AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday, June 6, 2013
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

Action
9:00-9:05 1. Approval of Minutes of May 16, 2013 meeting  

Information/Discussion
9:05 – 9:10 2. Announcements
a. Chair of the Graduate Council  
b. CCGA Representative  
c. Graduate Student Council Representative(s)  
d. Dean of the Graduate Division

Action
9:30 – 9:35 3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee
Meeting was via email – no attendance sheet

9:30 – 9:35 Approval of Courses – the following courses are to be approved:
1. Approval of Courses:
   1. GDIV 398I - Individual Internship – NEW  
   2. CS 211 - High Performance Computing – NEW  
   3. MGT 400 - Intensive Accounting Principles and Practices – NEW

Program Changes and Proposals
1. History program change – Master’s and Ph.D.  

Information/Discussion/Action
9:35 – 10:00 4. New Business
a. Double Ph.D. policy

Action
10:00–11:00 5. Graduate Program Reviews
a. Anthropology F&R  
b. Art History F&R  
c. Plant Pathology response – approve memo to program  
d. Mechanical Engineering F&R  
e. GGB response – approve memo to program  
f. CMDB request for clarification – approve memo to program  
g. Sociology response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Rev Date</th>
<th>PR or Resp. to F&amp;R Recv’d</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Path</td>
<td>2/2011</td>
<td>3rd resp recv’d: 5/21/13</td>
<td>Received response from program on 5/21/13; GC vote on memo to program at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomed.</td>
<td>3/2012</td>
<td>F&amp;R: due 7/1/13</td>
<td>F&amp;R sent to program on 6/3/13; response due 7/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4/2012</td>
<td>F&amp;R: due 3/28/13</td>
<td>Waiting on response to F&amp;R from program, was due 3/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengin. (I)</td>
<td>7/2012</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 3/25/13</td>
<td>Waiting on response to F&amp;R from program, was due 3/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDB (I)</td>
<td>10/2012</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 3/25/13</td>
<td>F&amp;R sent to program on 4/24/13; program responded for clarification; GC vote on memo to program at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc (I)</td>
<td>11/2012</td>
<td>F&amp;R: due 5/1/13</td>
<td>Received program’s response on 4/30/13; GC reviewing at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGB</td>
<td>12/2012</td>
<td>PR: 5/23/13</td>
<td>Response to F&amp;R received 5/23/13 – GC vote on memo to program at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>1/2013</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 4/2/13</td>
<td>GC review draft F&amp;R at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. Engin.</td>
<td>1/2013</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 5/20/13</td>
<td>GC review draft F&amp;R at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2/2013</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 4/5/13</td>
<td>GC review draft F&amp;R at 6/6/13 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>3/2013</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 4/24/13</td>
<td>Waiting on draft F&amp;R from subcommittee (LB, ET, RR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3/2013</td>
<td>F&amp;R due: 5/14/13</td>
<td>Waiting on draft F&amp;R from subcommittee (CN, MEH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

Program: MA
Department/Academic Unit/School: History/CHASS
Date: 5/31/13
Proposed Effective Date: September 2013

Faculty Contact: Dr. Juliette Levy
Prepared by: Iselda Salgado
Email: juliette.levy@ucr.edu
Email: iseldas@ucr.edu
Phone: 827-6492
Phone: 827-1435

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

☐ Admission requirements
☐ Unit requirements
☐ Professional Development Plan
☐ Other (please describe):
☐ Course requirements
☐ Examination requirements
☐ Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

☒ Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
☒ Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
☒ Revised and Dated Program Summary
☒ Revised Catalogue Copy
☐ Revised Website Copy
Proposed modifications and justification:

In response to both the short-term surge in students, the department decided to limit the graduate cohorts to numbers that could reliably be supported.

University regulations establish a minimum enrollment in a graduate seminar of 4 students per course; and with the smaller cohort size, courses were in constant risk of being cancelled because of low enrollment, or faculty were being asked to teach graduate courses as overloads. This situation was not tenable.

The new structure of the graduate program responds to the new smaller size of the program and the minimum enrollment caps, while still allowing students to complete their requirements in a timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department of History offers three programs of study leading to the M.A. degree: the Regular Program (Plan I and Plan II) and the Public History Program.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Program (M.A.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students seeking the M.A. degree choose a field of specialization from the list below, and follow one of two plans:</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan I (Thesis)</strong> Candidates must complete 40 units of required course work beyond the baccalaureate, 36 of which must be at the graduate level. The student's curriculum must include the following:</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least one course in historical theory and methods</td>
<td>1. At least one reading seminar in the student’s area of specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification: Theory and Methods &amp; Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At least one two-quarter research seminar, preferably in the student’s area of specialization</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At least 4 units in courses outside the student’s area of specialization</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Twelve (12) units of thesis preparation, HIST 299</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the additional required course work is to prepare the student for examinations, and should include relevant Materials courses. See below for areas of specialization and language requirement.</td>
<td>The purpose of the additional required course work is to prepare the student for examinations, and should include relevant reading seminars. See below for areas of specialization and language requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification: Theory and Methods &amp; Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students prepare a substantial M.A. thesis. Candidates must pass an oral examination discussing the thesis and future research agenda. The thesis and orals committee consists of three faculty members.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates must complete 40 units of required course work beyond the baccalaureate, 32 of which must be at the graduate level. The curriculum must include the following:</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least one course in historical theory and methods</td>
<td>1. At least one reading seminar in the student's area of specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification: Theory and Methods &amp; Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At least one two-quarter research seminar, preferably in the student's area of specialization</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At least 16 units in courses outside the student's area of specialization</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the additional required course work is to prepare the student for examinations, and should include relevant Materials courses. See below for areas of specialization and language requirement.</td>
<td>The purpose of the additional required course work is to prepare the student for examinations, and should include relevant reading seminars. See below for areas of specialization and language requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification: Theory and Methods &amp; Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates prepare a portfolio selected by the student and advisor, and must pass a comprehensive oral examination based on the submitted material. The examination committee consists of two faculty members.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Specialization</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Native American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ancient Mediterranean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. European, with concentration in either Early Modern Europe, Modern Europe, Britain, or Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Latin American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Requirement Candidates must demonstrate an ability to read one foreign language.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Advisor: Dr. Juliette Levy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: [Signature]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 5/26/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

Program: PhD
Department/Academic Unit/School: History/CHASS
Date: 5/31/13
Proposed Effective Date: September 2013

Faculty Contact: Dr. Juliette Levy Email: juliette.levy@ucr.edu Phone: 827-6492
Prepared by: Iselda Salgado Email: iseldas@ucr.edu Phone: 827-1435

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

☐ Admission requirements
☐ Unit requirements
☐ Professional Development Plan
☐ Other (please describe):

☒ Course requirements
☒ Examination requirements
☐ Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be strikethrough.

Existing
Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.

Proposed
Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

☒ Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
☒ Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
☒ Revised and Dated Program Summary
☒ Revised Catalogue Copy
☐ Revised Website Copy
Proposed modifications and justification:

In response to both the short-term surge in students, the department decided to limit the graduate cohorts to numbers that could reliably be supported.

University regulations establish a minimum enrollment in a graduate seminar of 4 students per course; and with the smaller cohort size, courses were in constant risk of being cancelled because of low enrollment, or faculty were being asked to teach graduate courses as overloads. This situation was not tenable.

The new structure of the graduate program responds to the new smaller size of the program and the minimum enrollment caps, while still allowing students to complete their requirements in a timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
<th>NO CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Department of History offers the Ph.D. in History. The Ph.D. program in History prepares graduates for careers as university teachers, public historians, and professional researchers and analysts.</strong></td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission</strong> Students may prepare for entry into the Ph.D. program by earning a B.A. or an M.A. degree in History or by earning a degree in a closely related field that involves significant study of history. Students holding a degree in another field are evaluated by the graduate studies committee on a case-by-case basis to determine the level of the graduate program at which they should commence their studies.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Work</strong> Candidates for the Ph.D. degree entering with a baccalaureate degree complete a minimum of 56 units of required course work, 44 of which must be at the graduate level. Students who enter with an M.A. degree complete a minimum of 28 units, 20 of which must be at the graduate level, and may be able to waive certain course requirements listed below. The student's curriculum during the entire graduate career must include the following:</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least two two-quarter graduate research seminars</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At least two graduate-level courses in theory and methods</td>
<td>DELETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At least three Materials courses or equivalent courses, chosen from the</td>
<td>2. At least six reading seminars or equivalent courses, chosen from the student's fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: We restructured the program to aid in time to degree, and we reduced our enrollment and class size. Theory and Methods & Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility.
student's fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. At least three courses approved by the graduate advisor for the teaching field requirement, of which two must be at the graduate level</th>
<th>3. At least three courses approved by the graduate advisor for the teaching field requirement, of which two must be at the graduate level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification: formatting change</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ph.D. students must also complete HIST 301. Students whose research or complementary field is Public History must complete HIST 402. These courses do not count towards unit requirements.</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses should be chosen in consultation with the student's faculty advisor and the graduate advisor; suitable courses are described in the departmental protocols. HIST 290 may be used towards the specific requirements above only with the permission of the graduate advisor.</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ph.D. Fields</strong> Students prepare three fields: a research field, a complementary field, and a teaching field. The research fields that the department offers are listed below; complementary and teaching fields may be chosen from among the research fields or from the list of additional fields. In special cases, students may petition to replace the complementary field with a custom field designed by the student in consultation with two faculty members who agree to administer the written examination in the field. Students may not offer three fields that all deal with a single country or region.</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Fields:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early America</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth-Century United States</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentieth-Century United States</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American West</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American History</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Mediterranean</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern Europe</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Europe</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern England</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern England</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Russia</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Latin America</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Latin America</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public History</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Fields</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern World History</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern World History</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender History</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth-Quarter Review</strong> All Ph.D. students undergo a comprehensive review no later than the sixth quarter of enrollment in the program, based on a portfolio selected by the student and advisor. The graduate studies committee reviews the student's record and makes one of the following recommendations: proceed, hold, or terminate. Students receiving a hold may reapply once, within three quarters. Students receiving a terminate may continue enrolling for no more than three quarters to complete MA requirements.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only under extraordinary circumstances may a student continue enrolling for more than 9 quarters (including enrollment while an M.A. student at UCR) without permission to proceed to examinations.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.A. in History degree for Ph.D. Students</strong> Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program may apply for the M.A. degree in History once they have completed the requirements for the degree.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements for completing the Ph.D. degree</strong></td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examinations</strong> Students are examined in their research and complementary fields by written examinations and at the Ph.D. oral examination. To take the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination, the student must submit a preliminary draft of the dissertation proposal. The teaching field is satisfied by course work.</td>
<td><strong>Examinations</strong> Students are examined in their research and complementary fields by a single written examination and at the Ph.D. oral examination. To take the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination, the student must submit a preliminary draft of the dissertation proposal. The teaching field is satisfied by course work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification: We restructured the program to aid time to degree, and for that reason students will take all their written exams in the same period. This will significantly reduce the time students take to accomplish this requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Requirement</strong> Students must demonstrate reading proficiency in at least one language other than English. In certain research fields, students may be required to demonstrate a higher level of proficiency or to demonstrate proficiency in additional languages. Consult the departmental protocols for specific requirements.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidacy</strong> Students advance to candidacy after completing all examinations, the teaching field, and the language requirement. By the end of the following academic quarter, each student must submit to the graduate study committee a dissertation proposal approved by the student's faculty advisor.</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation</strong> Candidates must submit a dissertation that demonstrates scholarly,</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original, and independent investigation of a subject in the student's research field chosen with the advice and approval of the dissertation committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Time to Degree 17 quarters (including M.A. work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Advisor: Dr. Juliette Levy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Signature: [Signature]

Date: 5/28/2013
It is the policy of UCR to prohibit the pursuit of duplicating Ph.D. degrees. However, a rare exception could be granted depending on the circumstances. The department or program considering the applicant must petition the Graduate Dean. The request must be in writing to the Dean and should include

i) a strong justification for admitting the applicant for a second Ph.D.
ii) a statement assuring that the applicant’s first Ph.D. is in a fundamentally unrelated area and that there will be no duplication or waiving of coursework. Materials such as transcripts and diploma should also be attached.
iii) a statement assuring that no California state funding will be used throughout the student’s Ph.D. at UCR.

The Graduate Dean will review all materials submitted and decide whether or not to admit the applicant, consulting with the Graduate Council when appropriate.
2012-13 Academic Senate Review of the Graduate Program of the Anthropology Department -- Graduate Council’s Findings and Recommendations

The Anthropology Department submitted its self-study report to the Graduate Council in the fall of 2012. Representatives of Graduate Council and department leaders met on January 24, 2013, to discuss the report and prepare for the extramural site visit. The extramural review team met with department constituents on February 4 and 5th, 2013, and submitted its report on February 28, 2013, followed by the department’s response March 21, 2013. The reports from the Anthropology self-study (including confidential surveys of faculty and students), the external review committee, and the internal discussion of the Graduate Council subcommittee were remarkably consistent.

