Agenda
Graduate Council
Thursday, May 21, 2015
9:10 – 11:00 am
Academic Senate Conference Room
Room 220 University Office Building

Action
9:10 – 9:15  1. Approve Minutes of the April 16, 2015 meeting

Information/Discussion
9:15 – 9:25  2. Announcements
   A. Chair of the Graduate Council
   B. CCGA Representative
   C. Graduate Student Council Representative
   D. Dean of the Graduate Division

Action
9:55 – 10:15  3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee
   A. Approval of Program Changes:
      1. GGB - Addition of elective course
      2. Math - Change in qualifying exams
      3. MEIS Designated Emphasis - Change to allow double counting courses between DE & PhD
      4. CMDB - Professional Development addition to catalog

10:15 – 10:40  4. ARPE Forms
   Action: Review and vote to approve or revise.

10:40 – 11:00  5. Graduate Program Reviews
   A. Statistics response to F&R
      Action: Vote to accept program’s response and close out review.
   B. Dance F&R
      Action: Vote to approve or revise F&R and forward to the program for a response.
   C. Education F&R
      Action: Vote to approve or revise F&R and forward to the program for a response.

Information
The following courses were approved by the Courses & Programs Subcommittee and should be approved electronically by the full Graduate Council prior to the full GC meeting:

1. EE 214/PHYS 220 (CHANGE) - Quantum Computing
2. EE 218V (NEW) - Power System Steady State and Market Analysis
3. EE 249 (NEW) - Power System Dynamics
Graduate Council  
Meeting Minutes  
April 16, 2015  
220 University Office Building 

Present:
David Lo, Chair, School of Medicine  
Tom Payne, Vice Chair, Computer Science & Engineering  
Alicia Arrizon, Gender & Sexuality Studies  
Malcolm Baker, Art History  
Michael Coffey, Plant Pathology & Microbiology  
Ted Garland, Jr., Biology  
Ryan Julian, Chemistry  
Rene Lysloff, C&P Chair, Music  
Rick Redak, Fellowships Chair, Entomology  
Amit Roy Chowdhury, Electrical & Computer Engineering  
Jorge Silva-Risso, SoBA  
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)  
Prent Williams, GSA Student Representative  
Linda Scott, Graduate Division (guest) 

Absent:
Wendy Ashmore, Secretary, Anthropology  
John Kim, CCGA Rep., Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages – on leave  
Chris Laursen, Political Science  
Rollanda O’Connor, GSOE 

Approval of Minutes 
The minutes from the March 19, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved as written. 

Chair’s Announcements 
Chair Lo discussed the new multidisciplinary research building on campus. The building will be located behind Materials Science and Engineering and will have mostly biology-type wet lab space with a significant proportion of dry lab computational space. The campus is still about five years away from having the building. 

Other Announcements 
CCGA Representative, Rene Lysloff – The Academic Senate leadership gave a report to CCGA. Members of the Governor’s staff will be attending the May CCGA meeting. The governor wants cheaper, but not necessarily quality, education. There was a discussion about developing standards for course requirements for transfer students. Standards are under development for the life sciences and will soon include the natural and social sciences. There was a proposal for a new UC campus for science, technology, and arts in Los Angeles or the Silicon Valley; nothing came of this proposal. The UC PATH program is continuing and the staff is expected to receive a 3% pay increase implemented as soon as July 1st. There is a proposal that no UC salary should be more than $500k; closing down medical programs to achieve this was discussed. A new member of the Board of Regents was announced, he is the President of Long Beach Community College. CCGA Vice Chair Valerie Leppert discussed the Grad Plan which has to do with funding for
students changing from terminal MA’s to PhD’s. Vice Chair Leppert also noted that graduate students are at a higher risk for mental health problems. CCGA recommended increased stipends, adding a couple years to normative time, and better mentoring. The 2015/16 budget was discussed. There is a proposal to discuss UC Care, perhaps introducing an HMO plan.

CCGA agreed on a change in the wording for SSPs. There was a discussion with Provost Aimee Dorr who wants to advocate that the Vice President for the Office of Research and Graduate Studies be a self-sustaining unit. Provost Dorr discussed resources and graduate research with CCGA.

UC MEXUS – CCGA discussed a sunset review. The program will more than likely be continued but they want the program to develop a vision of where they are going.

GSA Student Representative, Preston Williams – Mr. Williams was invited to the Department of Finance whose members are interested in putting a lot more money into online courses and increasing the percent of three year undergraduate degrees from 2.5% to 5%. Students were opposed to this.

Mr. Williams met with President Napolitano and the committee of two to describe what graduate education really is.

Mr. Williams is currently working with UCOP to write a grant for graduate student mental health funding.

Graduate Dean Joe Childers – Dean Childers announced that after decades of service, Linda Scott is going to be retiring in June.

Dean Childers thanked the committee for evaluating the GRMPs and DYPs. Graduate Division awarded 162 quarters to 108 students, a total of $1.62 million in allocations. Next year the evaluating criteria need to be more clearly defined.

GAANNs (Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need) are fellowships for areas of national need, for which most of the sciences qualify. For the first time, CHASS programs are eligible for these fellowships. If a program receives a GAANN, the program can recruit at least four to as many as six students. The student receives a full year of fellowship from the GAANN; they can be funded over three years but that is problematic because it is a need based fellowship and once you give them money from the GAANN, it counts against the student’s need. Graduate Division is suggesting programs apply for these fellowships – year one the student would use GAANN money; year two they would use Graduate Division funds; and the program, PI, or student would cover years three and four. For every three students supported by GAANN, Dean Childers is committing to support another. Graduate Division and the Office of Research will be providing all templates for GAANNs.

The take rate is down on admissions; the campus will probably be close to a 40% return this year. Programs are going back to their second group, partially because the quality of the applications has been going up.
Grad Slam – ten finalists were announced yesterday. The winner will receive $5k and will go on to compete at the systemwide competition on May 4th. The runner up will receive $2k, third place will receive $1k, and the people’s choice will receive $1k.

Graduate Advocacy day is approaching. Dean Childers will be taking two great graduate students to Sacramento. These students will help explain the importance of graduate education and research to state legislators.

The successful Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) candidate is Dina Plemons who has her PhD in Anthropology. Dr. Plemons studies ethical research in universities. She will train the trainers on campus and help coordinate the curriculum for RCR. Dr. Plemons will also help train postdocs and students who require training for NSF and NIH.

NSF GRFPs – This year Graduate Division only received 11 GRFPs. This was a drop from last year, specifically from Engineering (Bioengineering). Ten of the eleven students who received awards participated in four or more one-on-one sessions with Graduate Division’s graduate student grant writing consultants. Dean Childers wants to make it clear to faculty how important it is that students apply for these fellowships and that they are not research grants, they are fellowships. NSF is looking to invest in the potential of the student, not necessarily just the quality of the science.

Grad Quant is moving forward. Dean Childers is making sure it is well funded and organized. Dean Childers recently had a conversation with the Statistics department. The Dean indicated that there is a perception that the department is isolated. The department has agreed to participate more in the delivery of seminars and instruction, not just graduate students. The department realizes this will make them visible on campus and underscore their importance.

Student Services has hired someone who will help with counseling graduate students. The number of counselors in the campus health center is also increasing. This will hopefully help graduate student mental health issues.

Courses and Programs
Graduate Council voted to approve/return the following program changes as indicated:

1. SoBA MPAc – change to admission requirements – Graduate Council discussed this program change and returned the proposed change because Council members were not comfortable with the program offering conditional admission. The Council suggested the program change their catalog so that it says “Students will not be considered for admission until the required prerequisites are completed successfully. Those students who do not meet the minimum requirements for admission may fulfill these requirements prior to being considered for admission by enrolling in the intensive summer program.” The Council also wants all references to the Graduate Council and Graduate Division to be removed from the catalog copy.

2. MSOL – proposed changes to specializations – The Council approved this program change with a suggestion to clarify points 1 – 3 in the catalog.

Benchmarks for Graduate Programs form
A one-page Benchmarks form was created for department usage. The simple form will be used to internally submit to WASC and will help satisfy accreditation concerns. The form will be
completed with the program’s self-study and will be part of the review e-binder. The two-page Annual Research Progress Evaluation (ARPE) will be completed by programs annually. None of the criteria on the ARPE form is required to be used; programs are free to plug in their own criteria. Quantitative data is preferred. Members suggested adding a recommendations section to the template and adding a column for “n/a”. The idea is that the numbers would be used to measure how the students are progressing. The top section of the form that includes numbers is for WASC, the bottom section with comments is for the student. Some of the members suggested removing the numbers and using “yes”, “no”, and “n/a” options instead. Chair Lo asked CHASS, GSOE, and SoBA faculty of the Council to create a subcommittee that will use the STEM ARPE form as a model to create a form that better suits their colleges.
We propose the following changes to the Plant Biology Graduate Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program offers the Ph.D. degree in Genetics, Genomics, and Bioinformatics.</td>
<td>The program offers the Ph.D. degree in Genetics, Genomics, and Bioinformatics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Work</strong> The course curriculum consists of three core classes and one or more elective classes. The core curriculum is composed of one genetics, one genomics and one bioinformatics course, while one or more elective classes can be chosen from an area of a student’s specialization. These courses are described in the Genetics, Genomics, and Bioinformatics Graduate Student Handbook.</td>
<td><strong>Course Work</strong> The course curriculum consists of three core classes and one or more elective classes. The core curriculum is composed of one genetics, one genomics and one bioinformatics course, while one or more elective classes can be chosen from an area of a student’s specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Classes</strong> (breadth requirements) Students will take one course from each of the following three areas (A-C). A Molecular Genetics GEN 203 - Advanced Genetic Analysis of Model Organisms or MCBL 221 - Microbial Genetics or BPSC/BCH 231 - Plant Genome Students may choose other alternatives after approval by their guidance committee and graduate advisor.</td>
<td><strong>Core Classes</strong> (breadth requirements) Students will take one course from each of the following three areas (A-C). A Molecular Genetics GEN 203 - Advanced Genetic Analysis of Model Organisms or MCBL 221 - Microbial Genetics or BPSC/BCH 231 - Plant Genome Students may choose other alternatives after approval by their guidance committee and graduate advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Genomics GEN 241 (former GEN240A) - Advances in Genomics</td>
<td>(B) Genomics GEN 241 (former GEN240A) - Advances in Genomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Bioinformatics GEN 242 (former GEN240B) - Data Analysis in Genome Biology</td>
<td>(C) Bioinformatics GEN 242 (former GEN240B) - Data Analysis in Genome Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective Classes</strong> (areas of specialization) Students must take one or more classes from the following areas. Students can also choose elective courses other than the ones listed below after approval by their guidance committee and graduate advisor.</td>
<td><strong>Elective Classes</strong> (areas of specialization) Students must take one or more classes from the following areas. Students can also choose elective courses other than the ones listed below after approval by their guidance committee and graduate advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genetics</strong> • CMDB 201 - Molecular Biology</td>
<td><strong>Genetics</strong> • CMDB 201 - Molecular Biology • GEN 206 - Gene Silencing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Genetics, Genomics & Bioinformatics

