to the white paper, which are attached to this memo. Let me express once again on behalf of Executive Council that we appreciate your commitment to shared governance and your invitation of this full Senate consultation. I hope it proves helpful.

Peace.
dylan
December 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: John Levin, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Committee on Academic Freedom is disposed to favor option three presented in the white paper. However, the committee is concerned that faculty members should have the opportunity to provide meaningful input on hires within their fields throughout the process. The committee is also concerned that without the appropriate resources for hiring such as sufficient facilities, funding and staff support, the freedom of faculty to conduct its profession is curtailed.
December 18, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Vyjayanthi Chari, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Committee on Academic Personnel met to consider the status and future plans of the Cluster Hiring Initiative. CAP is in favor of Model #3 in conjunction with the requirement from Model #2 in which deans must submit a proposal to request hiring as a cluster position. The proposals should provide justifications as to how the position aligns with the department’s plans, how it will fulfill and enhance the research, service and teaching mission of the department.
February 5, 2018

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Tim Paine, Chair
       Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Cluster Hire White Paper

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the Cluster Hire White Paper drafted by the Provost at their February 2, 2018 meeting. The Committee recognizes the potential interdisciplinary benefit of cluster hires but is not supportive of the previous practice of cluster hires at UCR. The Committee does not endorse any of the 3 options presented in the white paper but does recommend that the cluster hire process be revisited with a more thoughtful and planned approach that includes consultation with faculty and a scale that meets the instruction and research priorities of departments and programs. Additionally, the Committee recognizes the need for a long term plan to be developed for how new faculty are hired that will provide synergy for departments.
Committee on Committees

December 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Sarjeet Gill Chair
Committee on Committees

Re: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Committee on Committees met to consider the status and future plans of the Cluster Hiring Initiative and opted not to opine.
To: Dylan Rodriguez  
Riverside Division Academic Senate  

From: Suveen Mathaudhu, Chair  
Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity  

Re: Consultation: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The committee considered the three models presented in the document entitled “Cluster Hiring Initiatives: Status and Future Plans”. Overall the committee supports model 2 as it gives some of the hiring authority and traditional search practices back to departments and deans. However, CoDEO strongly recommends that any future direction in which the campus embarks should include the diversity procedures used to maintain the ability to obtain high quality and diversity candidate pools.
January 12, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Amit Roy-Chowdhury, Chair  
Committee on Research

RE: Campus Review: [Consultation] Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future

The Committee on Research reviewed the Cluster Hiring Initiative proposal. After reviewing and discussing the three proposed models, the committee preferred model 3, if the following clarifications are addressed satisfactorily. Model 3 provides flexibility by “redirecting the resources to initiatives that may or may not be focused on growing the faculty”; however, it is not clear who makes this decision. CoR supports this model only under the condition that this decision is made by the department(s) involved. Furthermore, model 3 would need to be more specific on whether or not the department retains the available resources, even if they opt out of a faculty growth plan. How would the available funds be divided between departments if a particular opt-out faculty line was a possible fit to multiple departments? Finally, model 3 requires language stating that the department’s future hiring plans are not jeopardized if the department chooses a growth plan.
The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) met on 1/11/2018 to discuss the November 6, 2017 document entitled "Cluster Hiring Initiatives: Status and Future Plans," authored by Provost and EVC Cynthia K. Larive. FWC was unanimous in support of Model 3, noting compelling reasons for allowing spending in areas that will support the recent hires, and also noting it is the model that is the most responsive to faculty feedback on the cluster hiring process. On the other hand, FWC feels adamant that strategic hiring should be a conscious part of Model 3. In particular, when putting together faculty hiring plans, FWC feels that deans should consider the impact that woefully understaffed clusters could have on the careers of faculty who joined UCR thinking they would be part of a functional cluster.
Graduate Council

January 25, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair
Graduate Council

Re: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Council appreciates the status updates on the cluster hiring initiative. It also agrees that stepping back and evaluating both the hiring process and the current accomplishments of this initiative are important first steps.