Strengths and Achievements

Despite its relatively small size (15 ladder faculty), the NRC gives the Anthropology Department a strong ranking (35th to 65th among anthropology programs in the United States). Many of its faculty are nationally and internationally known and respected, and all (including new faculty) are productive in their research. The faculty in archeology (and especially Mesoamerican archeology) may be the best in the world, and these four faculty members advise 30% of the graduate students, who come to UCR to study with them particularly. Faculty in biological anthropology and cultural anthropology are also well known and productive and place their articles in respected and visible venues.

Teaching in the department is strong. The senior faculty in archeology and cultural anthropology teach the year-long graduate core sequence, which is valued by students. Discussions in the department are underway for including faculty in biological anthropology in this sequence, which in addition to broadening the content would also help to preserve the quality of this sequence as senior faculty retire. The growing number of undergraduates places a strain on teaching resources such that graduate faculty cannot consistently teach as many graduate courses as students need to fill their schedules, particularly in biological anthropology, which has only two faculty. The collaborations of these faculty with UCR’s new medical school and other units on campus are ongoing, with many of them long-term, as shown by the proportion of faculty with joint appointments outside anthropology.

Students enter the program with solid GRE scores and feel a sense of community with their student colleagues, well mentored, and happy to be at UCR. They view their program as coherent (as do the internal and external reviewers), and value particularly the year-long core sequence and the professionalization course, which they would like to have offered routinely. The students complete their degrees in an average of seven years (less than the national average) and most take positions for which they were trained in universities, colleges, and businesses. Students appreciate the two years of initial funding (one year of fellowship awarded through
Graduate Division and one year of guaranteed TAship) and the possibility of TA opportunities thereafter; however, they are often notified of TA positions only a few days before needing to assume their responsibilities, a problem throughout CHASS since the onset of budgetary downsizing and the uncertainty as to how many TAships will be funded each quarter via the CHASS dean’s office.

In terms of professional placement, 21 of the 36 former students listed in Anthropology’s self-study report were archaeology students and 10 of those 21 are now in tenure track positions at schools ranging from UC Santa Cruz to BYU. Others work in contract archaeology and some are adjunct faculty mainly at schools in California. Because the biological anthropology track is relatively new, only a single forensic anthropologist has completed the Ph.D. and is in a tenure track position. Eight of fourteen students who have completed their degrees in Cultural Anthropology have careers in academia, whereas others have careers as consultants or in the diplomatic service. As the review team noted, this is a strong track record for placement at a time when there are few academic tenure track positions open.

Goals and Plans

The Anthropology Department currently represents three specialties (archaeology, and biological and cultural anthropology), and would like to add linguistics as a fourth area (we note that a search for a linguistic anthropologist has recently been approved by the CHASS Dean’s office). A strategic plan seems essential to focus additional resources as they become available. From the outside, it would be difficult to choose among the competing demands of keeping the renowned program in Mesoamerican archeology strong, bolstering the small but well regarded program in biological anthropology, and adding more linguistics faculty. The department faculty may be the best judge in prioritizing these needs.

Computing facilities and laboratory space for using collections for research and honing the skills of graduate students is also a priority. Generating plans and alternatives for securing such space would be a useful conversation among the faculty and with their Dean.

Anthropology faculty already have strong and productive cross-campus ties. Faculty might consider how to make use of these collaborations for leverage in their strategic planning.

Summary Statement

The quality of the Department of Anthropology graduate program, along with its faculty and students, is high. Careful planning and budgeting will be necessary to maintain and enhance the program due to upcoming retirements and budget cuts that have interfered with resources in the department, college, and university. Graduate Council makes the following recommendations based on observations made by the extramural review team:

Recommendations:
1. Develop a strong strategic plan that prioritizes requests for new faculty hires.

While we understand that a faculty line in linguistics has recently been approved by the CHASS dean’s office, there are other needs due to imminent retirements in archaeology and the perceived need for more faculty in biological anthropology to build a strong graduate concentration in that field. The faculty in Anthropology should prioritize among these needs with a vision statement that is compelling to administrators, colleagues and graduate students alike. Current faculty in Mesoamerican archeology are “among the most highly respected scholars in their field” (External Review, p. 1); however all are close to retirement, and phased hiring in this area over the next few years seems essential to maintain this excellent program. UCR’s new medical school is already collaborating with faculty in biological anthropology, and this collaboration is useful but also potentially draining if no effort is made to add faculty in this area.

2. Develop a prioritized list and justification for upgrading computer and lab facilities for teaching and research.

The department maintains well-regarded collections, but appears to lack sufficient equipment and space for faculty and students to work with them. These deficits impact graduate students’ ability to take full advantage of the program’s excellent faculty and collections. The faculty should determine a prioritized list of equipment needs, and a narrative justification, for presentation and subsequent discussions with the CHASS dean’s office.

3. Expand graduate course offerings in biological anthropology, lab and field courses, and professionalization.

a) Biological anthropology has the potential to blossom, especially in conjunction with the development of UCR’s new medical school. To fully mount this specialization in the Anthropology Department, more course offerings will be needed. The faculty should consider additional future course offerings as a new strategic plan is developed.

b) Lab courses and fieldwork are essential for training anthropologists. Nevertheless, some strategic courses have been terminated. In the case of field training in archaeology, UCR Summer Sessions currently requires a minimum number of 35 students to run such a course which is far too many. Anthropology should develop a proactive approach to reinstate regularly taught field schools with an appropriate number of students, and consult actively with the CHASS dean’s office about this need; field training is essential for graduate students who specialize in archaeology.
c) In the context of the review, current graduate students expressed need for more professionalization course work (regular, yearly offerings), and the faculty should consider the feasibility of this request.

4. **Work with UCR’s Office of Research to assure timely submission and maintenance of large grants for research.**

   The Anthropology Department should work closely with the recently expanded Office of Research to make it easier for faculty and graduate students to get advice in submitting grant applications; nonetheless, ensuring in-house support for timely submission of proposals and for grant maintenance seems critical, especially to reward successful efforts in these lean times. In-house staff should receive adequate training to assist faculty in this regard.

5. **Explore training opportunities for staff in the use of CRAMS for new course proposal submissions.**

   To facilitate the development of new course offerings, dedicated staff should be available to assist in preparing and submitting the appropriate forms to the Academic Senate and to the Registrar via the CRAMS system. Faculty should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the appropriate “new course” forms and submit appropriate information for the forms to in-house staff. These staff members may need additional training in the use of the CRAMS system to assure proper submission.

6. **Consider ways to provide more transparency and guarantees for Teaching Assistantship support.**

   Resources to support graduate training have declined in all programs; however, the department might consider whether long-range planning and increased transparency in assigning doctoral students to TA-ships and other teaching responsibilities could help ease students’ concern over funding. The faculty may also want to consider offering more large classes for which Teaching Assistant support is essential.
March 21, 2013

TO: Lynda Bell, Vice Chair
    Graduate Council

FR: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Department of Anthropology

RE: Preliminary Response to the Extramural Report of the Review of Anthropology Graduate Program

Overall, the anthropology faculty is in general agreement with the findings and recommendations outlined in the extramural report of the review of the anthropology graduate program. There is one point that needs to be raised in terms of errors of fact, misperceptions, or interpretation on the part of the extramural team.

On page 6, the report discusses the lack of staff support and its impact on the faculty and graduate students. Although we agree with the assessment of the dire need in staff for the program, we disagree with the last sentence of the first paragraph: “This problem is not simply about numbers of staff, but about staff with the appropriate skills and experience.” This sentence may refer to the need of hiring qualified staff as opposed to hiring just part-time or work-study students. It is the first impression of this sentence, however, that there is a problem with the level of skill and experience in current staff. Nothing could be further from the truth. The current staff is of the highest level in efficiency and good will to go beyond the call of duty to carry out department functions. That the two departments (Anthropology and Sociology) could function at all after losing staff positions speaks to the level of competency and dedication in staff. The dire situation is the direct result of the college not replacing the lost staff positions, while the number of students served by the two departments has dramatically increased. The problem is about the size of staff.
University of California-Riverside  
Department of Anthropology  
Graduate Program Review  

February 4-5, 2013  

Report of the External Review Panel  

Dr. Patricia Crown, University of New Mexico  
Dr. Lisa Rofel, UC Santa Cruz  
Dr. Margaret Schoeninger, UC San Diego  

1. What is the quality of the program with respect to the following?  

a. overall reputation: The 2010 NRC ranking placed UCR Anthropology 35th-65th among all anthropology doctoral programs in the US. This is a strong ranking for a relatively small program.  

UCR Archaeology has an excellent reputation for training graduate students particularly in Mesoamerican archaeology. The current faculty members are among the most highly respected scholars in their field. Interviews with graduate students made it clear that many of the students are drawn to UCR to work with these faculty, a fact borne out by the high percent of graduate students who work closely with these four faculty members. The four faculty members are all full professors and a search for an Associate Professor is underway.  

Biological Anthropology consists of two faculty members. Both maintain close ties with their colleagues in the other sub-disciplines of the department, which allows them to train graduate students. The students spoke highly of these faculty members. Both are relatively young but are well known and recognized within biological anthropology as a whole.  

Cultural Anthropology faculty also have an excellent reputation for training graduate students. The graduate students praised these faculty for extremely close mentoring and for the kind of intellectual training they were hoping for. The senior faculty are renowned in their fields and the junior faculty are active in their research (see next question), which inspires the graduate students.  

b. Faculty Research: The four archaeology faculty have an excellent record of research and publication. They have a combined record of 354 peer-reviewed publications. They are widely cited: according to the Web of Knowledge, 13 of Ashmore’s publications have been cited 104 times in international venues; she was cited 21 times in 2012 alone. They are all active researchers with ongoing research programs. The American Anthropological Association recently recognized Ashmore with the Kidder Award, the highest honor for a Mesoamerican archaeologist.
The two biological anthropologists are relatively young; one began at UCR in 2001 and the other in 2009. The first is an Associate Professor who publishes steadily on paleoanthropology and the mining of massive databases. Her outlets include highly ranked anthropology journals (American Journal of Physical Anthropology [impact factor 6 of 81 Anthropology journals] and The Journal of Human Evolution [1 of 81]). She’s just completed a very large NSF grant although as the department chairwoman, her future publishing could slow down for a few years. The second is interested in growth and development of children especially with respect to health outcomes related to kin investment. Her publishing has been slow although her outlets are highly ranked (American Journal of Human Biology ranks 23 of 85 Biology journals and American Anthropologist ranks 17 out of 81 Anthropology journals), but there are several publications in progress and she seems to be able and ready to invest more energy into her publishing. Both have active research programs with external funding from NSF and the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

The Cultural faculty have an excellent record of research and publication. All of the faculty, from the most senior to the most junior, are active in their research. Their articles and books are published in the top journals and presses in the discipline. The senior faculty in Cultural Anthropology are renowned for their scholarship and were recruited to UCR for that reason. The Cultural faculty have not just one but two professors, Gailey and Moses, who have been inducted into the American Academy for the Advancement of Science. The associate and junior faculty show promise of becoming internationally renowned in their fields. The junior faculty have published well beyond what should be expected for tenure. All of the faculty have garnered prestigious grants and fellowships: the Hellman Foundation Fellowship (Fay), National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (McMullin), NSF (Moses), Guggenheim (Ness, Ossman), NEH (Ness, Schwenkel), Fulbright-Hays (Schwenkel), ACLS (Schwenkel), UC Pacific Rim (Schwenkel), Environmental Protection Agency (Harvey), John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (Ryer).

c. Faculty Teaching: Based on the surveys provided in the report and our own interviews, the four archaeologists are excellent teachers, covering a wide variety of topics in their courses. The same is true of the biological anthropologists although with only two of them (and one the department chairwoman), it is difficult for them to offer the range of class topics that would be ideal for the graduate students. The cultural faculty are also excellent teachers, covering a wide variety of topics that highlight the strengths of the department. The cultural and archaeology faculty teach the 3-quarter core sequence required of all graduate students. The department is beginning to have a conversation about how to re-structure the sequence to include less senior faculty in the teaching and to include more teaching from the biological anthropologists. The main concern expressed about teaching is that the increase in class sizes of undergraduate classes, coupled with the difficulties of hiring non-ladder rank faculty (i.e., lecturers and advanced graduate students) to teach, has had an impact on the number of graduate courses the department can offer.
d. Students in the program: The graduate students that we met were a lively group with diverse interests. The 2010 NRC ranking placed UCR Students 9th-41st based on students’ completion rates, financial aid, and other criteria. The students are serious scholars, and have actively chosen to be at UCR to work with particular faculty, whom they sought out prior to applying to the program. They appear to be a good fit with the program, willing to learn all the subfields and also interested in combining academic knowledge with applied goals.

e. Placement and reputation of program graduates: The Graduate Placement Table in the report shows that 21 of the 36 students listed were archaeology students and 10 of those 21 are now in tenure track positions at schools ranging from UC Santa Cruz to BYU. Some other students work in contract archaeology and some are adjunct faculty primarily at schools in California. The biological anthropology portion of the graduate program is largely new, so only a single forensic anthropologist has completed a degree and is in a tenure track position. The Graduate Placement table in the report shows that the graduate students who received their Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology have successful careers, either in academia (8 out of 14), or in careers outside of academia, including consulting work or diplomatic service. This is a strong track record for placement at a time when there are few academic tenure track positions open in any one year.