- CMDB/GEN/BCH 209 – Ribonucleic Acid (RNA) Biology
- BPSC/BIOL 148 - Quantitative Genetics
- BPSC/BCH 231 - Plant Genome
- BIOL/MCBL 221 - Microbial Genetics
- EEOB 214 - Evolutionary Genetics
- ENTX 204 - Genome Maintenance and Stability
- EEOB 216 - Theory of Evolution

Computational Biology and Statistics
- BPSC 234 – Statistical Genomics
- CS 141 - Intermediate Data Structures and Algorithms
- CS 100: Software Construction
  CS 234: Computational Methods for Biomolecular Data
- CS 238: Algorithmic Techniques in Computational Biology
- GEN 220 - Computational Analysis of High Throughput Biological Data
- STAT 110 - Biostatistical Methods in Life Sciences
- STAT 155 – Probability and Statistics for Science and Engineering
- STAT 201A/B/C Theory of Probability and Statistics (replaces 160A/B)
- STAT 201A/B/C - Elements of Probability and Statistical Theory
- STAT 160B - Elements of Probability and Statistical Theory
- STAT 161 - Introduction to Probability Models

Seminars
The GEN 261 seminar (Seminar in Genetics, Genomics, and Bioinformatics) must be taken every quarter. It is strongly recommended that students enroll in an invited seminar series during the other quarters in residence as well.

Supplemental Courses
Students may wish to take additional courses to supplement their graduate training. These courses will be tailored to the specific student’s needs and decided upon in consultation with their major professors.

Classes that emphasize genetics, genomics, bioinformatics and other related areas are given in the List of Potential Courses in the GGB Graduate Student Handbook.

Students should consider some training in the ethics of use of genetically modified organisms, impact of patents on application of
The Ph.D. is a research degree, and, accordingly, the goal of the program is to train students in the theoretical and experimental foundations of modern genetics. Students are strongly encouraged to participate in lab rotations, select a major professor and begin research work early in their training (during the first year of residence).

### Additional Units taken to maintain 12-unit course load

Graduate students will register for 12 units per quarter to maintain full-time status. These units will include any lecture and seminar courses taken for the quarter. Typically students will also register for Directed Research (GEN 297) prior to advancement to candidacy or Research for Dissertation (GEN 299) after passing the Qualifying Exam.

The Ph.D. is a research degree, and, accordingly, the goal of the program is to train students in the theoretical and experimental foundations of modern genetics. Students are strongly encouraged to participate in lab rotations, select a major professor and begin research work early in their training (during the first year of residence).

### Justification:

1. We are adding GGB course requirements to the catalog per the new Graduate Council Policy on Graduate Program catalog Entry.


   Since many GGB students work on research projects related to RNA biology, this course will provide relevant training to prepare them for this important aspect of their research.

Approved by majority faculty vote: April 2, 2015
Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree
- Designated Emphasis
- Course requirements — course changes/new courses MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with program change/new program submission.
- Specializations
- Other (please describe):

Does this program change affect any other programs? If yes, check the box.

1. If the program change involves changes to any existing courses (deleting courses, changing existing courses, or adding new courses), the course changes MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with the program change submission so that Graduate Council can review all affected courses with the proposed program change.

2. 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.

3. 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>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
- Completed Coversheet for Request for Approval To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements.
- Revised Catalogue/Website Copy in proper table format including Justification as indicated above. Must be signed and dated.
The proposed change concerns the number of qualifying exams required for PhD students in mathematics. The current policy requires students to pass courses in four sequences and to pass written qualifying exams in all four, three with an “A” level pass and one with at least a “B” level pass. It was proposed by the Graduate Committee to maintain the requirement of four course sequences, but to reduce the number of required qualifying exams to three. Again, one of the passes can be at the “B” level, but there must be at least two passes at the “A” level, and these two must be the exams corresponding to year-long sequences. (One of the possible course sequences is two quarters, rather than three.)

It is felt that the current requirement of four qualifying exams is unnecessarily delaying students’ ability to progress in the PhD program, and that requiring only three would sufficiently establish that a student is well-prepared to work toward a dissertation. There was concern, however, with the possibility of students getting only two “A” passes when one was in a two-quarter sequence, which led to the requirement that two “A” passes need to be in year-long sequences.

A vote was taken on April 3, 2015, and a majority of mathematics faculty favored the proposed change.

Sincerely,

Julia Bergner
Graduate Advisor for Enrolled Students
To:        David Lo, Chair
Graduate Council

From:     Julia Bergner, Graduate Advisor
Mathematics Graduate Program

Re: Proposed Catalog Changes for the Mathematics Graduate Program

We propose the following changes to the Mathematics Graduate Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current:</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Mathematics offers the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics.</td>
<td>The Department of Mathematics offers the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific requirements are as follows:</td>
<td>Specific requirements are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Passing four sequences numbered between MATH 200 and MATH 210. A sequence consists of all courses with the same course number except for an alphabetical suffix. Any course without an alphabetical suffix is not part of a sequence.</td>
<td>1. Passing four sequences numbered between MATH 200 and MATH 210. A sequence consists of all courses with the same course number except for an alphabetical suffix. Any course without an alphabetical suffix is not part of a sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For each of the four chosen sequences in (1), a qualifying examination must be taken. Three of them must be passed with a grade of “A” and one with a grade of “B” or better.</td>
<td>2. For three of the four chosen sequences in (1), a qualifying examination must be taken. Two qualifying examinations, which are associated with two of the year-long sequences, must be passed with a grade of “A”. The third qualifying examination can be passed with a grade of “B” or better in any of the five sequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student is allowed to take the qualifying examination at most twice for each sequence.</td>
<td>A student is allowed to take the qualifying examination at most twice for each sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completing four quarter-courses in mathematics numbered between 211 and 259.</td>
<td>3. Completing four quarter-courses in mathematics numbered between 211 and 259.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normative Time to Degree **15 quarters**

Justification:
The current requirement to pass four qualifying exams has been delaying students’ progress towards advancement to candidacy. The faculty agreed that passing three qualifying exams is sufficient to establish that students are prepared to pursue mathematics research. The requirement that the two “A” passes be in year-long sequences was included to address a concern that students would disproportionately favor taking the qualifying exam for the 210 sequence, which is only two quarters.

Approved by majority faculty vote: April 3, 2015
Coversheet for Request for Approval  
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>MEIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this an interdepartmental program?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an interdepartmental program, list other involved programs</td>
<td>MEIS, Chass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>MEIS, Chass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>4/24/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>5/30/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Contact:  Fariba Zarinebaf  
Prepared by:  Fariba Zarinebaf

Email:  Faribaz@ucr.edu  
Phone:  21786

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)
- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree
- Designated Emphasis
- Course requirements — course changes/new courses MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with program change/new program submission.
- Specializations
- Other (please describe):

Does this program change affect any other programs? If yes, check the box.

1. If the program change involves changes to any existing courses (deleting courses, changing existing courses, or adding new courses), the course changes MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with the program change submission so that Graduate Council can review all affected courses with the proposed program change.

2. 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.

3. 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.
☐  Completed Coversheet for Request for Approval To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements.
☐  Revised Catalogue/Website Copy in proper table format including Justification as indicated above. Must be signed and dated.
To be adopted:

**PROPOSED Change to the Middle East and Islamic Studies Designated Emphasis**

**Effective Date:** 6/30/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and Islamic Studies Designated Emphasis</td>
<td>Middle East and Islamic Studies Designated Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject abbreviation: MEIS</td>
<td>Subject abbreviation: MEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
<td>College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fariba Zarinebaf (History), Chair</td>
<td>Fariba Zarinebaf (History), Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:faribaz@ucr.edu">faribaz@ucr.edu</a>;</td>
<td><a href="mailto:faribaz@ucr.edu">faribaz@ucr.edu</a>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee in Charge</td>
<td>Committee in Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fariba Zarinebaf, Chair (History)</td>
<td>Fariba Zarinebaf, Chair (History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ali (Religious Studies)</td>
<td>Muhammad Ali (Religious Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reza Aslan (Creative Writing)</td>
<td>Reza Aslan (Creative Writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherine Hafez (Gender and Sexuality Studies)</td>
<td>Sherine Hafez (Gender and Sexuality Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Jaffe-Berg (Theatre, Film and Digital Production)</td>
<td>Erie Jaffe-Berg (Theatre, Film and Digital Production)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhi Khan (Media and Cultural Studies)</td>
<td>Ruhi Khan (Media and Cultural Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila Lalami (Creative Writing)</td>
<td>Laila Lalami (Creative Writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Liu (Hispanic Studies)</td>
<td>Benjamin Liu (Hispanic Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Ossman (Anthropology)</td>
<td>Susan Ossman (Anthropology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Sacks (Comparative Literature)</td>
<td>Jeff Sacks (Comparative Literature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designated Emphasis Requirements**

The DE in Middle East and Islamic Studies offers two tracks, one with a requirement for proficiency in a relevant language (Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Hebrew, Urdu or another language, with the approval of the chair of the DE), and/or a placement test and a second track without a language requirement.