During the discussion, some faculty noted that additional data and a more in depth evaluation of the cluster hire outcomes would be desirable to formulate a better informed response. This evaluation would ideally include an assessment of the impact on graduate educations. Possible points of interest are: the impact on graduate student recruitment and mentoring (e.g., has the increase in faculty resulted in a greater number of grad student applications and graduate students?), classroom teaching of graduate level classes (e.g., are more graduate level courses being offered?), interdisciplinarity of graduate education (e.g., have student committees and their dissertation topics become more interdisciplinary?), and graduate student diversity (e.g., is increased faculty diversity reflected in increased graduate student diversity?). Other faculty noted that while impact on some measures can take time to materialize in a significant way, they are noticing faculty hired through clusters collaborating across departments and schools and graduate students applying to do research on cluster topics. Another faculty noted that new courses are being offered in topics related to cluster hiring. Thus, while there is anecdotal evidence of positive outcomes from cluster hiring, it would helpful to collect data on related outcomes to evaluate the cluster hire process on an ongoing basis.

With regard to the three possible future models, many members of the Council rejected Model 1 for many of the reasons outlined in the Academic Senate report summarizing the outcomes of the recent senate surveys. Many members of the Council agree with components of Model 3, i.e. stepping back and reconsidering some of the clusters and the
potential of redirecting funds. However, the Council is concerned that under Model 3 funding allocated to this initiative would simply be returned to the Chancellor’s office and could then be redirected to unspecified initiatives without faculty input. Should Model 3 be the ultimately selected option, the Council stresses that graduate education is one of the cornerstones of this campus, but graduate funding is limited. Should funds be re-allocated from the cluster initiative, some of these resources should be devoted to graduate student funding.

Some members of the Council felt that Model 2 would be an improvement over Model 1, and would also be preferable to Model 3, while others rejected Model 2 with the concern that the initial cluster selection was not transparent and not faculty-driven. Some of the members who rejected Model 2 favored a modified version of Model 2 in which the deans involve the faculty and the department chairs in deciding the cluster hiring plans. This potential Model 4 would retain unfilled FTEs, but allocate them in an interdisciplinary, transparent, and faculty-driven process. The Council discussed a process in which two or more department chairs, even from different colleges, could propose a cluster hire that can allow them to establish a new but permanent interdepartmental collaboration or interdisciplinary program. The proposal should emphasize potential research and educational impact (such as the development of new graduate courses) as well as impact on graduate student recruitment and faculty diversity. The proposal should first be approved and fully supported by the dean(s) before being submitted to the Chancellor. Additional incentives might be funding for classroom technology and at least one graduate student research or teaching assistantship directly related to the new collaboration/program. Overall, the Council feels that Model 2 suitably modified to incorporate a more transparent, faculty-driven process (such as the proposed Model 4) is more likely to be successful.
December 18, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Covadonga Lamar-Prieto, Chair
       Committee on International Education

RE: Campus Review: [Consultation] Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Committee on International Education reviewed the initiative and had no comments.
January 8, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Jiayu Liao
Committee on Library and Information Technology


The Committee on Library and Information Technology reviewed the 17-18. Campus Review: Consultation: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans at their December 14, 2017 meeting. The LIT committee reviewed the cluster hiring within the last year and reviewed the process and outcomes. The committee thinks there are some disadvantages to CHASS as the nature of school does not have strong preference to certain topics and therefore not many cluster proposals were submitted. In addition, the large-scale cluster hire does not consider the constrains of computer resources, such as IT support and library, which are tight at current time. Although the cluster hiring does recruit a group of talented people, in considering current campus resources and need, the committee agreed that the cluster hires should be limited in 2018 as there is a drain on campus in general, including the budget (which is tight for many other more urgent needs). Particularly for the resources of library and information systems on campus, it is difficult to predict the library and IT resource needs without knowing what the new cluster hires are. The committee suggests that the campus prioritize the growth without large-scale cluster hiring and give autonomy back to the departments/college with balance of research and teaching needs.
The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (P&B) reviewed the Provost's memorandum of November 6, 2017, titled "Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status & Future Plans." The committee cannot advocate for any of the three proposed courses of action. However, P&B would welcome further dialog supported by more information on the present situation and the future plans.