2. Does the graduate program present a coherent program of study for students? Is it adequate in scope and depth to ensure education appropriate for the M.A./M.S./Ph.D.?

The graduate program begins with a 3-term Core sequence taken by all graduate students. Overall the students are enthusiastic about this sequence saying that they use what they have learned in these classes in all of their subsequent classes and that it accomplishes cohort-building. Several mentioned that it could be more contemporary and be more inclusive of all sub-disciplines in Anthropology. Although teaching the core classes represents a burden, the senior faculty teaching them currently should consider incorporating additional faculty so that this important sequence continues to be taught as senior faculty retire. There was some concern expressed about the number of available graduate classes within the department, the low number of biological anthropology classes, a desire for a quantitative methods class, and the need for regular offering of the Professionalization course.

3. Is the faculty quality and quantity adequate for a strong graduate program?

a. Areas that should (must) be strengthened or added?

As we state elsewhere in this report, the faculty in Archaeology have led a strong graduate program up until now, but there will be several retirements in the near future and given the stellar reputation of the Archaeology graduate program, replacements are imperative if the department is to maintain its reputation. The department also sees the value of offering a four-field program, which is important
in our discipline. Thus adding a Linguistic Anthropologist will help solidify the reputation and breadth of the program. The Cultural faculty should continue to build to their strengths, which are medical anthropology, political economy and transnationalism, as well as aesthetics and performance. Finally, for Biological Anthropology to have an adequate graduate program, they should add one or two more faculty.

**b. Areas that should (must) be de-emphasized or removed:**

We found no particular areas that should be de-emphasized or removed. As stated elsewhere, once the department develops a vision and strategic plan that can shape the future direction of the department, then it will become clearer if there are any areas that should be de-emphasized.

**c. Where should the next appointment (resources permitting) be made?**

The external review committee feels that the strength of the department in Mesoamerican Archaeology should be maintained and therefore, although there is a hire going on this year, another hire should be made in that area. The department has requested a linguistic hire since 2004 and the review committee supports this vision given their commitment to a 4-field department. Maintenance of the doctoral program in Biological Anthropology also requires another hire, particularly with one of the faculty members serving as Chair of the department.

**4. Has the program done reasonable planning for the future? If so, is it planning for appropriate future changes? If not, what do you suggest?**

The external review panel agreed that the Department of Anthropology needs to develop a strategic plan. It is always difficult to predict what the future will bring in academia. What is known for this faculty is that three of four archaeology faculty will be retiring in the next 2-3 years (p. 9) and that UCR has a new medical school. How will these facts impact the future of this department?

Archaeology is one of the department’s strengths. The archaeology faculty specializes in the Maya area. The statement that UCR has “one of the strongest, if not the strongest, Maya training programs in the United States” (p. 7) is not hyperbole. The opportunity to work closely with Ashmore, Fedick, Patterson, and Taube draws students to UCR for graduate school. These four individuals chair the dissertation committees of 31 out of 57 current students in the PhD program. In other words, 30% of the faculty oversees 54% of the doctoral students. Interviews with the faculty and students supported maintenance of the quality of this program. However, while one new faculty position for a Mesoamerican archaeologist has been advertised and will presumably be hired this semester, there is no plan in place to replace the other two archaeology positions. We urge the administration to make replacement of retiring faculty in archaeology a priority.
The new medical school offers exceptional opportunities for interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching. Professors McMullin, Harvey, and Nelson all study health inequalities, medicine and healing. Professor Lee’s research on data mining could also be directed in complementary ways. The sociocultural portion of the medical anthropology program is able to place students in jobs and increasing the presence of bioanthropology in medical anthropology could strengthen the program overall. According to Dr. Paul Lyons of the School of Medicine, Professor McMullin’s research has already impacted his plans for training incoming medical school students. The opportunity to create synergy with the new medical school involves both faculty and students in Anthropology. The UCR Anthropology faculty are well-positioned to train students across all sub-fields regarding biological, cultural, and socioeconomic issues that affect health outcomes and access to resources.

Departmental strategic planning should consider the possible ways the department might contribute to the Medical School and vice versa. The MCAT is currently being revised to include a new social science section. According to the AAMC news release, the new section will appear in 2015, “The revised MCAT exam will include a new section, “Psychological, Social, and Biological Foundations of Behavior,” that will test students’ understanding of how these disciplines influence behavior and behavior change; cultural and social differences that affect well-being; and the relationship among socioeconomic status, access to resources, and well-being. This new section recognizes recent findings—highlighted in the AAMC report “Behavioral and Social Science Foundations for Future Physicians”—that integrating social and behavioral sciences into medical education can improve health care” (https://www.aamc.org/newsroom/reporter/march2012/276588/mcat2015.htm).

5. What would be needed for this program (or some component) to achieve true national distinction giving due consideration to present UCR faculty resources compared to those available at top ranked programs elsewhere?

UCR’s Anthropology Department already has many of the characteristics of a top program: excellent faculty and a strong graduate program. The external review panel was asked to envision how this program might achieve true national distinction without any change in financing. We feel it is not possible to do so. However, we can envision improving the ranking of the program in several ways:

**Faculty:** The program is currently configured as a four-field program (Archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Socio-Cultural Anthropology, and Linguistics). However, there are no Linguistic Anthropology faculty and the number of Biological Anthropology faculty is too small (at 2) to attract, retain, and train the best graduate students. Improving the program would ideally include maintaining the strength in archaeology through targeted hires for mid-level faculty specializing in the Maya, hiring 1-2 additional biological anthropologists, and hiring one linguistic anthropologist.
**Staff:** There is no question that the lack of adequate staff support has impacted the faculty and graduate students. Faculty and students spoke of problems submitting grants through the UCR system because of a lack of knowledgeable staff and problems administering grants and accessing their grant money for the same reason. Junior faculty have been particularly impacted by the lack of staff available to help put new course paperwork through the system, an issue that impacts students as well. This problem is not simply about numbers of staff, but about staff with the appropriate skills and experience.

**Student Funding:** Anthropology programs compete for the best students, with funding often determining where a student will choose for their graduate degrees, as well as determining how quickly they can progress through the program. According to the current graduate students, UCR offers excellent funding for the first two years of the program, but lack of funding after that point creates stress and slows their progress, particularly after they return from fieldwork. Some Anthropology programs at state universities located in other states now offer as many as seven years of full funding to graduate students. Providing additional guaranteed funding would always attract the strongest graduate students.

**Course-offerings and sizes:** As the number of Anthropology undergraduate majors has risen dramatically in the past few years, the faculty has become increasingly burdened with large classes. The number of seminars taught to graduate students has decreased, so that many graduate students explained that they had to go outside the department to get enough courses each semester. This is a serious issue for adequate training as well as speedy progress through the program. For example, the senior graduate student in biological anthropology now serves as a class instructor because of the need to cover undergraduate classes.

The external review panel strongly recommends the addition of a course in proposal writing to capitalize the Graduate Dean’s hiring of an expert in grant writing, and a mandatory submission of doctoral proposals to external funding agencies as part of the graduate program requirements. Dr. Fedick has taught a Professionalization course, but as he is retiring this year, another faculty member should be enlisted to teach this important course. The graduate students argued persuasively for regular teaching of this course and the review panel concurs.

Class size is also an issue; some courses, particularly field classes and lab classes, have been dropped entirely because the faculty have been told they had to have 35 students for such courses. It is not possible to teach field or lab classes to such a large group under any circumstances, and the lab classroom at UCR will not hold that many students. Again, this impacts graduate students who are not able to take a field school with UCR faculty nor have the experience of TAing such courses and supervising younger students. Hiring non-ladder rank faculty could relieve some of the overload in teaching the large undergraduate classes.
Facilities: While faculty offices at UCR are a nice size, a nationally renowned program requires state of the art facilities. The absence of teaching laboratories is a particular problem for training of archaeology and biological anthropology students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This is a critical issue for this program.

Website: The departmental website was last revised in 2008 and could use updating to streamline the presentation of the department for prospective students. The website has many admirable features, including many documents of use to enrolled students. Comments from graduate students suggest that faculty might discuss best practices concerning social media, such as Facebook, and when it is appropriate to discuss students in such venues.

6. Are the admission mechanisms and standards appropriate for a quality M.A./M.S./Ph.D. program in Anthropology? Are they applied fairly?

The targeted annual admission is around 7 with the plan of rotating across the subfields when possible. This strategy will allow Biological Anthropology to build a group of graduate students quickly. If continued for very long, however, it will result in the 2 faculty members mentoring more graduate students than they can handle given the intensive apprentice-type of training required in biological anthropology. The faculty may want to reconsider this strategy on a regular basis.

Overall, the average GRE score and undergraduate GPA of admitted students (1230 and 3.674, according to the Dean of the Graduate Division) are appropriate for a state university. The students seem to be of good quality overall. The Graduate Dean ‘tops up’ the average financial package and many of the graduate students cited financial support as pivotal in their decision to attend UCR. The department actively considers diversity issues in its admissions policy, which the graduate students supported vigorously. The overall process of admissions appears to be applied fairly.

7. Do students receive appropriate supervision, e.g., do fair and appropriate evaluations of graduate students occur at proper time, is there sufficient counseling, are students treated fairly with regard to assignment of TAs, GSRs, thesis advisers, etc.? Are annual reviews of graduate students accomplished appropriate with due notice of the results being given to the students?

The graduate students appear to receive excellent supervision. They are assigned an advisor upon admission although they have the right to change if desired and most students choose to come to UCR because of a specific advisor. Students write a preliminary research statement in their second year, take written exams, and at the end of their 7th quarter take oral exams. All of the graduate students with whom we met are glad they came to UCR because the faculty are very supportive, responsive, and available. All groups of students mentioned their sense of community where the students are not competing with each other, the graduate mentor program that involved them immediately with other students, and their respect for the faculty.
It is not clear to the students how TAs or GSRs are assigned and increasing the transparency in this area is encouraged. Planning is difficult for the students because they don’t know what or if they will TA until just before or at the beginning of the term in which they would teach. Any improvement in this area by the administration or the department would relieve a great deal of student anxiety.

8. Do problems of physical facilities, research equipment, or aids to scholarship exist?

**Facilities:** As noted in our answer to Q. 5 above, the lack of laboratories for research and teaching impacts the graduate program on several levels. First, the students do not have any laboratory classes to learn basic skills such as artifact analysis or osteology. Second, the students have no space to conduct research with collections of any kind, except for the micromorphology laboratory maintained by Dr. Lee. Students conducting dissertation research require space for research collections and comparative collections. Third, students have no space to write their dissertations. While this may be seen as a luxury, having graduate students writing within the department creates a synergy that having them write alone at home or in library carrels does not. Furthermore, close interaction between students and faculty during the writing stage speeds completion of the dissertation. Having older students present within a department provides role models for younger students. Fourth, the department lacks a suitable graduate student lounge, a need raised by several of the students in their surveys and in our interviews.

**Research equipment:** Perhaps the most critical need for research equipment is for working departmental computers. There is a small computer laboratory with four older model computers, only one of which works. There is an adjacent small “lounge” area with non-working refrigerator. Students and faculty alike would benefit from a working computer lab. The lack of a working printer has also impacted the ability of students to work efficiently while on campus. The department would benefit from instituting laboratory classes in archaeology and biological anthropology, but without adequate equipment for such classes, it would not be possible to teach them.

**Aids to Scholarship:** The most critical need is for staff to help submit and administer grants. The newly instituted NSF Fellowship initiative from the Graduate Dean is an excellent example of how encouraging students to write grant proposals can result in increased funding and increased visibility for the program. However, if the students and faculty are not able to administer their grants or get money efficiently, the entire enterprise is in jeopardy. Another critical need is a library with regular hours; faculty and students complained that they had a hard time conducting research because they did not always know when the library would be open. The library is apparently no longer purchasing books, and younger faculty in particular discussed the difficulties they had with accessing research materials; they should be encouraged to use the cross-UC borrowing system. Anthropological
research involves fieldwork, often far from the academic institution of the researcher. Anthropology faculty would benefit from being allowed to “bunch” their teaching load to 2-2-0 in order to have an adequate field research season. Junior faculty would especially benefit from having some reward for obtaining grant funding, such as a course release. Those faculty with external research funding could ‘buy’ themselves out of teaching; but there seems to be little understanding of how much money it takes for a faculty member to replace themselves. The review committee heard different amounts quoted by different faculty members, and by the faculty members versus the administration. Clarifying that issue could release faculty from undergraduate classes and allow them to spend more time with graduate students or to teach graduate seminars rather than undergraduate classes. Some faculty worry that the increase in undergraduate enrollment has increased their workload while the standards for tenure have remained the same. Allowing “bunching” would be an immediate, no-cost fix to some of the research issues raised.