**Track One** Twelve (12) units plus...
Track One Twelve (12) units plus language proficiency (4-6 quarters)
Three (3) courses (12 units) selected from the list below, at least one of which must be outside of the student’s Ph.D. department, plus the completion of four (4-6) quarters of language study, as described above.

Track Two Sixteen (16) units
Three (4) courses (16 units) selected from the list below, at least one of which must be outside of the student’s Ph.D. department.

In both tracks, the student is required to take a 2 quarter graduate seminar with the prior approval of faculty member in the relevant discipline. It is understood that the second quarter would be devoted to substantial research and writing.

Applicable Courses
Current Graduate Seminars
- CWPA 256, CWPA 257, HIST 277, HIST 278, RLST 200, RLST 249, RLST 250

Petitionable Graduate Seminars
- CPLT 215B, CPLT 284, RLST 200A, SPN 251, SPN 279

Current Upper Division Undergraduate Courses
- ANTH 136/SEAS 136, ANTH 169/GBST 169, ARLC 120, ARLC 151/CPLT 151, ARLC 152/CPLT 152, ARLC 154/CPLT 154/PHEL 154, ARLC 155/RLST 157, ARLC 156/CPLT 156/RLST 156, ARLC 158/CPLT 158/RLST 158, HIST 121, HIST 124, HIST 125, HIST 126, MCS 172, POSC 133, POSC 152, POSC 156, RLST 111, RLST 113, RLST 116, RLST 149, RLST 150, RLST 151, RLST 155/PHEL 155, WMST 151, WMST 162, WMST 168, THEA 191J

Courses with MEIS content between the DE and the PhD.

Track One Twelve (12) units plus language proficiency (4-6 quarters)
Three (3) courses (12 units) selected from the list below, at least one of which must be outside of the student’s Ph.D. department, plus the completion of four (4-6) quarters of language study, as described above.

Track Two Sixteen (16) units
Three (4) courses (16 units) selected from the list below, at least one of which must be outside of the student’s Ph.D. department.

In both tracks, the student is required to take a 2 quarter graduate seminar with the prior approval of faculty member in the relevant discipline. It is understood that the second quarter would be devoted to substantial research and writing.

Applicable Courses
Current Graduate Seminars
- CWPA 256, CWPA 257, HIST 277, HIST 278, RLST 200, RLST 249, RLST 250

Petitionable Graduate Seminars
- CPLT 215B, CPLT 284, RLST 200A, SPN 251, SPN 279

Current Upper Division Undergraduate Courses
- ANTH 136/SEAS 136, ANTH 169/GBST 169, ARLC 120, ARLC 151/CPLT 151, ARLC 152/CPLT 152, ARLC 154/CPLT 154/PHEL 154, ARLC 155/RLST 157, ARLC 156/CPLT 156/RLST 156, ARLC 158/CPLT 158/RLST 158, HIST 121, HIST 124, HIST 125, HIST 126, MCS 172, POSC 133, POSC 152, POSC 156, RLST 111, RLST 113, RLST 116, RLST 149, RLST 151, RLST 155/PHEL 155, WMST 151, WMST 162, WMST 168, THEA 191J
Justification: We do not offer sufficient number of graduate courses in MEIS and students need to declare their De before candidacy.

Effective Date: June 30, 2015.
## Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this an interdepartmental program?</td>
<td>☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an interdepartmental program, list other involved programs</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>April 17, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty Contact: | Jeffreyc Bachant | Email: | jeffbach@ucr.edu | Phone: | 827-6473 |
| Prepared by: | Kathy Redd | Email: | kathy.redd@ucr.edu | Phone: | 827-5621 |

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

- ☐ Admission requirements
- ☐ Unit requirements
- ☒ Professional Development Plan
- ☐ Examination requirements
- ☐ Time-to-degree
- ☐ Designated Emphasis
- ☐ Course requirements – course changes/new courses MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with program change/new program submission.
- ☐ Specializations
- ☐ Other (please describe):

☐ Does this program change affect any other programs? If yes, check the box.

1. If the program change involves changes to any existing courses (deleting courses, changing existing courses, or adding new courses), the course changes MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with the program change submission so that Graduate Council can review all affected courses with the proposed program change.

2. 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.

3. 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.

<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-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.
- ☒ Completed Coversheet for Request for Approval To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements.
- ☒ Revised Graduate Website Content spreadsheet for rationale, justification, and detail.
April 17, 2015

Graduate Council
RE: Addition of Professional Development Training to CMDB Graduate Program Catalog Copy

On 11/12/12 the CMDB Program faculty voted to approve a professional development training plan for the Ph.D. program in Cell, Molecular and Developmental Biology. This plan was forwarded to Associate Dean Kevin Esterling as required. The text of the plan was not added to the catalog and is now being added to comply with Graduate Council policy.

Thank you for your consideration of this request,

[Signature]
Jeffrey Bachant
Program Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology program offers a Ph.D. degree.</td>
<td>The Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology program offers a Ph.D. degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Completion of the course work listed above</td>
<td>1. Completion of the course work listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One additional graduate course in cell, molecular, and developmental biology</td>
<td>2. One additional graduate course in cell, molecular, and developmental biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One graduate seminar course in cell, molecular, or developmental biology (BCH 230 (E-Z), BIOL 281 (E-Z)/CMDB 281 (E-Z), BPSC 240, BCH 289/BIOL 289/CHEM 289/ENTM 289/NRSC 289/PSYC 289)</td>
<td>3. One graduate seminar course in cell, molecular, or developmental biology (BCH 230 (E-Z), BIOL 281 (E-Z)/CMDB 281 (E-Z), BPSC 240, BCH 289/BIOL 289/CHEM 289/ENTM 289/NRSC 289/PSYC 289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A research project leading to a dissertation</td>
<td>4. A research project leading to a dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written and Oral Qualifying Examinations** Doctoral students are advanced to candidacy following successful completion of written and oral qualifying examinations. Students write a proposal detailing the rationale, specific aims, and approaches to be undertaken for their proposed dissertation research prior to taking the oral qualifying examination.

**Dissertation** Candidates must successfully defend their dissertation research in a public oral presentation.

**Teaching Requirement** Students must fulfill a two-quarter teaching requirement.

**Career Opportunities**

There is a high demand in industry and academia for scientists with training in cell, molecular, and developmental biology. Students matriculating from the program are well trained in this field and successfully obtain positions in biotechnology, including biomedical and agricultural industries, and at colleges and universities nationwide.

**Normative Time to Degree** Five years

---

**Justification:** Graduate Council Policy requires that the Professional Development Requirement be published in the catalog copy for all graduate programs.

**Faculty Approval Date:** November 12, 2012

**Department Program Director:** Dr. Jeffrey Bachant

**Signature:**

**Date:** 3/18/2015
Graduate students must consult with and prepare a report for their Thesis/Dissertation Committee at least once yearly. The Chair in consultation with the committee shall use the form below to evaluate the student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Performance</th>
<th>Please evaluate the student in each of the following areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background knowledge of the field</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to critically assess the literature</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to independently broaden the relevant knowledge base</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing acquisition of theory and skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of relevant language(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop a research plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to carry out the research plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in analysis/interpretation of data</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in applying appropriate research method</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop an argument in sustained passages of writing</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to prepare and give a conference presentation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the peer review process</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop &amp; write grant proposals</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of career options and ability to develop a career plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Performance</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Being Developed</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Yet Able to Assess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of oral presentations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making adequate Research Progress</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Please complete each section with detailed information and comments:

Are there any concerns about the research project? 0T
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any concerns about the student’s performance?</td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any concerns and recommendations from the previous ARPE been addressed?</td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific recommendations and plans for the next academic year</td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance/Dissertation/Thesis Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate students are required to meet with their Guidance/Dissertation/Thesis Committee at least once yearly and to prepare and present an ARPE Research Report to the committee at this time. The form below is to be used by the committee to evaluate the student’s performance during the year and at this meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Performance</th>
<th>Please evaluate the student in each of the following areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Knowledge</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to critically assess journal literature</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to independently broaden the relevant knowledge base</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing acquisition of experimental methods and skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop an experimental plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in analysis of data</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in applying appropriate statistical analysis</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an understanding of the peer review process</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an understanding of career options and ability to develop a career plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Research Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making adequate Research Progress</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Please complete each section with detailed information and comments:

| Are there any concerns about the research project? | 0T |
| Are there any concerns about the student’s performance? | 0T |
| Have any concerns and recommendations from the previous ARPE been addressed? | 0T |
| Specific recommendations and plans for the next academic year | 0T |
### Guidance/Dissertation/Thesis Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 17, 2015

TO:  Tom Payne  
     Vice Chair, Graduate Council

FROM: Daniel Jeske, Chair  
       Department of Statistics

RE:    Final Response on External Graduate Program Review

Dear Dr. Payne,

I write with our final response to the external review of the UCR graduate program in statistics. The review team visited the department January 22-23, 2015. We have previously issued a preliminary response that was aimed at correcting errors in the review report. For your convenience, we include highlights of our preliminary response document as an appendix to this document. At the outset, we would like to thank the review team for the general praise they offered concerning how much work we do with the constrained resources we operate with, and for their reading of us (that we regard as accurate) that we are an optimistic group that actively seeks constructive ways to ensure respect and cooperation.