The committee found that the analysis presented omitted important aspects of the cluster hiring process:

1. Table 1 suggests that cluster hires were a relatively small portion of the overall hires by listing total cluster hires since 2013 alongside total number of hires since 2013. This masks the effect of the cluster hiring process. Cluster hires were begun in 2015 as a way of increasing the number of faculty. Since 2015, cluster hires have represented 70% of the increase in faculty at UCR (68 out of 97).

2. The announcement to grow the faculty by 300 was made in 2014. However, this document uses a baseline of 2013. "300 net new faculty" is mentioned in "model 3." The campus should not be tied to previous rhetoric when circumstances have changed.

3. No part of this document addresses the faculty concerns over the method of selection of the clusters. Page three lists four "key issues," but selection of clusters is not among them. The haphazard fashion in which cluster solicitations and decisions were made continues to have repercussions. They should not be ignored as they define our current situation.
4. Discussion of the necessary (and to-date often lacking) infrastructure resources to support faculty growth on campus is conspicuously missing from this memorandum. P&B has repeatedly for years called for increased attention in planning and budgeting such resources. It is troubling that infrastructure and institutional support for new faculty is still ignored.

5. This document has no information on the remaining resources to support further growth.

6. The memorandum states that, "in terms of process, cluster hiring is very similar to the department hiring." While many of the steps might be the same, the differences are critical and result in delays, confusion, budgetary posturing, and planning uncertainties. The committee members' experiences suggest these are no better now than during the first year of cluster hiring.

7. The memorandum gives no sense of how individual clusters have proceeded. The only data are drawn from Human Resources Data Warehouse. It is not clear whether there has been any accounting or monitoring on a "per cluster" basis.

Generally, the document is not responsive to the faculty cluster hiring surveys. Model 1 does not really address the concerns. Model 2 turns control to the Deans over the positions and does not necessarily take into account the faculty involved in the clusters; it further decentralizes budgets on this campus. Model 3 encompasses all possible future actions and does not provide a clear alternative proposal for how the funds would be redirected. Without further information about how model 3 might be enacted, P&B cannot render an opinion.

P&B would like to see quantitative data on the resources available centrally to support future hiring, whether via clusters or not. This includes not only salary, benefits, and start-up support, but the necessary increases in staffing (for contracts and grants, for purchasing, etc.) and capital improvement (office and lab space, space for increased graduate students, parking, etc.). Further, the committee would like to see a plan (or set of plans) that acknowledges the current differences among clusters. Finally, any plans on central hiring initiatives should be coupled with a discussion of long-term plans for the campus as a whole.
January 18, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Richard Seto  
Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: [Campus Review] Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning reviewed the [Campus Review] Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans, which is largely outside the charge of this committee, except for the issue of space needed by new hires. Whichever option is chosen, it is crucial that an assessment of space needs be taken into consideration, such that the new hire's requirements are met, without jeopardizing the needs of present faculty. Critical to this, is the capability of the campus to renovate space and to provide the necessary infrastructure, such as vivaria, exhaust systems, major support structures and the like. This would require both funding, which should not come from initial complements, and the ability of Facilities and A & E to provide these renovations at a reasonable cost.
January 31, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Thomas Stahovich, Chair  
Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

On December 12, 2017, the BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the November 6, 2017 memo on “Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans.” The committee was supportive of Model 3 because of the flexibility it provides. However, the committee would like additional clarification of how this model would be implemented. More specifically, the committee would like additional details about:

1) the objective function to be optimized during resources allocation  
2) the timeline for the implementation  
3) who will provide input to the decision-making process  
4) what will happen to clusters that have been partially filled

Having clarification of these issues would enable the committee to provide a more complete evaluation of the model.
January 18, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Kate Sweeny, Chair
    CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Cluster Hiring Initiative-Status and Future Plans

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Provost's memo regarding the Cluster Hiring Initiative-Status and Future Plans at the regular meeting on January 17, 2018. The committee concurs with the challenges laid out in the memo, based on direct observations of the recent cluster hiring process and the Senate's responses in the cluster hire surveys. Given these persistent and significant challenges, our committee strongly recommends against the first proposed option (minor revisions to the previous cluster hire plan).