9. Is there sufficient interaction between the program and any campus programs with which it should interact?

The external review committee spoke with representatives from the medical school, art history, history and the Southeast Asian studies program (SeaTrip). They all concurred that they have ongoing, dynamic and in-depth interactions with various members of the Anthropology Department. With the exception of the medical school, these faculty work with the graduate students from Anthropology. While we did not speak with representatives from the other programs with which the Anthropology faculty are affiliated, the faculty stated and it is reiterated in the report that they have ongoing relationships with the Women’s Studies program, Ethnic Studies, Marxist Studies, Linguistics, Global Studies, Latin American studies, Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, Plant Biology and Earth Sciences, Center for Conservation Biology, UC Global Health Initiative, Center for Ideas and Society, Liberal Studies, and Center for California Native Nations. These are not superficial interactions. Seven faculty have affiliated status in one or more of these programs. Others have a collaborating relationship. At least three faculty have served as Chair of one or more of these programs. This record of interaction is quite impressive and is a testament to the reach and interest of the Anthropology faculty to others on campus.

10. Are the times to degree appropriate for an Anthropology M.A./M.S./Ph.D.?

The time to degree (average=7 years) is lower than the national average of around 10 years.

11. How does the program conceptualize diversity? Is the program working to increase diversity? If so, how is it trying to do so?

It is clear that the program has a capacious concept of diversity. Diversity includes racial and ethnic diversity, socio-economic diversity, gender diversity, international diversity, and age diversity. The external review committee was quite impressed
with the visible number of older students who came to the meeting with the external review committee. The program is pro-active about admitting graduate students who will create a diverse program. Approximately twenty-one out of 58 current graduate students are non-Caucasian and of those, three are Native American. While that number may seem small, most graduate programs in Anthropology in the UC system have even fewer Native American students. Thirty-one out of 58 students are female. In the 2007-2011 period, according to the report, eight international students were offered admission. Anthropology has, from its inception, been an international discipline. Therefore it is imperative that universities in the U.S. offer training to international students.

The program has been dedicated to diversity at least for the last decade. It tries to maintain and increase the diversity of its graduate program mainly through very pro-active support from individual faculty to individual prospective applicants. The majority of graduate students who met with the external review committee emphasized that they came to the program because an individual faculty member was willing to be in active dialogue with them and even mentor them when they were still undergraduates or when they were between their undergraduate and graduate education. In addition, the faculty's teaching and research interests attract diverse students, including the themes of race and racism, migration and globalization, Southeast Asian studies, and health inequalities. The faculty are also pro-active about having their research and teaching serve local populations, which in turn leads to a more diverse student body.

**Overall Assessment of Program:**

The overall quality of the UCR Department of Anthropology graduate program is very good, although somewhat uneven from a subfield perspective. The department has a strong reputation, particularly in Maya archaeology and Cultural Anthropology, but Biological Anthropology has not reached this same level and is just emerging as a focus of potential excellence. Although the department is smaller than those at some larger research universities, it compares favorably based on well-recognized senior faculty members, strength in publications, and research grant support.

The department offers an array of courses for graduate students, but could benefit from additions in laboratory methods, quantitative methods, and proposal writing/professionalization. Graduate level courses are more diverse in some subfields than others. Graduate students commented favorably on the program and faculty, less so on the resources available, including teaching opportunities and funding opportunities after the first two years.

Our conclusion is that the UCR Department of Anthropology has a dynamic, interactive and creative faculty and graduate student population, with a strong commitment to excellence in education and research. The department has done exceedingly well with static investment, attesting to the strength and vision of its faculty.
A. Introduction to the Graduate Program in Art History

The terminal Master’s degree program in Art History was established in 1971 and provides graduate-level study of works of art, visual culture, and architecture, making use of area collections while employing broadly interdisciplinary methods. The M.A. program has thus provided both professional training for museum or collections specialists as well as scholarly training for students who will pursue a Ph.D. degree, awarding 219 master’s degrees since its inception. Since Fall 2004 the program has enrolled 90 students and awarded 66 degrees. Enrollment for the two-year period ending 2012 was 12-15 students, a decrease compared to earlier years.

One significant result of the program’s last review in March 2005 has been the Department’s proposal of a new M.A./Ph.D. program. Just as terminal M.A. graduates have pursued scholarly training or non-academic jobs in the past, the Department foresees graduates of the new Ph.D. program similarly pursuing academic careers or non-academic jobs. Meanwhile, the Ph.D. program proposal sees current M.A. funding being re-dedicated to doctoral students, for example as TA-ships, while terminal M.A. program enrollment will shrink. (UC’s Academic Senate approved the Ph.D. program proposal in February 2013.)

Because UC Academic Senate consideration of the proposed Ph.D. program was ongoing at the time of review, the review team also commented on the proposed M.A./Ph.D. program. The extramural review took place on January 6 -7, 2013. The review team consisted of Professors Stephen Campbell (Johns Hopkins University), Patricia Berger (UC Berkeley), and Michael Leja (University of Pennsylvania). The Art History Department provided its preliminary response to the extramural report on March 12 2013.

B. Summary of the External Report

The extramural report was positive as to the achievements of the terminal M.A. program and optimistic in regards to the potential for a successful M.A./Ph.D. program.

The terminal M.A. program is, as the review makes clear, a program that has successfully filled clear functions while achieving significant distinction over the years. The reviewers note that the terminal M.A. is highly regarded programs amongst those that fund two-year students. Reviewers suggest increasing TA-ships to 12 from the current 9.

While the department’s Ph.D. proposal states that current terminal M.A. funding will be re-directed to the M.A./Ph.D. program, the extramural reviewers recommend continued funding for terminal M.A. students comparable to prior years. The best way to move forward with M.A. and M.A./Ph.D. programs with complementary but also in all probability competing goals is left to the Art History department to develop.

B1. Quality:
The extramural report rates M.A. program quality as “high,” based on student achievement and based on the faculty’s overall scholarly productivity and committed engagement with graduate education. The department clearly deserves administrative recognition for its achievements in M.A. education over decades, and we salute the faculty for its distinguished contributions to research scholarship especially insofar as these inform its pedagogical accomplishments with the M.A. program and the recent system-wide approval of the new Ph.D. program.

B2. Coherence:

The reviewers rate faculty configuration as “good.” They note coverage across the western canon, with strengths in early modern and modern/contemporary art as well as a strong and specific focus in photography that is particularly important given department faculty’s long affiliation with the California Museum of Photography. They also note that speedy replacement of positions in Asian art and Latin American art is necessary to maintain departmental expertise in non-western art as well as to maintain traditional lines of cooperation with other scholars on campus. They write: “At full strength, the faculty offers students a curriculum that is coherent, broad, and deep.” Yet the faculty was not at full strength at the time of review; an ongoing hire will help meet some but not all current needs. The reviewers further observe that faculty in other departments wonder whether the department supports its graduate students’ taking advantage of relevant offerings elsewhere on campus; the reviewers observe that those extra-departmental offerings will contribute to cohesive programming at the doctoral level.

B3. National distinction:

The review team writes that “any department would be proud of this record [of distinguished achievement by faculty], especially a relatively small one.” The review team observes that the M.A. program continues to be a “top” program in its class, as it was at the time of the 2005 review. And the reviewers write that the terminal M.A. program is further distinguished by its ability to provide fee support, TA-hips, and stipends to its enrollees. The extramural review supports preserving the terminal M.A. program in its current configuration.

The reviewers note that UCR is “almost uniquely positioned” within the UC system to train doctoral students in Medieval and Renaissance art history, because several UC art history departments have replaced more traditionally focused positions with positions centered in newer paradigms that may be more comparative in approach. This comment raises the question as to how strongly the department will emphasize “traditionally core” approaches if academic institutions are hiring in more recent research paradigms or more comparative modes of doing research.

B4. Appropriateness and fairness in admissions:

Enrollment has recently declined, the review team notes, but not alarmingly, and the new doctoral degree program is likely to contribute to the graduate program’s desirability. The reviewers note the terminal M.A.’s program successful track record of attracting talented, motivated students, many of whom come from underrepresented communities or are first-generation college or graduate students. The department now faces the challenge of developing unit-specific admissions and recruiting practices for the doctoral program.

B5. Student supervision and professionalization:
The report praises the program for its successful track record in advising, professionalization, and placement. It also notes that a “few” students have stated that professionalization opportunities have been lacking, in both practicum opportunities and seminars that could provide expertise required by relevant institutional employers. The reviewers note that such courses could “easily” be taught by current faculty. We caution that research faculty should not be charged with developing courses in areas or activities in which they have neither qualifications nor interest. We note that new hires will help fill both extant and future needs of this sort. Finally, we note that development of cooperative relationships with faculty in other departments and of transdisciplinary certificate programs administered in cooperation with other departments can help meet such needs at both M.A. and Ph.D. levels.

B6. Material support and facilities:

The review team reliably reports that funding for scholarship is “inadequate.” We duly note our support for increasing funding both for faculty and graduate student research support and for the libraries’ acquisition budgets, particularly for digital materials or other resources that can be shared among campus researchers.

B7. Campus relationships:

The reviewers note that “A ready supply of courses in related departments awaits PhD students.” Cooperation across departments will thus provide significant value to graduate students in art historical programs and to the campus for the long term.

B8. Normative time requirements:

Reviewers found, apparently, that the terminal M.A. degree’s normative time requirement to be reasonable. Attrition figures are low, as they should be for programs of this type.

The proposed six year normative time requirement for the doctoral degree program is representative of similar programs, as well. Potential for attrition rates to go up exists.

B9. Diversity:

The reviewers write that the department’s success in attracting a graduate student body where students from underrepresented communities or who are “first-generation” is “admirable.”

C. Departmental Response

The department accepts the extramural report without corrections (March 12 2013). The department notes that while department faculty may agree in principle with the review team’s recommendation to fully fund all terminal M.A. candidates, additional resources would be required to do so. The department offers to address terminal M.A. funding in their forthcoming response to the findings and recommendations presented in this document (see D4 below).

D. Recommendations

The Department has a strong record of placement, but concerns over professionalization and funding continue to receive mention by students and by extramural reviewers. Also, as the Department focuses attention on implementing the new M.A./Ph.D. program, significant planning
challenges lie ahead. Challenges range from the immediate need to create support systems, program procedures, and documentation for incoming graduate students, to providing professionalization and placement services for graduates, to meeting longer-term needs to further develop quality research facilities, to articulating the program’s presence and value amidst doctoral-degree granting programs on campus, in the UC system, and nationally or internationally.

GRADUATE COUNCIL’S RECOMMENDATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. **We recommend that the department, through some formal process it chooses, clarify its range, capabilities, and goals in relation to M.A. and Ph.D. training as it reviews needs and goals for the M.A. degree and as it begins to implement the new doctoral program; and that it present the results in a new vision statement. A preliminary version of this new vision statement should be part of the response to this F&R document.**

   Hosting a well-regarded M.A. program and embarking on doctoral training at a particularly exciting juncture in the history of the arts, the department has an extraordinary opportunity to move nimbly towards implementing cutting-edge research programs that will set it apart from more well-established programs. Clearly, how to reconcile longer-standing goals and needs of the current M.A. program vis-à-vis those of new programs requires careful planning and implementation. Questions about how to re-direct current funding to, and whether and how much additional funding will be required for, administrative costs and student package support in the combined M.A./Ph.D. require significant attention. We also think it will be worthwhile for the department to leverage emerging paradigms in interpretive or analytical method that might extend the department’s potential strengths as regards doctoral training, and to develop what may now be less obvious capacities or gaps, but which in time may develop into clear new strengths. We pose, then, the following question: how will the department redefine graduate training in its fields as it rolls out the new doctoral degree program, and as the contemporary terrain of academic and non-academic positions requiring or preferring Ph.D. credentials continues to change? What kind of funding will be necessary to support the department’s new vision, and what kinds of funding paradigms exist?

2. **The faculty of the Department should actively pursue possibilities for collaborative graduate training and facilities development with other faculty and programs on campus.**

   We recommend that the department continue to expand on its current cooperation with faculty members in other humanities departments who can play useful roles in building new degree or certificate program(s). (We recommend, in the same vein, that the department consider any potential value that the current designated emphases in “Book, Archive, and Manuscript Studies” and in “Science Fiction and Technoculture” may have for its new doctoral candidates.) Such development efforts may serve to build up doctoral research and training and contribute to the larger campus vision in the years to come.
We recommend that the department collaborate with other campus departments to identify and develop new modes of facilities support for mutual benefit.

3. **We recommend that the Department of Art History develop a concrete professionalization program to complement its degree offerings and provide a report of this program to Graduate Division by fall quarter 2013.**

   The report should indicate program needs and goals for professionalization, and provide information about the program’s curricular requirements or electives as well as other student opportunities for professionalization.

4. **New learning outcomes should be developed for graduate training.**

   The Program provided learning outcomes for students pursuing a terminal M.A. degree on March 19, 2012. We recommend that the program review them and draft learning outcomes for students who will pursue M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. We recommend that the complete learning outcomes documents be provided to Graduate Division prior to the beginning of fall quarter 2014.

5. **The Department should revamp its current Graduate Student Handbook and develop clear program Protocols defining graduate student requirements and procedures.**

   The Program provides current graduate students with a “Handbook” of “Graduate Student Guidelines.” The handbook will need updating to reflect program decisions about the terminal M.A. program and the new M.A./Ph.D. program. Regarding the new M.A./Ph.D. programs, we recommend that the Program develop comprehensive protocols clarifying: normative time schedules and requirements; graduate student representation on departmental committees; comprehensive and/or qualifying examination preparations, formats, and procedures; area or field declaration procedures; and so forth. Generally, all administrative procedures relevant to graduate student life in the unit should be as clear, reasonable, and accessible as possible, and in line with those in use nationally at comparable doctoral degree granting programs at research universities. We recommend that the department draft these protocols and make them available to all current and incoming students prior to the beginning of fall quarter 2014.