The overall recommendation in the program review report was an urgency to grow the size of the statistics faculty in order to "ensure viability and to maintain the quality of the program." On this point, we are gratified by the expression from the review team that we are running a quality program and by their concern for us to maintain this level of excellence. We could not agree more with the urgency of their recommendation to grow our size. Since our inception in 1972, it has been a challenge to get administrative support for growth in the department of statistics at UCR. We participated vigorously in the cluster hire proposal process during the early part of 2015, authoring our own biostatistics core cluster proposal (3 ladder-rank faculty appointments in statistics) and co-authoring half dozen other cluster proposals (including the big data center proposal) that included either a ladder-rank faculty in statistics or a joint appointment in statistics with another department. The review team supports our intended growth in biostatistics and also our participation in the big data cluster proposal. At this moment we are relentlessly trying to fill a current search at the assistant professor level. We have had two offers declined, in good measure due to the low salaries that are part of the current campus culture.

The comment in the review report about our lack of diversity in course offerings is regrettably true, and it stems from our small size that limits our teaching scope. The normal teaching load for professors in the UCR statistics department is 4 classes/year, and all of us routinely carry this full teaching load. To try as much as possible to give our students the best scope we can, the department has taken recent steps to shorten some AB and/or ABC sequences in order to free up teaching resources for new course offerings. Our roll-out of an

---

1 Exceptions are 1 course relief for being Graduate Advisor, Collaboratory Director, or Department Chair. One faculty member in the department has a 50/50 split IR/OR appointment and receives 1 course relief for that.
MS-level track in mathematical statistics and the reopening of our statistical data mining class are examples of progress we have made this way. Additionally, our faculty regularly offer special topics courses (STAT 255) to expand our coverage of important statistical topics.

The review report comments that the department of statistics should be playing a leadership role in the Gradquant program, but there are too few to do so. Since the review team visit, we have actively worked on this issue. There have been three meetings with the graduate division whose objectives were to: 1) try to get the department of statistics more visibility for its involvement with Gradquant to this point, and 2) discuss ways we could increase our involvement.

To the first objective, we feel our involvement to-date in Gradquant has been unnoticed on the campus. Our Associate Director of our department's Statistical Consulting Collaboratory, Dr. Karen Xu, has all along been working in Gradquant for 20% of her time. Since the beginning of Gradquant, we have encouraged and offered some of our very best graduate students to be research assistants in Gradquant to develop and deliver workshops on various statistics topics. Karen and our graduate students have been responsible for over half of the Gradquant workshops offered to-date. Our students have also been serving the Gradquant mission by working as consultants to walk-in graduate students. To help change the perception we have not been involved, we have elicited some change in how events in Gradquant are advertised. Campus email announcements, for example, now show the statistics department affiliation next to workshop instructor names. To the second objective, there will be three workshops in Spring 2015 that are developed and delivered by statistics faculty, with more of these to come on a regular basis in the future.

We appreciate the comments in the review report that speak about the University community not understanding the ways in which a statistics department is like other departments and the ways in which it is different. We feel there many members of the UCR community that do not understand statistics is a department of faculty that undertake independent research programs to advance the development of statistical methodology. We are not exclusively consultants to other disciplines. Our peers, prospective students, and even the employers of our graduating students judge us by the way we establish ourselves as leaders in our field. Were we here to unabashedly serve the campus community with statistical advice on their research directions we would not be seen as the leaders in our field we all want to be. Indeed, if that was our primary role we would not be able to recruit top faculty to come here. On the other hand, our research is interdisciplinary and we want collaborations that fuel our research programs. But collaboration is different from service-oriented statistical consulting. Our Statistical Consulting Collaboratory was set up to handle service-oriented consulting and protect our independent research programs from being swallowed up by the demand for this type of help.

Unfortunately, the only university support for our Collaboratory is from Chuck Rowley in Computing and Communications, and this covers about 75% of the minimal cost to support the Collaboratory operation\(^2\). The remainder of the minimal cost, as well as the cost of any student support opportunities that are provided, is covered using a fee-for-service model that was initiated 12 years ago. The fee-for-service model may be inadvertently creating an image that we are siloing ourselves. Offering free statistical assistance to the campus community, while at the

\(^2\) The minimal cost to keep the Collaboratory open is the salary and benefits of the Associate Director.
same time protecting the time faculty need to develop independent research in our field, is only possible with full and expanded funding support from the university for our Collaboratory.

A model now being cited across the country for academic statistical consulting centers is the one at Virginia Tech, where they have a Laboratory for Interdisciplinary Statistical Analysis (LISA). LISA is jointly funded by the university colleges, the graduate division, the office of research and the office of the provost. We have scheduled a near-term exploratory meeting with Mike Pazzani and Joe Childers to discuss how to manage converting the Collaboratory to this support model.

The review team mentioned both ECE and CS departments have expressed a desire to collaborate with Statistics. We are very pleased to hear this. We have recently participated in a successful NSF REU training grant on computational entomology (the PI is a computer science professor) and are currently participating with some of the ECE and CS faculty in both an NSF interdisciplinary training proposal (NRT) and an NIH interdisciplinary training grant proposal (T32). We have also begun dialogue with faculty in these departments on how best to take advantage of the commonalities between our statistical data mining graduate-level class and their machine learning graduate-level class to have complimentary rather than redundant treatments of these important topics.

The review team commented that improved integration of international and domestic students would be desirable. We agree, and strive for this balance. But statistics graduate programs around the United States face the same challenge as we do to recruit qualified domestic graduate students. We'll continue to try and figure out ways to succeed. Among recent initiatives, we are in negotiation with U.S. Navy for a fellowship that would start in AY15-16 and be available to a U.S. citizen only. If we could succeed in turning this into a perpetual student support channel, it will be a recruiting chip when considering domestic applicants.

The review team suggested the department could find ways to support student travel to conferences. For the last two years the department has partially funded the travel costs of 8-15 undergraduate students who have participated in the UCLA Datafest event. The cost for that has been between $500 and $1000 each time. Other than that, we have generally relied on the faculty members to fund student travel to conferences using their own research dollars. While this has happened in individual cases, we agree it has been limited. At the upcoming annual fall retreat, the department will discuss the feasibility of establishing policy and procedures for helping support student travel more generally while maintaining department fiscal responsibility.

The review team mentioned some of our students desire to teach statistics after graduation, and we might enhance their training in this regard. We are aware of some of this interest, and we generally have multiple opportunities during the year (especially in summer) for our graduate students to gain teaching experience through associate-in positions. A good number of our students take advantage of this opportunity. Aside from striving to be role model teachers ourselves, we feel that might be all we can do in this regard for the time being.

The review team mentioned the Garber lab has elderly computers. We will review the age of these computers and bounce that off the demand for their use. The department has funds for new computers if there is a business case for that investment.
Appendix: Highlights from Preliminary Response Document (February 10, 2015)

The review report incorrectly indicated our program has about 50 MS students. We have 15 MS students. Counting 26 PhD students, the total size of our graduate program is 41 students. We are comfortable with the current size of our graduate student population, but look forward to growing it as our number of ladder-rank faculty increases.

The review report incorrectly indicated there is no regular course in Bayesian inference. Since AY08-09 we have been offering 203A (the first of two quarters in Bayesian inference) every other year. We offer 203B in those same years, but often the class size is too small to keep the course on the schedule.

The review report states that "New faculty must undertake many fresh course preparations and serve on many committees (in other UC Riverside departments, these committee positions are usually staffed by tenured faculty, putting their publication pipeline in peril." This comment strikes us as somewhat of an overstatement. The department makes a concerted effort, given its faculty size, to help our new assistant professors as best as possible in their transition from being a graduate student to being a professor at a research university by providing them course relief as well as assigning the minimal departmental committee work. Specific details about these efforts are available upon request. As a young faculty member grows into their UCR Statistics career, the small-sized aspect of the department implies we have to look for willingness in our young faculty to increasingly make more commitments to the department such as becoming our graduate or undergraduate advisors, accepting more dissertation advising, and even becoming department chair. While these roles provide valuable opportunity, a larger sized faculty would eliminate the need for our younger faculty to step up to these roles sooner than they might prefer and would also provide more choice for the department when filling these important roles.
Statistics Graduate Program Review
Findings and Recommendations

1. Introduction

The Statistics graduate program administered by the Department of Statistics, which is in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, was reviewed on January 22-23, 2015 by an extramural team composed of:

- David Banks, Department of Statistical Science, Duke University
- Glen Meeden, Department of Statistics, University of Minnesota
- Ronghui (Lily) Xu, Department of Family Medicine and Public Health and Department of Mathematics, UC San Diego.

On February 10, 2015, the Graduate Council received a preliminary response from the program in response to the extramural reviewers report. The subcommittee of the Graduate Council involved in the review and drafting the F&R were Michael Coffey (Plant Pathology & Microbiology), Theodore Garland (Biology), Thomas Payne (Computer Science and Engineering), and Amit Roy Chowdhury (Electrical and Computer Engineering).

The Statistics graduate program includes both an M.S. in Statistics and a Ph.D. in Applied Statistics. The department currently has 8 faculty members (4 full professors, 2 associate professors, and 2 assistant professors), and 41 graduate students (15 M.S. students and 26 Ph.D. students).

2. Key points from the external Review Report

Per the external review team, UCR's Department of Statistics is successful but severely understaffed and therefore fragile:

But their success is not sustainable. The department is one retirement, one illness, or one sabbatical away from having to drop one or more of its core responsibilities. And the strain of juggling all these duties with too few hands takes a slow toll on the energy and morale of everyone.

... we think the faculty size needs to be at least 14 to provide the sustainable quality that your university deserves.

For perspective, the external review committee provided the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular faculty</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Joint/affiliated</th>
<th>Ph.D./M.S. students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Per external review committee, the statistics departments of Temple and Kansas State rank just above and below that of UCR, respectively. (In their preliminary response, the department noted that UCR’s “students” entry should be 26/15 rather than 25/50.)