The committee is supportive in spirit of the second option (fulfilling promised cluster hire positions using a different process); however, we feel that such an approach should be pursued with considerable and broad consultation with faculty across colleges and units, providing clear guidance regarding departments' participation in the remaining clusters. That is, even departments not originally involved in a given cluster hire proposal should be given the opportunity to participate in clusters, as desired and within reasonable constraints. Barring such broad consultation and participation, the third option (foregoing most remaining cluster hires) may be the best way to respond to concerns raised in the Senate surveys.

Kate Sweeny, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee
February 1, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Ward Beyermann, Chair, Executive Committee
       College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: Campus Review: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans from Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Larive at its January 9, 2018 meeting. After a lengthy discussion, the committee felt this is a complicated issue and expressed a range of opinions. The committee members were given more time to consult with their departments, and what follows is a summary of the discussion and responses sent after the meeting.

As mentioned above, opinions on the proposed models varied, ranging from strong support for cluster hiring to complete disdain for the program. Despite this range of opinions, there seemed to be a consensus that the three models in the cluster hiring initiative lacked enough detail to make an informed decision on which is the best option. Also, the document focuses on how to proceed with the remaining cluster proposals, while much of the criticism of the program is directed at the initial proposal selection process. Instead of critiquing the options in the cluster hiring initiative, the committee felt it would be more productive to provide feedback on the overall hiring process focusing on those aspects of it that are important to faculty.

Two common complaints with the cluster hiring model are a lack of transparency in the process and a misalignment of the resulting hires with the department/program structure of the university. Many felt these issues were more a consequence of the implementation, not intrinsic to the basic concept. Additional time and better communication are needed to improve faculty buy in on the cluster proposal selection process, and while departments are not the main diver in cluster hiring, they still need to be consulted throughout the process to better integrate the new hires with the department programs.

However, on the plus side, cluster hiring is a quick means of achieving a critical mass in specific fields, usually at the interface of traditional disciplines where ground-breaking research often occurs. It was also pointed out that some of the problems associated with the
cluster hiring model, such as a lack of transparency in the process, existed with the old system. For example, before the cluster hiring program, departments provided hiring plans that its faculty felt best supported the research and teaching missions of the disciplines, only to have these plans upended by the administration with little explanation.

While individuals expressed diverse opinions on this subject, perhaps influenced by personal experiences, I think most would support a compromise strategy where both cluster hiring and department/program driven hiring play a role. Both models have merit in the process for attracting new faculty to UCR, and while clusters often target interdepartmental interests, we must not neglect important fields of study completely contained within departments. However, for any model to succeed, a well thought out implementation is needed that successively integrates participation for all the stakeholders throughout the process. Faculty need to be informed and have a guiding role because they best understand how fields of scholarship are evolving. Finally, UCR must be better prepared to receive these new hires once they arrive. The mismanagement of space and resources in the recent past jeopardized our investment and tarnished UCR’s reputation.

Yours sincerely,

Ward Beyermann, Chair
CNAS Executive Committee
February 2, 2108

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
UCR Academic Senate

FROM: Jan Blacher, Chair  
GSOE Executive Committee

SUBJ: GSOE Executive Committee response to Cluster Hire Initiative: Status and Future Plans

Thanks so much to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for preparing this paper to bring members of the Academic Senate and related faculty up-to-date with regard to the Administration’s reflections on the cluster hiring process.

After some deliberation, Executive Committee members of the GSOE emerged in support of your Model #2, for the following reasons: 1) We are concerned about negative effects on faculty hired as part of a cluster that might remain “incomplete.” By not bringing on additional members, those faculty members may not only feel isolated, but their work could potentially be undermined by not bringing on additional members. 2) The second model more-or-less assures that a department/unit would take ownership of the hire and thus conduct the search with the blessing and enthusiasm of the entire faculty. Some previous cluster searches, as the surveys suggest, left departments a bit fragmented. 3) This point was not stated in #2, but Dean’s proposals should be required to indicate how the position will contribute to interdisciplinary efforts, and which other departments would be involved in the search. As a final comment: It is not clear whether the data on underrepresented minorities (URMs) and women are mutually exclusive. EC members were curious about how many URMs hired were also women.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 19, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division of Academic Senate