6. **In addition to seminars, etc., we recommend that the Department create appropriate advising and evaluation procedures for doctoral candidates.**

   We recommend that the department survey and recommend best practices: 1) for administering graduate student advancement in terms of normative time requirements, and 2) for providing fair, consistent, and ethical unit-level evaluation procedures for students as they advance through the six years of their academic careers at the University. How will students track normative time progress? Where will student files be maintained? Who will provide access to those files? Etc. When relevant, formal procedures developed should be included in the updated Handbook or program protocols (see above), before fall quarter 2014.

   Also, as the new M.A./Ph.D. program gets underway, we also recommend that the department faculty be provided with pro-active advising guidelines and approaches.
that might minimize attrition and support students in achieving the best professional outcomes for their desired placement goals. We recommend that the faculty produce a first version of advising procedures before fall quarter 2014, and iterate upon them as needed.
March 12, 2013

Connie Nugent, Chair
Graduate Council

RE: Report on the Extramural Review of the Graduate Program in Art History

We have no corrections to errors of fact, misperceptions or interpretation to the extramural team’s report on our graduate program. On the contrary, we believe the committee has given us a fair evaluation and are extremely pleased by their positive assessment of our graduate program.

One significant issue requires further discussion among department members before we can form a thorough response: the committee’s recommendation that the M.A. program be continued in its present (funded) form. While, in principle, we might agree with this recommendation, we must consider the additional resources required to maintain a funded M.A. as well as its relation to the newly-approved doctoral program. In our detailed response to the Graduate Council’s Findings and Recommendations, we will address this recommendation.

Sincerely,

Patricia Morton, Chair
Art History Department
University of California at Riverside

Extramural Review of the Graduate Program in Art History, January 7-8, 2013.

Patricia Berger, Professor, Department of History of Art, University of California, Berkeley
Stephen Campbell, Professor and Chair, Department of the History of Art, Johns Hopkins University
Michael Leja, Professor, History of Art Department; Director, Visual Studies Program, University of Pennsylvania

I. The Present Review and the Review of 2005

In addition to the deans and the Graduate Council Chair and members of the Review subcommittee, the reviewers interviewed several members of the faculty in Art History, all 13 of the current M.A. students, some faculty members in other humanities departments and programs with which History of Art interacts, and staff in the Visual Resources Collection.

The reviewers were provided with data on the current M.A. program (enrollment data, courses, outcomes for graduates), the report of the extramural committee review of 2005, as well as the most recent draft (February 2012) of the History of Art Department’s Proposal for a Ph.D program. While the reviewers had been charged to evaluate the M.A. program, it was already clear that the issue of the greatest urgency facing the Department of Art History is the plan to offer a doctoral degree, which if implemented would have very significant impact on the M.A. program in its current form—one scenario would even foresee its disappearance.

The program was last reviewed in March 2005: reviewers on that occasion strongly endorsed the institution of a Ph.D program, contingent on a number of recommendations including:

1. The authorization of searches to replace departing faculty in two specific areas 1) Contemporary Art and Critical Theory 2) Latin American Art and in one additional area—using a faculty line originally dedicated to Ancient Art—to a new sub-field that would bridge or augment the research interests of existing faculty.

2. The creation of an M.A./Ph.D program that would complement the existing M.A. program. The reviewers called upon the Graduate Division to work with the Department and the University to create funding packages for Ph.D students that would be competitive with fellowships provided with other art history or visual studies Ph.D programs in the UC system (UC Irvine, UC San Diego, UC Santa Cruz, UCLA, UC Berkeley).

3. The reversal of funding shortfalls in Visual Resources and in the library, where holdings and acquisitions in art history and visual studies had been seriously affected by budget cuts.

Over the past seven years, the university and the department have made significant moves to implement the recommendations of the 2005 reviewers.
1. Several new hires have added greatly to the department’s strengths in Modern and Contemporary Art, History of Photography, and Early Modern European Art. For a small program at UCR, art history appears robust in terms of the range and quality of its faculty. At the same time, the maintenance of faculty strength remains an issue. Recent and more long standing departures or retirements require new recruitment initiatives. While a search for an Asianist is currently under way, the recent departure of Latin American specialist Stella Nair has created a breach in programmatic continuity, given her complementarity with Jason Weems in American Art and—beyond the department—with the Ancient Americanist Karl Taube in Anthropology.

2. Approval is still pending on the Ph.D program at UC system-wide level; at the same time the prospect has provided a clear impetus to recent faculty hiring and will clearly be a retention factor for the department’s ambitious and productive faculty. However, the future shape of the M.A. program—or even its future existence—is uncertain. While the department and the 2005 reviewers profess their conviction in the “efficacy and academic worth” of the M.A., a number of factors—not all of them arising from academic concerns—have led to a kind of pre-emptive prioritization of the doctoral program, towards which the greater part of graduate funding resources will very likely be allocated. Under present circumstances, it seems unlikely that the M.A. program will be sustainable according to a competitive merit-based funding model, and that it will be available, if at all, only to applicants who pay their own tuition costs.

3. While funding for Visual Resources remains precarious and there is no guaranteed annual budget, there are now 3.0 FTE as recommended in 2005, and the unit maintains an impressive level of productivity offering access to its collections through an effective and user-friendly interface. The staff also provides a range of important services—preparing photographs for faculty publications, designing and producing posters and other publicity materials—not usually provided in VR units. The faculty still expresses extreme dissatisfaction regarding the predicament of the library and the inability to acquire books and journals at a level that supports teaching and research. While this continues to be a problem (as it is at other UC campuses) most M.A. students and a few faculty commented on the efficiency of the Interlibrary Loan service.

II. The Existing M.A. Program

Our primary charge as external review committee was to evaluate the existing M.A. program in Art History. We found the program to be strong and thriving. The uniqueness, strength, and success of this program are appreciated by students and faculty alike, and our committee joins them in hoping to see it maintained in its current form across the addition of a Ph.D. program. We note that the 2005 external review concurred in this judgment. To quote that report: “UCR’s MA program belongs to this top group, and care should be taken—whatever reconfiguration might occur at the PhD level—to preserve it.”
The quality of the program is high. One measure of this is the impressive success graduates have had finding places in the museum/art market/arts administration work force and in Ph.D. programs at universities nationwide. Another is the caliber of the faculty, which includes distinguished senior figures, productive and visible mid-career scholars, and promising assistant professors. They are publishing in prestigious journals and winning competitive fellowships, including, as noted in the self-study, awards from the Guggenheim Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, Getty Research Institute, Fulbright Foundation, I Tatti, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Dumbarton Oaks, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence/Max-Planck-Institute, Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, Huntington Library, and American Council of Learned Societies. Any department would be proud of this record, especially a relatively small one.

The configuration of faculty is good, with coverage across the western canon and special strength in early modern and modern/contemporary art and photography. Specialists in Asian art and Latin American art have recently been lost, one to retirement and the other to a competing university. Replacing these figures as soon as possible is important for maintaining breadth beyond the western canon and preserving strong connections to the rich programs in area studies and related fields at UCR. At full strength, the faculty offers students a curriculum that is coherent, broad, and deep.

The faculty’s collective dedication to teaching was striking in the interviews conducted by the visiting committee. All showed real commitment to the success of the students and of the program overall. The graduate students we interviewed (and we interviewed all of them) demonstrated a remarkably high level of contentment. To a person they noted that the faculty has been accessible, stimulating, and challenging and that morale among grad students is high. They also commended the excellent work done by faculty and department staff in recruiting prospective students.

The M.A. program has been very successful in attracting talented and motivated students. Significantly, many of these students come from populations underrepresented in academia. At a time when universities across the country are striving to attract qualified minority and first-generation students, UCR’s success is enviable. In addition to the obvious strengths of the program, the financial support offered to these students is an important factor in recruitment. We know of relatively few programs (Tufts, Williams, UC Davis, Cal State Longbeach, San Francisco State) that serve M.A. students needing financial assistance. Another effective recruitment tool is UCR’s impressive record of post-degree job placement and bridging to doctoral programs. Graduates with M.A.s in art history have more career opportunities open to them than do M.A.s in other fields of the humanities, including curating, arts administration, public and private collection management, cultural heritage work, conservation, art market, publishing, and design. UCR’s graduates have had noteworthy success finding places in these fields. This argues for the special value of M.A. degrees in art history in contrast to many other fields in the humanities.
The review committee noted some small concerns that arose in our interviews and discussions. First, the number of M.A. enrollments has declined somewhat—not excessively and perhaps not beyond a normal range of variation. The addition of a doctoral program may resolve this problem. Special efforts may be necessary, beyond the already strong recruitment activities, to increase application and enrollment levels, and results should be monitored over the next several years. Second, faculty in related departments say that they are not seeing as many art history M.A.s in their courses as they would like. This may well be an effect of the brevity of the M.A. program. A ready supply of courses in related departments awaits PhD students. Third, while the M.A. students generally raved about their experience in the program, a few expressed a desire for more professional training, practicum opportunities, and museum studies courses. Such courses could easily be taught by existing faculty and would serve well many of the students in the program. Fourth, funding to support and facilitate scholarship is inadequate. Travel grants and research funding for students and faculty should be increased, as should the library’s budget for acquisition of books, journals, and digital media resources. Finally, many faculty and students feel that the M.A. program is undervalued as a resource in the university and its administration. They say its future would be precarious if it were left unchanged. The comments above about the special value of the M.A. in Art History address this issue.

III. Plan for the Proposed Ph.D. Program

As already noted, this review of the M.A. program in Art History takes place at a moment when the History of Art department is awaiting news of UCOP approval of its proposed Ph.D. program. The discussions the review committee had with faculty and students have made it clear that the very desirable institution of a Ph.D. will inevitably have an impact on the future of the M.A. program, at the very least in terms of student support. The anticipated Ph.D. program in History of Art also raises significant issues about graduate funding overall. The Deans have stated that the Department’s funding will not increase, leading to the inevitable conclusion that the resources currently allocated for support of M.A. students will eventually be consumed by a much smaller number of Ph.D. students.

The effects of this move on the M.A. program are difficult to calculate, given the apparent lack of commitment (or resources) to provide additional resources to support the Ph.D. We note that almost every student we had the opportunity to interview reported that the promise of funding—fee remissions, TA-ships or small stipends—was a decisive reason they chose to come to UCR. As noted above, funding for M.A. students is, indeed, a nearly unique feature of UCR’s program; M.A. programs at almost every one of the very few other schools that offer the degree are “self-supporting,” precluding enrollment by the very kind of student that UCR prides itself in fostering: the student who may come from an under-represented group, who might be the first in his/her family ever to attend college (never mind seek a graduate degree), or who might have come to the History of Art after some soul-searching and under pressure to do more “practical”
work. Because the M.A. program offers funding, the department has been able successfully to recruit talented students from across the country. We strongly recommend that the University improve its funding of graduate training in History of Art across the board, particularly in the area of TA-ships (12 rather than the current 9 would go a long way to solving the problem). UCR is in an enviable position to become a new center for graduate study in the History of Art that would provide training in the field unlike that of any other major program in the UC system and beyond. The department can only do so if it has the resources to provide funding packages that are competitive with those offered by the nation's leading departments.

In the 2005 review of the M.A. program, the department was strongly encouraged to develop a proposal for advanced graduate training. The department's particular strengths, which are detailed in the final Ph.D. program proposal now in the hands of UCOP, are found in the productive and resourceful History of Art faculty and colleagues in related departments (Anthropology, English, Art Practice, Dance, etc.), in UCR’s geographical proximity to a global art center, and in the University’s own permanent resources and collections. The department faculty, then as now, has notable strengths in early modern-contemporary Western art and in the history of photography. UCR is uniquely positioned to support the latter; the California Museum of Photography is a national resource that attracts scholars from around the world and the museum has an ongoing and apparently regular relationship with the department, providing unique opportunities for M.A. students in the form of internships and access to primary resources. UCR’s History of Art faculty includes three members who are directly engaged in innovative research on photography and related subjects.

The faculty has outlined a Ph.D. program that builds on its current strengths: broad coverage of Western early modern-contemporary art; specific emphases on photography, architecture and sculpture; and, until the recent and lamentable departure of the department's Latin Americanist to UCLA, an impressive subfield in Latin American art that has attracted an sizeable group of students. The Ph.D. proposal relayed to UCOP outlines a program that will utilize faculty in unusual ways: first, by medium (architecture, sculpture and photography), second, by period (early modern-contemporary) and third, by area (Europe, the US and, potentially, Latin America). Within the UC system, the UCR faculty is almost uniquely positioned to train advanced students in Medieval and Renaissance art. Several of UC’s History of Art departments have shed these traditionally core positions in favor of visual studies and "world art," a rubric that designates art historians whose work is largely comparative and cuts a wide swathe through periods and places. UCR’s proposal thus builds on existing faculty interests and strengths even as it outlines a program that would differ significantly from current programs at other UC campuses, specifically at nearby campuses, including UCLA, UCI and UCSD.