Regarding the question of how to grow the department, the external panel notes that:

... in essentially all conversations with faculty from the Department of Statistics and those from other departments and the administration, there was a consensus view that a cluster hire of three new faculty in biostatistics, with one of those at an associate or full professor level, would be smart growth that could leverage opportunities in the new medical school. The external panel agrees with that consensus. But, as advocates for the department, we believe that strategic hires in other areas might do more to resuscitate statistics at Riverside.

The external review team also notes that:

A statistics department is like any other department in that its members research and publish in their own domain’s journals, seek external funding from the NSF and the NIH, are active in their professional societies, earn accolades, and administer undergraduate majors while running rigorous Ph.D. and M.S. programs. But a statistics department is different in that [...] there is an expectation that statistics faculty will provide assistance, often out of uncompensated collegiality, to any other member of the university.

They note that these other members of the university often turn to econometricians or psychometricians for statistical advice and that:

A more effective approach to promote collaborative research is perhaps through joint hires, preferably at mid-career or higher level (so that the faculty member is tenured at the university). ... Without a joint appointment, a biostatistics faculty member in the Statistics Department would presumably spend 9 months and teach 4 courses a year like everyone else, with only 2 summer months supported by the medical school. This faculty member most likely will NOT satisfy the collaborative needs of the medical school. A typical biostatistics faculty member in this country spends about 20-30% of the effort on teaching, with the rest of the effort spent on statistical and collaborative research.

The external review team expressed some concern regarding matters of morale:

The external panel had feared we would find a demoralized department. And we are delighted to report that this is not the case. Almost everyone feels (correctly) that they are doing important, meaningful work, and that they are doing it pretty damn well, given the severe level of understaffing. But there is concern that the administration does not understand the role of a statistics department in a modern university.
Although a bit nervous, the statistics department at UC Riverside is still optimistic, and actively seeks constructive ways to ensure respect and cooperation. You have really, really nice people in the department. A little bit of diplomacy, and a little donativity, will do much to repair the strained esprit de corps and re-establish trust in the constancy, competence and compass of academic administration.

The other key point of the report is that:

The GradQuant and the Department of Statistics need to work out a model so that statistical needs around the campus are properly triaged and distributed to competent consultants. This model should identify what kinds of support should be provided for free and what kind of statistical support should be fee-based. There are a number of examples at other universities; the LISA program at Virginia Tech is one that seems to work well.

3. Recommendations of the Graduate Council

Based on the external review team’s report, the Graduate Council makes the following recommendations.

1) The size of the Department of Statistics should be increased by 50% to 100%.

2) Particular attention should be paid to opportunities for excellent joint hires.

3) The Department and the Graduate Division should review the relationship of the GradQuant program to graduate program in statistics.

4) In matters of merit, promotion, and staffing, the entire campus should be mindful of the assumed additional duties of statistics faculty in the areas of collaboration and consultation.
Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations
Graduate Programs in Dance

I. Introduction (adapted from the self-study)

The UCR department of dance recently celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Ph.D. program in Critical Dance Studies -- the first of its kind in the nation -- and this program continues to lead in the field of dance scholarship: the research and writings of the faculty, and of the students trained by the program, influence the direction of the field of dance studies internationally. The MFA in Experimental Choreography, with course requirements interwoven with that of the Ph.D. has produced graduates that now lead dance programs at other universities and who are developing and establishing important venues for dance beyond the university. New efforts to initiate dance studies programs at universities worldwide can be directly traced to the visionary accomplishments of UCR’s program. In short, the Dance department has been and remains a flagship program on the UCR campus.

II. Strengths, Achievements, Challenges

II.i. Strengths and Achievements

To paraphrase from the external review, the graduate programs in Dance are offered by “a department with an enormous impact on the field of graduate dance research and since it was founded has helped to usher in the current vibrancy in the field of Critical Dance Studies. We observed a department that continues to excel and serve as a reminder to us all of the potential for what a graduate department in the field of dance can be.”

II.ii. Challenges

The department has recently been through a transition period as some of the most senior faculty members have retired; but several new faculty members have been hired in recent years, and along with continuing faculty there are now eight faculty. This group has been undergoing a process of re-integration, but keeping with its main strengths of focusing its PhD on dance scholarship and maintaining an integrated and collaborative relationship between the MFA and PhD programs. This collaboration between practice and theory will continue to be a distinguishing feature, even as more
departments across the country begin to model their programs after the success of the UCR program. Despite this ongoing strength, there is a need to grow the department both among faculty and staffing so that the service burdens can be eased. These investments would help free up time to support academic advancement among the junior faculty; for example, the burden of producing dance performances is disproportionately taking faculty time that might more appropriately be served by staff support and infrastructure.

III. Goals and Plans

There are some basic needs that have been identified that include growth in the number of faculty, as well as investment in staff support, and graduate student support. While some of these plans are fundamentally resource calls, some other plans have the potential to greatly expand the impact of the program; these include expansion into postdoctoral training, sponsorship of a Visiting Artist position, and establishment of an online journal in dance studies.

IV. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

The Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations are not aimed at correcting specific deficiencies since none are evident beyond resource limitations.

1. Resources, staffing, and facilities

We encourage the college to support additional faculty lines so that the program can maintain its excellence and enable continued academic progress among the junior faculty. In addition, adequate staff support would be helpful in relieving the burden placed on faculty in the production of dance performances, support of graduate student activities, and so on. Finally, support for multi-year graduate fellowships would go a long way in helping the program compete and retain the top students.

2. MFA - PhD relationship

As noted above, the active engagement between the MFA and PhD programs is an excellent example of the synergies between practice and theory. Continuing assessment of this relationship may be further developed, especially in the ways that the MFA program can help shape the curriculum of the PhD students.

3. Faculty hires; visiting artist
As noted in the discussion of the MFA - PhD relationship, developing this toward a further contribution of choreography to the PhD program can be further promoted by hiring a new faculty position designed for this purpose.

Another area that would have a significant impact on the program would be to support a standing position for a visiting artist. This position would be filled each year by an artist who would interact with all students in the program, and with a new visiting artist each year, it would give students direct access to many scholars from around the world, greatly enriching the diversity of the program.
To: David Lo, Chair, Graduate Council

From: Anthea Kraut, Associate Professor and Acting Chair, Department of Dance

Re: Preliminary Response to Review of Dance Graduate Programs

Date: April 6, 2015

Please find below a list of corrections to errors of fact, misperceptions, or interpretation on the part of the extramural team.

a) Page 2, 3rd sentence of first paragraph under Staff:
   “But we note with alarm that this 60% employee is responsible for all 100% of the departmental business during the three days that she reports to Dance.”

   This statement creates the misperception that our 60% employee is able to accomplish 100% of the Department’s business during her three days of work each week. It is true that this employee is the sole Dance-designated staff person who is responsible for a variety of tasks that support the Dance faculty and graduate students; other tasks are shared by the merged Performing Arts Administration (PAA) staff. But it is also true that on days that our 60% designated employee is not in the office, the FAO of the PAA structure is obliged to carry out some of our departmental tasks.

b) Page 3, lines 15-16:
   “As an unfortunate example, UCR dance graduate faculty also produce the annual undergraduate performance, ‘UCR Dances.’”

   This needs to be corrected to reflect the actual title of the undergraduate concert, which is “UCR Is Dancing.”

   In addition, Dance Department faculty don’t make a distinction between graduate and undergraduate faculty. The production of “UCR Is Dancing” is part of the faculty’s artistic and curricular mission. The critical need for substantively greater production and administrative support mentioned in this paragraph, however, remains.

c) Page 4, first paragraph, lines 4-5:
   “The recent (continued) loss of key faculty in recent years threatens the department’s ability to sustain that excellence.”

   The word “continued” seems unnecessary and misleading here; the Department lost a number of faculty prior to 2014 but has not continued to lose faculty since then. Still, the need to replenish our faculty remains.
d) Page 4, second paragraph, last sentence:
“There is a bare minimum number of administrative positions/functions required to run a graduate program — especially one that requires both production support (on the MFA side) and specialized academic-professional mentoring (on the PhD side) — and this department is very close to, and arguably below, that minimum.

The Dance Department faculty want to clarify that the number of current faculty – eight – is not just “arguably” below the minimum required to run our graduate programs. There were, in fact, six Ph.D.-holding faculty secured when the Ph.D. program was built, and 3.5 choreographers in place – plus a funded, recurring visiting artist line – when the MFA program was inaugurated in 2001.

e) Page 8, lines 4-6

“…no other dance program in the US boasts four junior researcher/artists accredited after the millennium.”

A more accurate statement would reflect the fact that five researcher/artists currently in the department were accredited after the millennium (four junior faculty and one associate faculty).
External Review report on the Graduate Programs in the Dance Department at the University of California at Riverside

Submitted by:
Thomas F. DeFrantz, Duke University
Lionel Popkin, University of California at Los Angeles
Karen Shimakawa, New York University

It was an honor and a pleasure to review the graduate programs in the Dance Department at the University of California at Riverside. It is a department with an enormous impact on the field of graduate dance research and since it was founded has helped to usher in the current vibrancy in the field of Critical Dance Studies. We observed a department that continues to excel and serve as a reminder to us all of the potential for what a graduate department in the field of dance can be. We would also like to acknowledge the generous hosting by the Department, the Academic Senate, the Graduate Council, the Dean of the Graduate Division and the Dean of CHASS at UCR.

The last eight years have been difficult for the dance department. With seven separations, all for different reasons, the department has been perpetually under resourced in overall faculty presence, and overly burdened with the service roles necessary for the department to function falling on only a few shoulders. We observed a department that is both exhausted and energized. Exhausted from the toll of years of exceptional labor. Energized by the influx of four excellent junior hires and the current potential of the department. Everyone in the field knows the stellar history at UCR in graduate research in dance, and these graduate programs serve as highly respected ambassadors for the University. That said, now is a crucial moment to pivot toward the future. The department needs essential support to move forward and maintain its leadership position as the field shifts and expands.

Below is a list of our main recommendations with more detailed explanations following.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Staff:** At minimum an additional 100% FTE dedicated to the dance department for Faculty, Student, Production, and Administrative support.