FROM: Jean Helwege, Chair
School of Business Executive Committee

Re: Cluster Hiring Initiative

The Executive Committee of the School of Business has reviewed the white paper on the cluster hires. First, we wish to express our gratitude since our school has been able to expand its faculty as a result of the cluster hires. Nonetheless, this nice outcome was not obtained without its problems. Members of the committee were especially concerned about the bottlenecks involved in the process and the timing of the searches. Most of our searches have been done without interviewing, and sometimes without even approaching people, at conferences. This limits the pool of applicants and makes it harder to fairly judge the candidates.

While bottlenecks are inevitable in any process, the committee was unanimous in its opinion that they were worse because of the fact that the searches were done at the university level. By making the process interdisciplinary and by holding training sessions that can accommodate all professors on campus, it was impossible to conduct the search in the most effective way. We much prefer that hiring decisions be made in the department. Of course, we also prefer that the resources for the positions continue to be provided by the university. Therefore, of the three models, model 2 comes closest to what our faculty would like to see in the future.

Jean Helwege, Chair
School of Business Executive Committee
December 15, 2017

TO: Senate Division Chair Dylan Rodriguez

FROM: Maurizio Pellecchia, Chair Executive Committee, School of Medicine

RE: comments on the “Cluster hire initiative Status and Future plans”

The School of Medicine Executive Committee discussed the matter at length at the FEC meeting and a Biomedical Sciences faculty meeting. The consensus among faculty was that option 2 of the 3 proposed is the most reasonable. The School is interested in pursuing some of current cluster hire initiatives that may help the school fulfill gaps in teaching needs.

Kind regards,

Maurizio Pellecchia

Maurizio Pellecchia, Ph.D.
Professor of Biomedical Sciences
School of Medicine Research Building
Office 317 900 University Avenue Riverside,
CA 92521 Tel 951.827.7829
www.medschool.ucr.edu
TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: Re: Consultation: Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status and Future Plans

Date: January 21, 2018

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy is appreciative of Provost/EVC Larive’s report on the status and future plans of the Cluster Hiring Initiative, as well as the request for feedback, particularly with respect to three models we might consider adopting moving forward.

Based on feedback from SPP faculty that was requested by the SPP Executive Committee, we (the Executive Committee) feel that there are good reasons to put the cluster hire initiative on pause for the time being with the intention to reflect upon our own efforts, successes, and experiences surrounding hiring at UCR alongside significant published evidence that is developing on the subject of cluster hiring within the scientific literature.

First, it would be useful to evaluate the degree to which “success” has been achieved—from whose perspective using what metrics. The report begins to provide the foundation for such a discussion in its “Accomplishments-To-Date” section, but we feel a much more in-depth discussion and analysis is worthwhile. While we understand it’s difficult to impossible to prove the counterfactual, we feel that with our experience to date we should be able to identify metrics that can be used to measure whether this process has been a success based on the objectives behind instituting the cluster hire process.

Second, it has been brought to our attention that there is now a rather extensive research literature on interdisciplinary collaborations and cluster hiring and the experiences of institutions that have made significant investments in this approach (e.g., Brint, in-press; Geiger and Sa, 2008; Patton, 2015; Evans, 2016; Dahlander and McFarland, 2013; Rawlings et al. 2015; McMurtrie, 2016; Rawlings and McFarland, 2011). Consequently, as part of the “pause”, we feel it would be useful to identify campus-level conditions recognized in the literature evaluating cluster hiring as influencing cluster hire success and consider the degree to which such conditions are present, or can be developed, at UCR.
By combining our own experiences with lessons gleaned from the latest published research in this area, as well as perhaps soliciting feedback from researchers on campus with expertise in cluster hiring outcomes and successes, we can more fully understand how UCR’s campus conditions may or may not facilitate the use of cluster hiring to meet particular objectives, and how efforts and/or resources may or may not be harnessed to achieve such objectives through the use of cluster hiring.