We note that the goals of the Ph.D. program are in part commensurate with the goals of the present M.A. program—to provide advanced academic training in the history of art for students who aim to teach and do research in the academy or to take curatorial positions in museums. The current M.A. program currently funnels students into other Ph.D. programs; its track record
in this regard is strong and about 50% the current cohort of M.A. students that we interviewed expressed the intention of moving on to a Ph.D. program. The M.A. program has provided a productive haven for students not quite prepared to move directly into doctoral programs. But it also effectively accommodates the needs of students who want to work in museums in non-curatorial roles (as museum educators, as registrars, in public relations, etc.), who envision themselves as art educators in primary or secondary schools, as art dealers, or who find other places in the culture industry. The Ph.D. program would emphasize the first set of goals over the second. This is as it should be. But it is also, we feel, a strong argument for maintaining the M.A. program with funding at the current level, because the work it performs is distinct from the goals of the Ph.D. If UCR is serious about upgrading its graduate training to include the Ph.D., then its administrators should support the decision in a way that makes the new program truly competitive without pulling support from a proven program that is deemed somehow less prestigious within an arena where departments must compete for limited funding.

The faculty has the ability and ambition needed to oversee a rigorous doctoral program and to direct doctoral students in a manner consistent with the highest standards. We commend the current search in Asian art and strongly recommend quick approval of a search in Latin American art. UCR is well positioned to become a center for the study of Latin American art (and campus demographics point to the need to support growth in this area). We also recommend that the administration give thought to the added burden to faculty directing graduate students in a Ph.D. program and urge that graduate advising be given consideration in determining course load.

IV. The Art History Department and its Place in the University

Despite its size, the department presents a common characteristic of many strong art history departments – it is a nexus of interdisciplinary activity, where liaisons between individual faculty and colleagues in other units are in many respects as important as professional links within the department. Two art history areas with strong interdisciplinary potential for UCR as of recently are no longer represented and urgently require replacement: Asian Art and Latin American Art.

The department now has particular strengths in History of Photography, which provides rich collaborative scope with California Museum of Photography and with some faculty in Fine Art; it is to be hoped that resources are actively sought out to enable further creative developments of this connection in the form of special fellowships, internships, conferences and publications, and exchanges of students and faculty with other programs (for instance, The International Center of Photography at Bard College in New York).

The reviewers met with faculty in Anthropology, English, History, and Comparative Literature who all bore witness to the collaborative willingness of faculty in Art History (especially for service on examination and thesis committees, but also because course offerings complement
program strengths in other departments, such as the Public History concentration offered in History, which prepares graduates for careers in museums, archives, and historic preservation).

A few faculty nonetheless remarked that they were surprised by the low rate of participation by Art History M.A. students in courses offered in other departments, such as Cultural Studies courses in English that engage Contemporary Art from the perspective of gender or affect/emotions. However, it is worth noting on the latter point that there is a vigorous intellectual debate regarding the relation of art history to Cultural Studies and to Affect Theory in particular (see the online journal Nonsite.org). It will always be the case that many disciplines will have investment in the visual and the material and the aesthetic – the difference of disciplinary approach rather than their elision (i.e. disciplinarity rather than eclecticism) should be a source of intellectual strength.

Renaissance and Early Modern European is a major strength in Art History at UCR and is complemented by the teaching of a major scholar in Medieval Art, as well as the Medieval/Early Modern group in History (Gorecki, Cogswell, Head). The three Renaissance/Early Modern faculty approach this “canonical” field in fresh and inventive ways and refuse to take its centrality for granted (there is none of the complacency that has elsewhere placed the field in crisis, as positions previously dedicated to Italian Renaissance and Baroque have been re-dedicated to other periods and regions, as has happened at UCLA). In addition, the program in Early Modern carries a specialization of its own, since the three faculty in this area all work on sculpture and/or architecture, offering an alternative to the traditional concentration on painting in most other departments. It is hoped that the Early Modern will market and promote itself through pursuing a more global track with hires in Chinese Early Modern and in a parallel field in Latin American/Pre-Columbian.

Currently, the prominence of Renaissance/Early Modern makes it unique in the UC system and places it in an increasingly smaller cluster of national programs with strengths in this area. There is considerable demand for M.A.s and Ph.Ds in Early Modern European (and for undergraduate teaching in Renaissance) yet currently many of the leading research universities (Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Penn) lack a senior faculty appointment in this area. There are significant resources for the study of Early Modern Europe in the Southern California region, and it is likely that already existing links with The Getty and the Huntington will be strengthened in the years to come. However, effective training of doctoral scholars in this area needs to be reinforced with resources for travel to Europe and for specialist training (languages, paleography).

The overall strength of the department means that its doctoral program could flourish, given the correct input of resources and, above all, attractive funding packages for graduate study that will alleviate the prospect of significant student debt – perhaps the chief obstacle to graduate study in the second decade of the 21st century. The university could additionally secure the future success of the graduate program by underscoring its commitment to the humanities at a campus-wide level. Reviewers were very concerned that the documents for the UCR 20/20 contain not a
single mention of the humanities. Among its seven areas of proposed concentration, only performing and studio arts as well as creative writing have been flagged for development (e.g: *New Voices and Visions: The Global Studio of the Creative Arts*). The arts and the humanities are not the same thing – they are complementary and mutually reinforcing, but neglect of the latter in the name of promoting the former would be counter-productive. The humanities provide the historical and critical apparatus for thinking about the arts and their role in human culture. Failure to recognize this would be seriously impoverishing and a blow to the faculty morale that the establishment of a doctoral program in art history is seeking to galvanize.

**Recommendations:**

1. The committee supports the introduction of a doctoral program, and it strongly recommends that the current M.A. program be continued in its present form, i.e. with funding for M.A. students. According to the documents supplied to the review committee, this was the Department’s original plan: “Our original intention had been to retain the M.A. program as a terminal degree and add a highly selective Ph.D. program as a complement, with new funding for the doctoral students. In the current budget situation, however, additional funds are not available for a new program, so we will use the current M.A. program funding to fund the Ph.D. program.” The committee feels strongly that the M.A. program is a significant resource that UCR would be unwise to abandon. We understand that there are precedents at UCR for an M.A. program and a PhD program to co-exist, both with funding for students.

2. Replace the recently departed specialist in Latin American art. For future recruitments, it would be desirable to re-visit the possibility of an appointment in a) one of the fields of Ancient Art and b) in nineteenth century art, which was one of the areas of expertise of Françoise Forster-Hahn.

3. Ensure that the doctoral program is provided with attractive and competitive graduate fellowships.

4. Ensure that the extra labor for faculty that comes with doctoral supervision is recognized in merit raises and courseload allocation.

5. Increase support for library acquisitions, research travel, and courses that would enhance professional preparedness.
June 6, 2013

TO: Katherine A. Borkovich
Chair, Plant Pathology Graduate Program

RE: PLANT PATHOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAM RESPONSE TO GRADUATE COUNCIL’S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Thank you for your second response to the Graduate Council’s Findings and Recommendations resulting from the review of the Plant Pathology Graduate Program.

The program’s responses are reasonable and show satisfactory progress moving forward on almost all issues that were identified in the review. With regard to the recommendation for curricular changes to the program, given the uncertainties associated with the potential re-structuring of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), the Council agrees that a delay in responding to this concern is acceptable. However, attention to the curriculum should not be on an indefinite hold. Thus, the Graduate Council requests an update on the program’s intentions with regard to curricular changes by December 15th, 2013.

Yours truly,

Connie Nugent
Chair, Graduate Council
May 21, 2013

To: Connie Nugent, Ph.D.
   Chair, Graduate Council

From: Katherine A. Borkovich, Chair
   Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology

Re: Response to Grad Council’s Findings and Recommendations Memo 4/22/13

Below are the responses of the Plant Pathology Graduate Program Faculty to your April 22, 2013 memo regarding the Program’s Responses to Council’s Findings and Recommendations.

1. In response to the fifth recommendation, please provide specific course numbers and changes that will reduce redundancy. Also, please provide a list of new courses, as well as the specific deadlines when the curriculum will be finalized.

We have put all discussion of changes to our graduate program curriculum on hold due to the ongoing CNAS Redesign process. We will revive the discussions once any administrative decisions have been made.

2. To more fully respond to the sixth recommendation; please clarify the program’s plans, if any, for development of a Professional Science Master’s.

We are not currently developing a Professional Science Master’s Program. The suggestion to establish a Professional Science M.S. was made by the review committee as a vehicle to attract more domestic students to the program (Quote: “Discuss mechanisms that can increase the number of domestic graduate students in the program by giving serious consideration to reviving the MS degree program and consider the development of Professional Science Master’s program”). However, we have done even better by recruiting 6 domestic Ph.D. students for 2012-13 and 3 more domestic Ph.D. students that will begin matriculation in Fall 2013.

3. With regard to the eighth recommendation, please provide specific details and discussion of the plans for improved graduate student representation in the program. For example, will there be representation on curriculum or seminar committees?

We are in the process of implementing several changes to the graduate program. First, the Plant Pathology graduate students will now invite and host an outside speaker for the PLPA250 Winter quarter seminar series, beginning in 2014. We are tentatively planning to present a new endowed student research award (Calavan Award) right before the student-invited speaker seminar. Second, the graduate program curriculum committee will include a graduate student member beginning with the 2013-2014 academic year. Third, the department chair and graduate advisors have met with program students to suggest ways that they can revive their graduate student association and plan events that will increase interactions between themselves and program faculty. Such meetings will now occur as needed, with at least one meeting/year.
April 22, 2013

TO: Professor Katherine Borkovich, Chair  
    Plant Pathology Graduate Program

FM: Connie Nugent, Chair  
    Graduate Council

RE: Plant Pathology response to Graduate Council’s Findings and Recommendations

The Graduate Council has considered the program’s responses to the Council’s Findings and Recommendations concerning the review of the Plant Pathology Graduate Program. It is clear from these responses that the graduate program has been working to implement many of the recommendations, and we appreciate your efforts. However, there are a few areas in which a more substantive response is requested, as detailed further below.

In response to the fifth recommendation, please provide specific course numbers and changes that will reduce redundancy. Also, please provide a list of new courses, as well as the specific deadlines when the curriculum will be finalized.

To more fully respond to the sixth recommendation; please clarify the program’s plans, if any, for development of a Professional Science Master’s.

With regard to the eighth recommendation, please provide specific details and discussion of the plans for improved graduate student representation in the program. For example, will there be representation on curriculum or seminar committees?

We will expect your response by May 30, 2013.
Plant Pathology Graduate Program Response

We thank the review team and the graduate Council for their evaluations and recommendations. As we have been in a leadership transition, we have focused on making adjustments to our graduate program. We respond to the Graduate Council findings and recommendations for each point below, understanding that these specifically derive from the recommendations of the excellent review team.

Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

1. The program must work to establish a clear and compelling vision of its future goals and develop a coherent strategy for accomplishing its goals. The program faculty and students should work together to develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

We have worked diligently to redesign our vision as our faculty has changed. The new vision is defined as a suite of new goals. “Our departmental goals are to conduct research on the basic biology of plant pathogens and microbes, to develop methods for the management of microbial diseases of plants and other organisms, to provide a quality education to our students; and be a repository of expert advice on plant diseases and microbiology to the citizens of California and the world.”

Building upon this, “The Graduate Program of Plant Pathology at the University of California, Riverside aims at conducting research on the basic biology of plant pathogens; developing methods for the management of plant diseases; providing a quality education to its students; and, providing expert advice on plant diseases to the citizens of California and the world.”

Both goals are stated in our two new websites; for the Department at http://plantpathmicro.ucr.edu, and for the Plant Pathology Graduate Program at http://plantpath.ucr.edu

One output of achieving our goals has been the reinstatement of the interdepartmental Microbiology Graduate program and reinvigoration of the Plant Pathology Graduate Program (see below). Our department is the administrative home for the two programs and most faculty are members of both. This is reflected in our new departmental website, with prominent links to both programs.

2. Work with the CNAS Dean and the Graduate Dean in identifying a faculty member to serve as Department Chair, who has the leadership and interpersonal skills to work successfully with all members of the faculty to build a common vision and strategy.

Professor Katherine Borkovich has accepted the Chairmanship, bringing the breadth of perspective in Plant Pathology and Microbiology broadly to build a new common vision and strategy.

3. Re-evaluate recruitment efforts in hiring some mid-career faculty potentially with focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology.
While we continue to request new positions for the Department, we point out that our faculty have matured and we have been successful in hiring new faculty. We currently have a good distribution of junior and senior faculty. We have 10 full Professors (including several step I to IV), 3 Associate Professors, and 3 Assistant Professors, plus 3 Cooperative Extension Specialists.

4. **Undertake a concerted effort to work with the administration and the department in determining a strategy for renovation and/or replacement of the plant growth facilities so that faculty can undertake research of the highest quality.**

We continue to work to improve the ancient, decrepit, and unreliable plant growth facilities. All facilities are under the management of Agricultural Operations directly under the Dean’s office, who are also committed to improving facilities. Efforts are underway to generate funding for a new facility.