- **Next Hires:** Immediately an Advanced Assistant or Associate level Choreographer. Two more lines of crossover hires each with physical and theoretical awareness.

- **Visiting Artist:** Consistent lines need to be established to bring guests for short term residencies and for full quarters.

- **Graduate Student Funding:** The administration needs to secure more sources of funding and consistent TA opportunities. The department can help. The current situation dramatically impinges on the ability to recruit top students. We recommend having 5 2-year fellowships guaranteed.

- **MFA/PhD Relationship:** The Department needs to further examine the relationship and crossover between the two distinct terminal degrees they offer (MFA and PhD). A series of open conversations and or a faculty retreat is strongly recommended so that new voices and concerns can be taken into account.

- **Budget:** We learned with pleasure about the Dean’s new initiative to shift the temporary budget to the new 85% rule of guaranteed future funds. We hope this will lead to greater stability in future planning and enhance the long-term success of the department and indeed the entire University.

**Staff**

The most pressing need for the Dance Department is full-time administrative support. Right now, the unit operates with a 60% administrator, Katrina Oskie, who performs well with the sitting faculty. But we note with alarm that this 60% employee is responsible for all 100% of the departmental business during the three days that she reports to Dance. This surprising circumstance is entirely unacceptable. The Dance graduate program counts eight full-time faculty and more than twenty graduate students on its roster at any time. Less than full-time dedicated administrative support stands as a major hindrance noted again and again by faculty and students alike.

Because the current administrator is only available to the Dance Program as a 60% employee, many tasks that she might ordinarily perform in a five-day week are left to faculty. The faculty have to plan their administrative labor according to this three-day-a-week schedule, a fact that limits their productivity and efficiency. Indeed, the committee learned that a large portion of the support that the faculty insistently requests could be handled by a 100% administrator who could coordinate much of the ‘production support’ that currently stymies faculty progress.
The committee recommends that this 100% time employee be someone with theatrical production experience, who could aid significantly in the production support needs of the unit. UCR Dance faculty consistently produce academic symposia and intellectually-driven performance events as are entirely befitting its stature as a leader in dance studies and experimental choreography. These events require attention from an administrator who will be familiar with the specialized requirements of dance performers in an academic setting. At times, these requirements will be like those of any academic symposium: meeting space, projection and sound equipment, visitor arrangements and simple hospitality. But dance events might also require specialized performance space, projection, lighting, and sound equipment, and even access to a green room or performer changing room. The task of securing appropriate space and equipment for UCR symposia has fallen unfairly to faculty when these tasks should be fulfilled by the 100% time employee. As an unfortunate example, UCR dance graduate faculty also produce the annual undergraduate performance, “UCR Dances.” The administrative-heavy tasks of securing and engaging appropriate performance space, lighting and media designers, devising technical rehearsal schedules, and the like place an unfair burden on faculty. Most of the tasks identified here should be completed by the Dance Department administrator, freeing the faculty to work on the artistic contents of the undergraduate production and, of course, the specialized needs of the graduate students.

The committee also commends UCR Dance for its terrific Graduate Student Handbook, included in the self-study materials. We recommend that the department produce a similar Production Handbook for its internal use, compiled annually with an up-to-date listing of suitable venues, production staff and contact information, sample contracts for engagement, sample technical rehearsal schedules, budgets, publicity materials, and the like. This document will streamline production concerns, and will be extremely useful to the faculty member who oversees production, as well as graduate students presenting their MFA theses, and especially, the administrators who complete the crucial execution of these tasks.

We note that the engagement of undergraduate work-study students or Graduate Student Research Assistants (GSRs) could possibly help the Dance administrator in some simple technical tasks. Hiring a GSR for this purpose would also help to increase much needed graduate student support (see below) with secured funding. More than this, though, the committee cannot believe that UCR Dance has managed to produce the international symposia and MFA theses presentations of the past several years without the dedicated support of a 100% time administrator. This circumstance must be remedied immediately, so that the unit can continue to grow in its creative-intellectual capacities without too-rapid faculty burnout.
Faculty

The department’s historic influence in the field of dance studies rests largely on the strength of their faculty, both in choreography and in the scholarly study of dance; maintaining excellence in both fields, and a healthy balance between them, is essential to the continued prestige of the department. The recent (continued) loss of key faculty in recent years threatens the department’s ability to sustain that excellence. Our recommendation is that the department be permitted to search for a mid-level (Advanced Assistant or Associate) faculty in choreography as soon as possible, and permission to search subsequently for two additional faculty (Assistant or Associate) who can bridge the Dance Studies program and the Experimental Choreography degree, maintaining a specialty but providing crossover and shared mentoring between the MFA and PhD.

The department’s focus on “Experimental Choreography” is a distinguishing feature of the program, and meshes in very productive ways with the focus of the Dance Studies PhD curriculum. However, the MFA program (as well as the BA, which is not the focus of this report) requires a great deal of hands-on, present, and actively engaged oversight by choreography faculty; it also requires programmatic oversight specific to the MFA by senior faculty. Moreover, the department’s (outstanding) junior faculty are themselves poised to become important figures in the field; but they require mentoring and support from senior faculty. While this latter role has been filled primarily (and heroically) by Wendy Rogers for some time, she cannot be expected to continue to serve indefinitely as the sole senior MFA faculty; additional mid-career expertise is needed, to both relieve Professor Rogers of some of her burden, to be prepared to transition into a leadership role upon Professor Rogers’ retirement, and to mentor the junior faculty up through the ranks in the coming years. An additional choreography faculty would also enable the current MFA faculty to diversify their teaching beyond the “core” required courses and to offer more specialized, focused courses in addition to the core requirements. This is crucial both for their professional development and for the students preparing to launch their own professional careers.

The committee spent a great deal of time investigating the “log jam” of Associate-level faculty in the department; the long delay for these faculty who should be advancing to Full is directly attributable to the extremely heavy administrative service burdens they have shouldered over the past 5-7 years. While some of this burden will be alleviated, we believe, with the addition of staff/administrative support, it is also true that the faculty are barely able to run a graduate program of this size and stature. The loss of key tenured faculty in recent years means that the remaining faculty have had to take on the work of these departed colleagues in addition to their own. There is a bare minimum number of administrative positions/functions required to run a graduate program — especially one that requires both production support (on the MFA side) and specialized academic-professional mentoring (on the PhD side) — and this department is very close to, and arguably below, that minimum. Yet one
consequence of the prestige of this program and the quality of the faculty is that at any given time, someone in the faculty could, and should, be on research leave; thus, it is clear that part of the reason for the forestalling of promotions is due to their inability to pursue their individual research as fully as they could. It is a measure of the faculty’s loyalty to, and belief in, the department that they have poured such enormous amounts of energy and time into running the department, potentially at the expense of their own research agendas. This is admirable, but not sustainable. The department needs to replenish the faculty — we recommend two tenure-track lines that can enhance and support both graduate degrees.

One thing to note in this regard: the committee applauds the faculty on the astuteness of their recent hires; it is worth noting that several of them are trained cross-disciplinarily and have a deep understanding of the particular strengths (and perhaps challenges) of an endeavor like UCR Dance: that is, whether on the “studies” or “practice” side of the department, in their own work and in their teaching, they approach these fields as integrated, rather than merely aligned. We would encourage the faculty to continue with this practice for subsequent hires — to seek out dance studies faculty who have either direct engagement with, or a deeply integrated understanding of, dance making in addition to dance as an object of study.

**Visiting Faculty Line**

The committee learned with great interest of a plan to create a Visiting Arts Faculty line, to be shared by all four of the Arts Complex Departments. This visitor would be afforded guest artist status, or possibly operate as a guest dance studies researcher, and bring welcome imaginative energy to the activities of the faculty. The visiting faculty line would be affiliated with Dance on rotation with the other units in the Arts Complex, greatly enhancing the capacity of the department to remain at the front of developing trends in the field. We applaud this initiative suggested by Dean Joseph Childers, and encourage UCR to move this project forward with all deliberate speed.

**Graduate Students**

Given the tumult in recent years, it is extraordinary that there seems to be almost no negative impact on the graduate students. Across the board we met with intelligent and passionate students who felt stimulated by the faculty and their courses. The morale is incredibly high, as is the sense of a cohort that is pushing forward and eager to continue UCR’s legacy as a primary location for research in the dance field.
There were the very real, and unfortunately all too familiar, calls for more reliable funding packages. As an external committee we agreed with the graduate students and the faculty that increasing fellowships and TAships to create stronger multi-year packages are essential if the programs are to compete on a national level. The PhD is losing out on recruitment efforts with NYU, Northwestern, Berkeley and UCLA (to name a few) and the MFA is having difficulty recruiting the level of candidates they have in the past as other departments across the nation offer more comprehensive funding packages. The administration has an option with this department. Maintain the current funding packages and slowly watch the level of graduate students decline, or increase the packages for the PhD and the MFA and allow the reputation of the department to persist and expand.

The department should continue to explore every avenue of supplemental funding available. They have done an excellent job of reaching across campus for TAships in other departments, and should look to make any relationships permanent that can be. For example, it may be possible to set a minimum of TAships from the Writing Center that are guaranteed to the Dance Department. This would help to secure longer funding commitments than are currently guaranteed. The sense on campus is that the Dance PhD students are of the highest caliber and the Writing Center has been pleased with their work. It would also benefit the graduate students if there were an increase in support for conference travel. On a positive note, the recent development success of securing a future PhD fellowship from a prestigious former faculty member should be commended and built upon if possible.

Many graduate students expressed a desire for more consistent professional development. While many appreciated the DANCE 301 course on Pedagogy and Professional Development, it was felt to be more appropriate as a TA training seminar rather than preparation for the job market as it is taken so early on in their course of study. It was noted that the department has done mock job talks in the recent past and the graduate students by and large felt a need for this process to be regularized as opposed to an intermittent event. As a review committee we agree with this recommendation but are all too aware that the above issues of faculty burnout and lack of staff support are creating an untenable situation that does not allow for these sorts of gatherings to provide essential guidance for students entering the job market to occur.