5. **Assess the curriculum to reduce redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses, to allow students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization and to introduce new courses that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.**

Efforts to revise the 4-course base currently in existence (Mycology, Virology, Bacteriology, and Nematology) are underway. Professor Jim Adaskaveg recently redesigned his undergraduate Mycology lecture and laboratory courses so that they could be taken by both undergraduate and graduate students. This will expose our graduate students to real-world fungal diseases and their management.

6. **Discuss mechanisms that can increase the number of domestic graduate students in the program by giving serious consideration to reviving the MS degree program and consider the development of Professional Science Master’s program.**

We are making extensive efforts to increase the number of graduate students, especially domestic students. These include direct calling and aggressive recruitment efforts. We also believe that as our faculty mature, we will continue to increase our student recruitment. These efforts are already paying off, as we had 6 new domestic PhD students last year, and 6 offers out this year, with one acceptance already received. Our primary limitation now to expanding the graduate program is support from the College for GSR funding for new graduate students, and TA positions for 2-5 year students.

We are continuing discussions for the Masters and a Professional Science Master’s degree.

7. **Develop the professional training requirements and cultivate an appreciation of the importance of teaching experience for graduate students and view TA-ships as an essential learning experience for graduate students.**

We redesigned our PLPA265 course to offer a review of the Principles of Plant Pathology and also provide education in professional development to our students. This course was well-received by the graduate students and will be offered again in Spring 2013.
We do agree that teaching experience is a critical part of our training. Many of our students now receive some TA experience. However, the allocation of TAs is ultimately determined by the Dean’s office through the TAAC, and funding cutbacks have curtailed the number of available TA positions.

8. **Address the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives.**

We will be asking for student input while we revise our curriculum over the next few years. We are also planning more activities for students in order to increase the *esprit de corps* of the group. Current students are essential and effective contributors to our recruitment of new students.
July 11, 2011

Michael Allen, Chair  
Department of Plant Pathology

Dear Dr. Allen:

The Findings and Recommendations of the Graduate Council resulting from the review of the Plant Pathology program are enclosed. A formal response is due from your program by **October 11, 2011**. Your response package should include appropriate program changes, statements of changed procedures, course proposals, etc., or statements of why the points in the Recommendations are not to be carried out. Acceptance of your response package by the Graduate Council will conclude the present review of the program.

Yours truly,

Morris Maduro, Chair  
Graduate Council

Cc: Chancellor White  
EVC and Provost Rabenstein  
Dean T. Baldwin, CNAS
A. Introduction

The Graduate Program in Plant Pathology has a strong and well-deserved reputation in plant pathology. The program was established in 1961-1962, but remains relatively small, consisting of 15 PhD students at the present time. Currently, the Program does not have Master’s students. In total, the Program has conferred 232 PhD degrees, with 23 of these awarded since the prior extramural review in 2002. The overall attrition rate for students who leave without a PhD is 32%. The mean time to completion of the degree for students who earned their doctorate during the period from fall 2002 to winter 2010 is 5 years.

The Program underwent an extramural review on February 7-8, 2011. The extramural review team consisted of Professors Andrew O. Jackson, University of California Berkeley; James D. MacDonald, University of California Davis; Leland S. Pierson III, Texas A&M University. The review team submitted its report on March 30, 2011. Graduate Division received the Program’s response to errors of fact, misperceptions and interpretations in the extramural report on May 2, 2011.

B. Summary of the Extramural Report

The extramural review team positively notes high national ranking of the Plant Pathology Program and recognizes its strengths in subtropical and semi-arid crop production that sets it apart from many other plant pathology programs and provides UCR with a competitive advantage in this area of research. The program is well positioned to build new focus on Microbiology that can interact synergistically with Plant Pathology addressing more fundamental questions of host-pathogen interactions. The team finds the faculty to be strong, internationally recognized and to attract a substantial level of extramural funding. The program recruited a number of outstanding new faculty members in recent years. There was an approximately 50% increase in grants, including federal grant support, and 30% increase in faculty hires during the review period.

The review team found a number of areas in which the Program could be strengthened.

Leadership and Faculty

The review team expressed concerns related to leadership. The team recommends identifying a new chair, someone committed to the future success of the program and equipped with the social networking skills to reach across all
members of the faculty to move the program forward. The team views as essential to the long term success of the program a new leader who can develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

The team comments that the department has few mid-career faculty members to fill important leadership roles. The team recommends new mid-career faculty hires in microbiology to meet anticipated instructional needs and to provide a balance between the microbiology and plant pathology.

**Graduate Students**

The review team raises a number of issues with respect to the graduate students. The graduate program is composed of a diverse group of mostly international students and a smaller number of domestic students. The team finds that program’s research focus on subtropical and semi-arid crop production is one of the factors making the program highly attractive to students from developing countries. The team also finds that the difficulty in attracting domestic graduate students to both Plant Biology and Plant Pathology is seen broadly as a national problem. Nonetheless the MS program could provide a mechanism for attracting domestic students to the program that become interested in research and choose to advance to PhD studies. The team raises concerns that there is no effort in recruiting or admitting students to the MS program, even though it is listed as an active option for students. The team also indicates that there are many career opportunities for graduates with the MS degree and there is a strong demand for MS level graduates in private industry and many other agricultural outlets. The team recommends giving serious consideration to the mechanisms for reviving the MS degree program. The team also suggests that undergraduate microbiology interactions with faculty in the plant pathology track might enhance domestic graduate student recruitment efforts.

Although a student group was active in the past, the review team found that the students, in general, appear to be unaware as to how decisions that affect their lives are made. The team recommends addressing the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives. The team finds the Program’s track record for placing its graduates into faculty positions to have been strong but does question whether this record may have fallen off in recent years.

The team points out that the program should recognize the importance of teaching experience for graduate students (via TAships) as an essential learning experience. The team also recommends that student experiences should be broadened to consider professional opportunities outside academia by inviting industry representatives to speak in the departmental seminar series.
Curriculum

The most significant finding of the team with respect to the structure of the graduate program itself is that there are too many core courses offered to support them. The four core courses currently required of all students are organized around the primary plant pathogen groups, fungi, bacteria, viruses, and nematodes, and the curriculum has been in place for many years without revision. The team recommends reducing the redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses and allowing students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization.

The team also suggests additions to the curriculum. Noting that undergraduate students do not get involved in plant pathology research, the team suggests converting some of the core courses to cross-listings at both the undergraduate and graduate levels to increase undergraduate student exposure to this area of research that will potentially enhance pool of domestic applicants. The team also suggests separating lecture and lab components of classes, offering them as two related, but independent courses and adding new classes that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.

The team recommends additional mid-career faculty hires with the focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology tracks of the program.

The team also indicates the lack of student awareness of career options outside academia. The team recommends the program to invite industry representatives for seminars to educate students about professional opportunities outside academia.

C. Departmental Response

The Department was appreciative of the external review recommendations and considers their assessment to be helpful. The Preliminary Response of the Department of Plant Pathology to the Extramural Report identifies three minor errors as follows:

1. The student group exists and was active in the past. However the strength of student organization has reduced due to lack of programmatic cohesion and the dispersal of students across labs in many buildings.

2. Professor Baldwin has expressed concern about a possible perception that he served as interim chair of the Department of Plant Pathology to facilitate a merger between the Department of Plant Pathology and Nematology, where only a minority of faculty consider themselves to
be programmatically compatible with the Department of Plant Pathology versus with some other department.

3. A college-wide TAAC committee assigns TAships taking into consideration student teaching requirements of the program, their experience and language skills, instead of financial needs.

D. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

1. The program must work to establish a clear and compelling vision of its future goals and develop a coherent strategy for accomplishing its goals. The program faculty and students should work together to develop a unified vision that integrates plant pathology and microbiology.

2. Work with the CNAS Dean and the Graduate Dean in identifying a faculty member to serve as Department Chair, who has the leadership and interpersonal skills to work successfully with all members of the faculty to build a common vision and strategy.

3. Re-evaluate recruitment efforts in hiring some mid-career faculty potentially with focus in host-pathogen interactions that can help to integrate plant pathology and microbiology.

4. Undertake a concerted effort to work with the administration and the department in determining a strategy for renovation and/or replacement of the plant growth facilities so that faculty can undertake research of the highest quality.

5. Assess the curriculum to reduce redundancy that exists to varying levels among the four core courses, to allow students some flexibility in taking courses that would enhance their knowledge of their area of specialization and to introduce new courses that will increase student exposure to real-world plant pathology.

6. Discuss mechanisms that can increase the number of domestic graduate students in the program by giving serious consideration to reviving the MS degree program and consider the development of Professional Science Master’s program.

7. Develop the professional training requirements and cultivate an appreciation of the importance of teaching experience for graduate students and view TA-ships as an essential learning experience for graduate students.
8. Address the issues of graduate student governance and student representatives to be included in discussions of curriculum and other issues that impact their lives.

APPROVED BY GRADUATE COUNCIL ON JUNE 7, 2011
Mechanical Engineering (ME) Graduate Program Review

Findings and Recommendations

A. Introduction

The ME Graduate program was reviewed January 10-11th, 2013, by an extramural team comprised of Matthew Begley (UCSB), Daniel Fletcher (UC Berkeley), and Kyle Squires (Arizona State). The external report was sent to the Chair of the Mechanical Engineering Department (Prof. Thomas Stahovich) on March 25, 2013. The Graduate Council received a preliminary response from the program on April 29, 2013. The subcommittee members involved in the review and drafting the F&R were David Johnson (Biomedical Sciences) and Jianzhong Wu (Chemical and Environmental Engineering).

The ME graduate program was established in September 2001. It offers M.S., Ph.D., and 5-year Bachelor-Masters (BSMS) degrees in Mechanical Engineering. Currently, the Department has 15 faculty members (7 Full Professors, 3 Associate Professors, and 5 Assistant Professors) and 6 cooperating faculty members from four other departments. The number of graduate students enrolled in the program at the end of AY11-12 was 60, including 15 enrolled in the M.S., 5 in the BSMS, and 40 in the Ph.D. program. An additional 18 graduate students entered the program at the start of AY12-13. Since 2001, the program has awarded 95 (53 in M.S. and 42 in Ph.D.) graduate degrees.

B. Key Points from External Review Report

1) The extramural team recognizes that the graduate program in mechanical engineering has been very successful in its initial stage of development over the past 10 years in terms of faculty recruitment and graduate students training in the broad fields of mechanical engineering. The team also offers several important recommendations as the program moves into the next stage of growth aiming to be nationally more competitive.

2) By meeting the Graduate Council Chair and Members of the Review Subcommittee, the Graduate Division Dean, the Engineering Dean and Associate Dean, all of the mechanical engineering faculty, and a representative group of graduate students, the review term observed high morale among the faculty and the graduate students and adequate support of the program from the key administrators. For example, they found that faculty and students interviewed were enthusiastic, engaged and confident. In particular, some students considered their research superior, and sometimes far superior, to their peers at other institutions.

3) The review team was impressed by the overall quality of the graduate students from the ME graduate program and commended their indispensable roles in the success of the faculty research. The reviewers believed that graduate students have been provided with adequate opportunities to attend national and international conferences to present their scientific work.
4) Although a lack of specialized graduate courses was raised as a major concern among the faculty in the self-study, the reviewers maintained that, with an average of 3.9 lecture courses and one seminar course offered per quarter, the number of graduate courses given by the department should be considered as adequate. The graduate students would be better served with a set of core courses to ensure broad training in fundamental areas. Offerings beyond the core courses should reflect the focus areas in which the Department aims to become well known.

5) The review team concurred on a major faculty concern of the weak campus support on the facilities and equipment that has dramatically undermined the competitiveness of the graduate program. They pointed out that growth and further improvement of the graduate program will depend upon a facilities infrastructure that is essential for research success in the types of interdisciplinary environments that faculty operate in today. It was bluntly stated that “UC-Riverside will simply not be competitive if the administration accepts the current level of responsiveness and expense of basic laboratory modifications.”

6) The review team pointed out that postdoctoral training is a vital component of any healthy and competitive graduate program in science and engineering. Attracting postdocs and placing them in academia should be taken as an important strategy for the young graduate program to establish its national/international reputations and visibility. Given the complexity and sophistication of the interdisciplinary research being pursued by the faculty, postdoc support is critical to generate high-impact publications, to maintain cutting-edge research projects, to increase research productivity, and to establish new laboratory capabilities. Postdocs working together with graduate students not only enable the faculty to focus on development of new research ideas and to secure competitive funding, but also benefit the students by enhancing their research productivity and experiencing collaborative environment. The reviewers noted that restriction on hiring postdocs would jeopardize the faculty competitiveness against other programs with well-developed research hierarchy.

7) While the reviewers admired the ability of individual faculty to obtain competitive grants for diverse research projects, the program needs to identify its unique strength and develop focus research areas that are nationally recognizable. The process of defining focus areas in which the program is or can be nationally competitive is challenging and will require a serious effort in strategic planning and strong leadership.

8) The need to increase the number of faculty in the program was repeatedly emphasized by the reviewers. The program needs more faculty in order to adequately address the demanding teaching load due to the rapid increase of the undergraduate enrollment. The growing undergraduate population is a huge drain on the amount of time and attention that the relatively small set of faculty can give to the graduate program and course offerings. When stressing the importance of core courses in the graduate curriculum, the review team again brought up the need for additional faculty to help deliver the curriculum. Independent of teaching needs, when the external team discussed that the program is now at a point where they can look to increase their ranking, they again brought up faculty hiring. The program needs to define a focus and make a couple areas
very strong - so that UCR becomes an identifiable leader in those areas. Thus, the review team recommended that the program hire new faculty who can compete with the top tier to strengthen strengths, rather than hiring to fill gaps in breadth.

C. Findings and Recommendations of the Graduate Council

Based on the external review, the Graduate Council makes the following recommendations:

1) Identify and define a small set of focus areas that can be nationally recognizable and competitive and those areas should be prioritized in the future faculty hires.
2) Improve the research climate of the graduate students by enhancing their interaction with post graduate researchers. Relax the restriction on recruiting and hiring post-docs.
3) Given the evolution of the program, restructure the graduate curriculum around a set of core courses that emphasize the fundamental areas of mechanical engineering.
Date: April 29, 2013

To: Connie Nugent, Chair
    Graduate Council

From: Thomas F. Stahovich
    Chair and Professor
    Department of Mechanical Engineering

Dear Dr. Nugent:

The Mechanical Engineering faculty has reviewed the Graduate Program Review report. We would like to thank you and the review team for this careful evaluation of our program. We have no corrections to make at this time. We look forward to receiving the Graduate Council’s final Findings and Recommendations.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Stahovich
Chair and Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of California, Riverside
Introduction and Overview

As one component of the Five-Year Review of the Mechanical Engineering Graduate Program, in January 2013 the three authors of this report visited the main campus for approximately two days. During the visit, interviews were conducted with Graduate Council Chair and Members of the Review Subcommittee, the Dean of the Graduate Division (Prof. Joseph Childers), the Dean of the Bourns College of Engineering (Prof. Reza Abbaschian) and Divisional Deans, the Chair of the Mechanical Engineering Department (Prof. Thomas Stahovich) and Department Graduate Advisor, all of the mechanical engineering faculty, and a representative group of graduate students. A tour of some of the faculty research laboratories was also included in the visit. This report summarizes the review team findings and recommendations.

The graduate program in the Department of Mechanical Engineering is relatively young, established in September 2001. The program offers M.S., Ph.D., and 5-year Bachelor-Masters (BSMS) degrees in Mechanical Engineering. The Department has 15 faculty members (7 Full Professors, 3 Associate Professors, and 5 Assistant Professors) and 6 cooperating faculty members from four other departments.

Based on the self-study and two days spent on campus, it is clear that the graduate program in mechanical engineering is a launched, fully functional program that trains graduate students in relevant and interesting research areas, with mentoring by faculty who are clearly vested in the success of the program and their students. The next stage of development of the program has thus arrived, and this upcoming stage will present new challenges as the program must now be more nationally competitive.

A series of observations from the visit concerning the Mechanical Engineering program are especially important, were identified in the self-study, and are central to the program’s current standing and future growth. These require attention and are summarized as,

- The growing undergraduate population is constraining further advancement of the graduate program. One measure of a robust graduate program is a suite of course
offerings that occur at predictable intervals. However, teaching obligations to the undergraduate program have become more substantial as enrollments have grown from around 350 in 2007-2008 to around 525 in 2011-2012, with zero net growth of faculty members since the last program review. If recent undergraduate enrollment trends continue, this will curtail the number of graduate courses offered in the program.

The scope of this challenge should not be under-estimated; the graduate student experience is negatively impacted by relatively few courses and makes them less marketable as future faculty, industry leaders, or national lab engineers. Placement of graduates is ultimately one of the most important quality measures of a thriving graduate program.

- The Department is entering a phase of growth in which it will benefit from defining research areas of particular strength.

The prospect of faculty growth to meet the large undergraduate program demand highlights an opportunity for focusing hiring around a few key themes for which the Department could become well known. Prominent, clearly identified focus areas in the department’s research activities is one of the key elements needed to further advance the graduate program. The process of defining focus areas in which the program is or can be nationally competitive is challenging and will require a serious effort in strategic planning and strong leadership. Note that an initial focus on a few areas for initial growth does not preclude growth in other areas. In fact, other areas of the department can be filled out once the foci to be defined have achieved prominence.

- An issue raised repeatedly by a majority of the faculty and administrators is the relatively poor state of facilities management at UC-Riverside. Long delays in attending to the most basic renovations are common, and there is a prevailing perception that facilities management has relatively little interest in the success of the programs.

While growing the faculty is an important component of advancing the graduate program, it will ultimately be of relatively low impact without a corresponding commitment to ensure facilities are up to speed and functional for new hires. This is particularly true for a comparatively young research program such as the one at UCR, since research cannot be shifted to existing facilities while new ones come on line. The current state of facilities at UC-Riverside significantly hampers faculty competitiveness and imposes a tremendous strain on the graduate program and especially the junior faculty.

Faculty

The Department has successfully recruited talented faculty and provides a collegial environment that is critical to their success. In general, the faculty appears forward-thinking, enthusiastic, supportive of each other and engaged. Further, they have demonstrated an admirable ability to obtain funding for very competitive research.
A concern raised by several faculty was the restriction on hiring postdocs on faculty startup funds. Given the complexity and sophistication of the interdisciplinary research being pursued by the faculty (admirable in its own right), it is critical to provide advanced support for the faculty that will increase publication rates, enable faculty to focus on research program development, establish basic laboratory capabilities, and do so at the accelerating pace demanded by today’s funding climate.

It is understandable that the college is strongly focused on graduate degree production to establish the legitimacy of the graduate program. However, clear successes in this initial phase have elevated the importance of other strategies to compete at the highest level. Post-doctoral researchers are a critical tool for faculty to remain at the cutting edge of their discipline, particularly since they are now competing against other programs with well developed research hierarchy. The review team recognizes that faculty startup funds are finite and, consequently, perhaps models could be considered in which more shared laboratories are developed that will lower equipment costs and perhaps free up resources for postdoc support.

The review teams also believes that in the next phase of the Department’s evolution, emphasis should be placed on producing seminal work that will be highly recognized. Such an emphasis would recognize that quality publications are ultimately more critical to the program development than fund raising, as external research funding is an enabler of outstanding scholarship, and not an end in itself. A department culture that values the importance of the outlets where faculty publications appear and the quality of graduate student placements will be two elements central to future success. For example, placing UCR Ph.D.s as post-docs in top research programs would be highly effective in publicizing the quality of UCR’s program and faculty accomplishments.

As delineated in the Department self-study, the faculty research is categorized within four broad research areas:

- Thermal and Fluid Sciences
- Mechanics and Materials
- Biosensors and Biomedical Applications
- Information, Computation, and Design

Within the above four areas, the Department identifies developed expertise in seven multidisciplinary clusters:

- energy processing;
- nano & microscale engineering;
- biomedical applications;
- information, computation and design;
- materials properties & processing;
- multiphase flow and combustion;
- air quality & environmental engineering.

While laudable as an approach to capture all dimensions of each faculty’s research, a smaller set of cluster areas are needed as it will guide thinking on strategic hiring and help the Department
identify 1-2 areas that it desires to achieve national prominence. The focus areas listed above are broadly pursued in programs across the country, and a more refined definition of research strengths will significantly aid in the development of ME’s reputation for excellence.

**Students**

The number of graduate students enrolled in the program at the end of AY11-12 was 60, including 15 enrolled in the M.S., 5 in the BSMS, and 40 in the Ph.D. program. An additional 18 graduate students entered the program at the start of AY12-13. Since 2001, 95 (53 in M.S. and 42 in Ph.D.) degrees in Mechanical Engineering have been awarded.

The number of students admitted to the graduate program has remained relatively static over the past few years with a steady increase in domestic applicants and larger increase in the number of international applicants. These trends are healthy at the department’s current faculty size and consistent with a graduate program that is on a solid foundation, positioned for future growth. An additional positive indicator is that selectively and yield have also remained relatively constant with the exception of an increase in the selectivity of international students.

The graduate students interviewed by the review team are enthusiastic, engaged and confident. Overall, morale seems high and the program should be commended for maintaining such a positive environment. Student exposure to the broader scientific community is admirable, with students having the opportunity to attend national and international conferences and seeming successful in presenting their work. The program should be commended for its recruitment of quality students who appear to have roles central to the success of their faculty advisor’s lab. This is particularly impressive considering the relatively young age of the graduate program.

Journal publications including student authors have been increasing and the impact of those publications as evidenced by increasing number of citations has also been increasing. These are healthy trends as one sign of a strong graduate program are students who are contributing and ultimately leading research with journal manuscripts one of the more important measures.

There was an interesting slight disconnect between the students’ perception of program competitiveness and the publication rate amongst the graduate students. In particular, some students considered their particular research superior, and sometimes far superior, to their peers even though they had only presented at conferences and not actually published their research in archival journals. The review team recommends that attention be given to emphasizing the importance of journal publications and thus increasing the publication rates of the students. The students would also benefit from a strong consistent seminar series that would both advertise their successes and provide exposure to standards of performance at other schools. The graduate student culture would also benefit from the hiring of post-docs, who could share their experiences at other institutions and assist in training, publishing, and mentoring.

**Curriculum**

Graduate students can pursue one of two degree options at the Masters level and the PhD. Two options are available at the Masters level, one that includes an applied project and a second plan
that is coursework only. Both require 36 units of upper division and graduate-level approved coursework. PhD students must complete a program consisting of a minimum of 72 units of graduate-level and upper-division coursework. Enrollment in the department colloquium series is required in the PhD program for at least six quarters.

Given the relatively limited size of the faculty and disproportionate growth in undergraduate enrollment, the department is doing an adequate job on the number of graduate offerings with an average of 3.9 lecture courses and one seminar course offered per quarter. The department points out in its self-study that part of the plan to improving the graduate program is the offering of additional courses and addressing a lack of courses in some areas such as robotics, controls, and/or cyber-physical systems.

Prior to considering expanded offerings in under-served areas of the curriculum, the department would be well served to consider a restructuring of the graduate curriculum around a set of core courses. This would alleviate some of the stress on course offering constraints, ensure broad training in fundamental areas that the Department points out as important, and serve the student interests by ultimately contributing to their growth as well-rounded researchers. Offerings beyond the core courses could be organized to reflect the focus areas in which the Department aims to become well known.

Facilities

Growth and further improvement of the graduate program will depend upon a facilities infrastructure that recognizes its role in promoting student and faculty success and is resourceful in providing the support that is essential for research success in the types of interdisciplinary environments that faculty operate in today.

While existing facilities and equipment appear competitive, a common complaint (and with specific examples provided by several faculty and administrators) is that the adaptation of facilities to meet new demands and the development of new capabilities is poor. This represents a severe constraint that dramatically undermines the competitiveness of the graduate program.

This weakness was not judged to be specific to mechanical engineering, but rather the entire college (and perhaps across the university). UC-Riverside will simply not be competitive if the administration accepts the current level of responsiveness and expense of basic laboratory modifications. As an extreme example, one faculty travels consistently to the campus of one of UC-Riverside’s competitors to conduct experiments, while the required equipment has been sitting on a loading dock for years waiting for facilities to come on-line. Other extreme examples related to the cost of basic wiring and cosmetic work, wherein response times and costs were shockingly unacceptable. This facet – poor infrastructure support – was easily the most glaring deficiency of the entire review.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The graduate program in mechanical engineering is strongly valued by the faculty who possess much enthusiasm for the program and for one another and is comprised of a core of enthusiastic
students who appear to have the support needed to succeed. The program also enjoys the support of key administrators that include the ME Department Chair, the Engineering Dean, and the Graduate Division Dean. The graduate program exists on a solid foundation reflecting excellent progress in the last seven years and is positioned for future growth. This upcoming growth phase will present challenges different than those faced since the program’s inception, as the program should now be aiming for achievements that are typical of the nationally prominent programs which are now the department’s competition.

Addressing enrollment growth in the undergraduate program is needed if the graduate program is to be further improved. This might be accomplished by either considering enrollment thresholds, or an aggressive growth in the faculty size, or a combination of both.

Faculty hiring is needed both to address undergraduate enrollment pressures and to further advance the graduate program. The department is strongly urged to strategically plan future hiring, initially around 1-2 key areas in which the department can achieved national prominence. Part of that planning will also refine the rather large number of research clusters that currently define the department research. The development of nationally competitive research programs in some areas (notably those emphasizing experimentation and multi-disciplinary research) requires the hiring of post-docs, both to enrich the graduate student experience and to ensure productivity at the highest levels.

Strategic planning around faculty hiring will also present an opportunity to reinforce the core values that characterize top departments that UC-Riverside aspires. These should include an emphasis on journal publication in top journals and graduating and placement of PhD students at top industry and academic programs for post-doctoral research, as peer assessment and ranking of the graduate program will be sensitive to such measures. The department has an opportunity though whatever level of hiring is possible to mentor their untenured faculty in ways that reinforce the department’s core values.

Finally, a stronger commitment is needed by the university to ensuring the basic infrastructure needed by the faculty and graduate students can be put into place in an efficient, timely, and cost-effective manner.