**MFA/PhD Relationship**

The hallmark of this graduate program is the relationship that is forged because the MFA and the PhD exist side by side. Both are terminal degrees and represent the pinnacle of the educational ladder in their respective fields of choreography and scholarship respectively. Excellence in both and a nuanced overlap of the two benefits both degrees tremendously.
This is the one area we as a committee believe requires faculty attention and thought. Perhaps a series of faculty discussions or a retreat would be in order to discuss how the required courses impact each degree? To be sure, these are different degrees with different outcomes, but at the moment most people seem very clear as to what the PhD offers the MFA, but not as clear in the other direction. If this is to be a fruitful partnership some serious thinking and planning will need to be undertaken. With all of the recent hires (half of the faculty are at the Assistant level), now is the time to reassess the relationship between praxis and theory that this department has always grappled with and to move forward with new ideas. While the purview of this review is the graduate programs, the BA is relevant to this discussion in how it impacts faculty course assignments and TAships that are generated within the department. Discussion is warranted about the assumptions over who can teach what courses and even to what extent the current requirements are serving the department’s vision of a BA in Dance.

It has long been true in our field that choreographers who are able to teach an introduction to dance studies class have an advantage on the job market. As a committee, we have noticed that the market is trending toward scholars who are capable of leading lower level studio based classes as well. The Dance Department at UCR is in an enviable situation in that it could offer its PhD candidates these skills and envision more synergy with the practice of dance and how that practice interfaces with its analysis.

Facilities

The relatively new Arts Building has afforded the department enough spaces for teaching, rehearsing, and faculty and TA offices. None of these were brought up as a serious issue. The major space issue is more of a student issue. The department and indeed the entire Arts complex lacks a gathering space for the students. As a committee we could not help but notice the solar paneled picnic tables being installed across campus. If this initiative is ongoing, and the tables were placed judiciously in the courtyard or patio spaces available in and around the Arts Building, they would solve this issue and provide the students at UCR a needed gathering space for informal discussions and meetings.

The other facilities issue is the maintenance of the existing spaces. The bleachers in ATHD 102 are in a state of disrepair and in need of renovation. There is a leak in one of the studios. This is a curricular and a safety issue. You cannot have dancers moving across water and be assured of their well-being. Along these lines, general cleanliness and upkeep was raised as an issue. While we did not witness this to an extreme, we were shown a room that had been recently contaminated with rat feces. UCR needs to avoid these health and safety issues with a more regularized janitorial schedule.
**Conclusion:**

UCR Dance deserves the highest commendation that its university can offer. The unit has revived from the brink of near-disaster, with the departure of several senior faculty. Four new hires bring an enviable energy to the unit, with an unmatched potential for innovation among its peer programs. Indeed, no other dance program in the US boasts four junior researcher/artists accredited after the millenium. The graduate students are productive and enthusiastically committed to the grand project of the adjacent MFA and PhD programs. The four senior faculty members inspire incredible dedication for their efforts among students and colleagues: for example, we note with admiration the establishment of the Dr. Susan Leigh Foster Endowed Graduate Fellowship in Dance.

We urge the university to acknowledge the excellence of the department’s standing faculty, and their considerable perseverance against all odds, with confident action that will stabilize and enhance the unit’s capacity. As noted again and again, UCR Dance holds a special place in the field of graduate studies, now enlivened by renewed vigor and momentum. Afforded sufficient resources, and time to grow as a group, we are convinced that the graduate programs of UCR Dance will continue to flourish as an essential ‘jewel in the crown’ of the expanding university community.
Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations
Graduate Programs in Education, Graduate School of Education

I. Introduction
The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) consists of 22 ladder rank faculty members in five academic program areas, and a teaching staff, in service of both academic research PhD programs and professional programs (MA and M.Ed.). Their stated research mission is to “To support, develop, lead, and provide critical interpretations of educational systems. Our responsibility for education requires that we undertake disciplined inquiry into, and provide guidance regarding, the foundations of educational quality and effectiveness. To develop these multi-disciplinary insights, we analyze in both qualitative and quantitative ways the origins, possibilities, and impacts of educational programs and practices.” In addition, as a professional school, GSOE is “Committed to informing those responsible for institutional operations and management of the significance of our research findings and helping them to understand the human, economic, and social benefits associated with the development of quality teaching, learning, and educational institutions.”

II. Strengths, Achievements, Challenges
II.i. Strengths and Achievements
To quote from the external review: “There is a noted presence of strong senior faculty with international profiles and significant research and training grants across several programs. We observed expressed commitment and connection to serving the local community. There was a perception of respect and collegiality within the department.” Strength in academic research is exemplified by the faculty members serving as editors for top-tier journals in their respective fields, the presence of three endowed chairs, and four Distinguished Professors.

The previous review in 2007 raised a number of concerns, and nearly all have been solidly addressed, including more active student recruitment activities, diversification among the faculty hires, and efforts to build a sense of community within the GSOE.

II.ii. Challenges identified from the Self-Study
As with the campus in general, many of the ongoing and future challenges relate
to the availability of resources to support graduate students and the recruitment of additional faculty to the program. Similarly, limitations in campus resources have led to seriously deferred maintenance of campus infrastructure, from educational spaces to office space for faculty and students.

One concern raised in the Self-study is that PhD student participation in faculty research is not as active as it could be and many students may not even aspire to research careers. Related to this problem is the perception (unrelated to fact) that GSOE research is not as high a quality as expected for this campus.

The problems identified here not only have effects on overall function of the program, they also have impact on the recruitment of new students and faculty. For example, competing programs with multi-year support for graduate students will be far more successful in recruiting the top students aspiring to research careers, and the competitive disadvantage will have additional consequences in recruiting top research faculty.

II.iii. Issues Raised in the External Review

There were a number of items raised in the external review, although it appears that some may be related to perceptions versus reality, and some are also to be addressed now with the presence of the new dean. A general theme of the review relates to the question of GSOE’s cohesiveness and vision for the future. Of course, this is in part directly related to the previous period of transition with an interim dean, but it seems to cut across several issues in the program. For example, a shared vision for the mission of the school affects to some degree the external impressions of the program and consequent national rankings. The interviews with faculty and students also seem to reflect this absent shared vision, with more attention paid instead to specific programs or research areas. The curriculums of the various program have shared common elements, but in the absence of consistent documentation and interactions across the school, these common elements are not known to all.

Another topic of concern raised in the review is the impression that while much of the faculty research is outstanding and nationally recognized, the overall quality and quantity of research overall seems to have dropped off. This may be due to a lack of coordination of educational versus research effort across the school, and a lack of sufficient mentoring and incentives for those who have less active research programs.
III. Goals and Plans

At this stage, the question of new goals and plans is in the portfolio of the new dean, in consultation with the faculty, and so we leave this section to the ongoing discussions within GSOE and those to come in response to this review.

IV. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

Considering the ongoing changes in the GSOE and the comments of the external review, the Graduate Council makes the following findings and recommendations:

1. The GSOE should consider a review of its mission and develop a more coherent mission statement that encompasses both the Masters degree programs and research-focused PhD programs. Appreciating the problematic nature of national rankings, the GSOE can identify specific areas of emphasis that would promote the reputation of GSOE as a more integrated school outside of any uniform ranking standard. The arrival of the new Dean is an ideal opportunity to assess and reinvigorate the mission.

2. GSOE programs include both practice-focused and research-focused degrees, but an increased emphasis on research will be beneficial to both types of programs, by increasing the number of top rank faculty recruits and graduate students. The GSOE can increase research efforts by (1) providing explicit incentives to faculty to develop research programs able to garner extramural funding, (2) further develop mentorship relationships among the faculty specifically to improve research and funding success, and (3) promote collaborative projects with researchers in other colleges on campus. Metrics should be inclusive, so that individuals are not penalized for participating in team research efforts; indeed, collaborations should be encouraged as a way to quickly increase faculty research activity. It may be a reasonable goal to aim to double the number of research grants every year for the next three years, but this should begin by focusing on greatly increasing the number of submitted grant applications from all faculty.

3. The large number of degree specializations may have common elements such as the core curriculum, but the sheer number of offerings would be easier to navigate if
documentation were more uniform, such as having a common graduate student guide to cover all GSOE PhD programs. This could also help both faculty and students frame their relationship to the various programs within the school, and also help provide perspective on whether some course offerings could be better coordinated across GSOE.

4. Faculty activity distributed among teaching, mentoring, research, and so on will certainly vary for each individual as their career progresses, but with the number of different specialized areas studied among the GSOE faculty, this appears to lead to some disconnect as some faculty may be operating largely on their own with minimal engagement with the rest of the faculty. A feeling of greater cohesiveness in the school would benefit from having faculty at all levels participate in different types of teaching (e.g., large versus small classes). A benefit to students is that they would be able to interact with both junior and senior faculty throughout their training.
We appreciate the opportunity to provide a preliminary response to the Review of the External Review Team. We understand that the purpose of this response is to permit corrections to errors of fact, misperceptions, or interpretation on the part of the extramural team. GSOE faculty were invited to provide input into this response, as well as opportunity to review it. Overall, I find the assessment of GSOE graduate programs to reflect our current challenges, although there are several comments and recommendations in the review team report for which we suggest corrections:

1. Lack of definable quality. A rank by the U.S. News & World Report is only one index of quality. Quality of teaching, diversity of faculty and students, number of publications by faculty and students, placement and impact of research, and placement of students in research positions are additional indicators that GSOE is moving towards the UCR 2020 goals not included in this # 76th ranking. While moving up in the rankings has clear benefits, helping to attract more applicants to graduate programs as well as faculty positions, we need to hold ourselves to a broader set of quality measures. I agree that there needs to be an aggressive push to avoid being left behind.

2. Lack of coherent narrative. On page 202 of the GSOE ebinder which the reviewers were sent before the site visit, there are descriptions of GSOE initiatives related to “narrowing the gap for at risk populations at all stages and preparing teachers with the best skills to effectively address issues of access and opportunity.” Page 190 describes how a major research focus of the faculty is to “reduce risk and improve opportunity for students who face challenges in reaching optimal academic and social outcomes due to poverty, limited English proficiency, cultural differences and disability.” While this might fall short of a tight, coherent narrative, these passages and others in the GSOE 2020 Vision (Strategic Plan) highlight school-wide initiatives towards which we are working. It would have been useful for the reviewers to compare what they heard during interviews to these themes described in the GSOE Vision document. In addition, one faculty member felt that the external report’s call for a "coherent narrative," "consistent definition of quality," and “core curriculum for all PhD students” reflected a biased belief that schools and colleges of education can share common norms. While I agree that it is difficult for multidisciplinary programs to share common goals,
definitions of quality, and an overall curriculum, I do believe that the reviewers have interpreted correctly that GSOE Area Groups have sought to maintain their own distinct identities, preferences, and goals, and have not worked collaboratively to align their goals with UCR 2020 or make sufficiently visible definitions of quality that faculty in other area groups might come to consensus around.

3. Need for expansion of faculty. “It is simply mistaken to say that every School of Education that is ranked in the top 50 has twice as many tenure line faculty as UCR…” (page 2). This is a correct statement, although it is important to note that few Schools of Education in the Top 50 have as few as 22 faculty. Faculty hiring alone is not going to improve the quality of the GSOE, but faculty hiring combined with other innovative and entrepreneurial initiatives could help to move the school in the rankings.

4. Some faculty and some programs are not research-active. “Many faculty, especially at the associate level seem to have stalled in research…” (page 3). While there are several GSOE faculty members whose scholarly production and journal/press placement is less than desirable, it would be incorrect to say that many faculty are unproductive. I would emphasize that the typical faculty member in the department is as productive as peers in other higher ranked schools of education and some of our faculty lead their fields.

5. The curriculum lacks coherence in sequencing, offerings, and redundancy. “The course offerings are compartmentalized by program area. The faculty apparently shares no beliefs about what all GSOE students should learn…” (page 3). This is not completely accurate. In fact, all students except those in School Psychology take a yearlong sequence in educational inquiry and methods shared across programs, which is also taught by faculty across three program areas. In addition, many courses are shared across the areas of Educational Psychology, Special Education, and School Psychology. The reviewers are correct, however, in that there has not been a strong press to coordinate course offerings across all programs, and there is a resistance to having a core set of content courses as opposed to methods courses.

6. Eliminate some master’s degrees and many courses; streamline the curriculum. “It’s as if a restaurant has 100 items on the menu – 30 of which are no longer offered, many are duplicates of one another, and others are out of sequence.” (p. 4) This suggests 1/3 of our courses are not offered and make no coherent sense. Some programs, such as Special Education, have a sequence of shared and individualized course requirements, with courses offered consistently every other year. Students plan a tentative course sequence in their first term during their introductory Professional Seminar, which of course they alter as their research interests develop. Courses are offered every other year so that class sizes will be larger. It is true that there could be more coordination across area groups in course planning and that there is little coherence to the non-credential courses offered in the M.Ed. program.

7. Mentoring. “A mentoring committee also should be established to help individuals move from assistant to associate, and from associate to full professor.” (last paragraph on page 4). Since 2011, untenured faculty have met quarterly with two senior faculty
for discussion and mentoring toward tenure. This does not mean that current systems of mentoring are adequate, just that we have some systems in place.

8. Minor error in fact: The reviewers note they interviewed associate deans (first paragraph page 1) in GSOE, although we only have one Associate Dean. Perhaps they were thinking about the Graduate Advisors or Assistant Deans.
We appreciated the opportunity to review the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) at the University of California, Riverside on March 5-6, 2015. It was a very productive visit; we reviewed the documents provided to us and met with the GSOE Dean, Associate Deans, and the faculty and staff within each area in addition to their students. We also had the opportunity to meet with Graduate Dean Joseph Childers and the Graduate Council.

There are many areas of strength within GSOE. There is a noted presence of strong senior faculty with international profiles and significant research and training grants across several programs. We observed expressed commitment and connection to serving the local community. There was a perception of respect and collegiality within the department. However, we also observed many significant challenges within the GSOE. Although we do not believe that GSOE is in either imminent danger or has overly glaring problems, we do think that the school is at a crossroads. The university, graduate school and in particular the faculty and dean in education need to ask if they are comfortable with the current state of affairs and in particular a ranking of 76th in the US News and World Report rankings of Schools of Education. We appreciate the weaknesses of rankings. We also understand the challenges that have been presented to GSOE over the last several years while deans have come and gone. Anyone in academe is also aware of the challenge of acquiring resources in an era of fiscal limits. However, we do not think in the current postsecondary environment that simply ‘staying the
course’ is an adequate response for any academic unit – especially for a school that is at risk of falling out of the top 100 Schools of Education in the country. Several Colleges and Schools of Education of which we are aware are putting forward aggressive plans for change. Our concern is that if UCR’s School of Education is not similarly aggressive it will continue its slide into mediocrity.

We also do not believe that simply demanding additional resources and faculty is the answer. Every department in every university in America will respond that they can do great things if they get additional resources and faculty. It is also often true that additional faculty and resources can make a difference. But it is simply mistaken to say that every School of Education that is ranked in the top 50 has twice as many tenure line faculty as UCR currently has and the only way to improve is to add faculty. Similarly, what is holding GSOE back is not an inadequacy of funding for PhD students. Simply stated, we are convinced that simply adding faculty and fiscal resources will have minimal impact on the School if the problems we outline below are not addressed. What GSOE needs is a plan, and in what follows we wish to outline our recommendations of what a plan might look like.

**Challenges:**

1. Lack of definable quality: ranked 76th:

   *We were unable to see either in the documents or in our interviews a coherent and consistent definition of quality as defined by GSOE participants.*

2. Lack of a coherent narrative:

   *Similarly, by the end of our interviews we had no idea of a shared notion about what GSOE faculty stood for and aimed for in their research and teaching.*

3. Some faculty and some programs are not research-active:
A university that aspires to AAU status has to have faculty in all units who are research active; many faculty, especially at the Associate level seem to have stalled in research output and grant production.

4. The curriculum lacks coherence in sequencing, offerings, and redundancy:

The course offerings are compartmentalized by program area. The faculty apparently shares no beliefs about what all GSOE students should learn (or how courses should be taught).

5. Retirement and retention is a significant concern:

Some of the most research/grant active faculty is likely to retire within the next 5 years. Some of the most productive younger faculty is likely to be lured away to more prestigious institutions in that same time period.

6. Individuals have an inability to talk about the school and instead focus on one’s program/area; there is a lack of energy and enthusiasm for the School.

The school is oddly Balkanized. There does not seem to be resentment of other units or individuals. However, there is very little discussion of the ‘common good’ or what will benefit GSOE. In any unit that is ‘on the move’ the faculty will reflect an energy and enthusiasm that was lacking in our interviews. Instead, many individuals seemed to look at their work simply as a job.

Recommendations:

1. Create a coherent narrative that is aspirational.

A mission statement should lead action. It explains what GSOE stands for, and explains actions that follow.

2. Create an Ed.D that is practice oriented, so that the PhD is research focused and consider a blended model.

The PhD should focus on research. A new Ed.D should be created that honors practice-oriented work and is equivalent to the PhD in significance. The Ed.D could have several viable models that capture current and new programs. The lack of any on-line presence also limits GSOE. A new Ed.D should use the best of what exists to help expand the reach of the school.
3. Create a core curriculum for all PhD students.

*The core of a PhD underscores what a faculty believe is important. Core curricula obviously can vary from institution to institution. What a core does, however, is bring faculty together in terms of what they think is unique to their program.*

4. Eliminate some master’s degrees and many courses; streamline the curriculum.

*The curriculum as it stands now makes no sense. It’s as if a restaurant has 100 items on the menu – 30 of which are no longer offered, many are duplicates of one another, and others are out of sequence. GSOE should create an intellectual banquet that makes sense to the student.*

5. Ensure that every faculty member has an opportunity to teach one seminar class and there is active participation on the part of senior faculty to teach the larger common core courses.

*There seems to be a tendency for some people to teach small classes and larger classes are taught by others. There needs to be more commonality to ensure that all students benefit from the faculty writ large.*

6. Encourage those faculty who are no longer research active (e.g. publications in Tier I journals, and grant submissions to federal and state agencies and foundations) to increase their contribution to the school such as in teaching and service.

*Individuals can contribute to a university in multiple ways. If an individual is no longer grant-active or publishing articles in Tier I journals then alternative models need to be developed to ensure that everyone’s work is honored and rewarded.*

7. Double the number of grants for research every year for the next three years.

*If the research productivity of the school is to improve then simple, clear and attainable benchmarks need to be set as goals. For such a goal to occur the School should consider establishing a Research Advisory Committee of external individuals who could advise the Dean and Faculty about grant opportunities. A mentoring committee also should be established to help individuals move from assistant to associate, and from associate to full professor.*
8. Enable the Dean to make swift changes.

The current climate in higher education does not auger well for those institutions wedded to the status quo. When “deliberation” becomes a synonym for “filibuster,” then no one will benefit. The faculty needs to create the conditions for the Dean to make informed, collaborative decisions in as speedy a manner as possible.

Conclusion

To be sure, additional challenges exist. For example, we appreciate the desire for a new building and better maintenance of the current one which clearly suffers from deferred maintenance and seems in need of updating. A more robust fund-raising campaign needs to get underway. A better admissions plan and the articulation of it are necessary. However important such issues are, we urge the faculty and dean to consider the challenges that have surfaced in our review and the recommendations we have made as a first priority.