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I. Introduction

As UC Davis approaches the beginning of its second century of service, the Division of Social Sciences in the College of Letters and Science has undertaken a departmental-based academic planning process during academic year 2008-09. The purpose of this effort is to engage its academic community in a process that positions the division to move thoughtfully into the second decade of the twenty-first century. Specifically, it develops our vision and priorities for the period of 2009-2014.

Over the past decade, the social sciences have experienced very significant growth in both student enrollment and faculty hiring. In the early part of the current decade, nearly 70% of the campus’ growth in student majors took place in the Division of Social Sciences. DSS majors grew to comprise seven of the eleven largest majors on campus. While the division’s share of campus undergraduate majors has grown to 25% as of 2006-07, its share of undergraduate degrees awarded in that same year has ballooned to 39% as students migrate heavily from other units to DSS after initial matriculation to the university (source: http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/inform/).

Over the coming five-year period from 2009-2014, UCOP anticipates a markedly slower growth in enrollments due to the combination of a flattened curve of anticipated high school graduates and significant state fiscal resource constraints. Owing to a number of factors, particularly campus budget limitations, our planned growth during this period is expected to be relatively modest, probably no more than about 5%-7% in total over the five-year period. As such, the planning process has addressed two primary scenarios of enrollment and faculty growth. The first is a steady state of no growth. The second would be a net growth of 5-7% in total over the five-year period.

The departmental academic plans, attached as appendices, have identified priorities and goals, assessed the availability of resources, developed a coherent strategy to achieve those goals within the resources available, and identified a methodology for evaluating the success of those plans. The plans highlight anticipated changes in faculty composition, curriculum, and graduate and undergraduate programs.

The academic plans have been crafted in broad consultation with our faculty. They have preserved and built on current strengths, while at the same time, allowed for new areas of creativity and discovery. Where possible, they have identified and supported campus-wide areas of academic excellence.
The dean’s office has reviewed these plans jointly with its divisional advisory committee. The committee membership is broad and varied in both disciplines and methodologies. Together as a group, we carefully reviewed and discussed major themes and approaches in the plans. In developing the overall divisional plan, we have also consulted with the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science.

The dean’s office will submit the divisional plan to the provost in August 2008. After receiving feedback from the Academic Senate, the overall campus academic plan is expected to be adopted by the end of winter quarter 2009.

The social sciences will continue to play an important role at UC Davis for the current planning period and beyond. A number of factors contribute to this.

1. **The social sciences are of central relevance and importance to any top-rated large university.** The societal issues facing our world in the twenty first century are among the most pressing concerns imaginable. As economic and political forces are increasingly seen to be globally linked, cross-border phenomena are more clearly identified, interaction and communication expand, and the world seemingly “shrinks,” we are being forced to examine a myriad of new problems and opportunities central to the social sciences. Furthermore, a well-educated student from any discipline must have some basic understanding of social sciences issues and methodologies in order to participate as an effective world citizen. It is not a coincidence that virtually all prestigious universities have strongly developed social sciences disciplines.

2. **Economies of scale favor growth in the social sciences.** The marginal costs of adding students in the social sciences is relatively low when compared with the hard sciences. The nature of social science instruction yields more flexibility on the whole to accommodate large class sizes in both lower and upper divisions than do many other disciplines. In part because low demand results in low class enrollments, the average cost per student in the many of the HArCS disciplines is substantially higher than in social sciences. In addition to instructional salary cost differentials, the social sciences have enormously less expensive capital costs per students than do the hard sciences. Indeed, an analysis by the Office of Resource Management and Planning concluded that capital costs per student are substantially higher in the life, physical and engineering sciences than in the social sciences and humanities.

3. **The social sciences have a long history of very strong student demand and bright prospects for continued growth.** The Division of Social Sciences regularly accounts for approximately 25% of the general campus majors. Given the
demographic evolution of the school age population in California, that trend is not likely to reverse. In part this reflects the broad array of career options available to students graduating in the social sciences. Indeed, one might convincingly argue that the prototype of the well-educated person has shifted from being rooted in classics and humanities during the nineteenth century to the social sciences for the twenty first.

4. The social sciences are increasingly linked to other areas of academic strength at UC Davis through interdisciplinary efforts. Throughout our planning over the past decade, the division has continually forged ways to leverage its competencies and growth with complementary units broadly across the campus. The Center for Mind and Brain, which reports to the dean of the Division of Social Sciences, has built from its strength in cognitive neuroscience to include core and invited members from the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Engineering, the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and the School of Medicine.

II. Current Status

The Division of Social Sciences is comprised of ten departments and eleven academic programs and centers. The division has 254 budgeted faculty FTE (including open and authorized positions). As of fall 2007, DSS had approximately 6,100 unduplicated undergraduate majors (nearly 6,500 duplicates ones) representing 25% of the campus’ undergraduate majors and 500 graduate students. Last year, the division’s total student credit hours averaged just under 90,000 per quarter. This represents approximately 60% of the majors in the College of Letters and Science.

The division is characterized by having well-established fields of study with some of the largest undergraduate enrollments on campus and graduate programs that are generally well regarded. Departments such as Psychology, Political Science, Economics, Sociology, History, and Communication have very large enrollments, as does the highly popular program in International Relations. At the same time, the division includes a number of departments and programs that have lower enrollments on an absolute basis, but highly rigorous research and instructional standards. Departments such as Anthropology, Philosophy, and Linguistics fall into this category. It is important to remember that lower absolute enrollments does not necessarily translate into lower productivity. Anthropology, for example, has a ratio of students taught by ladder faculty that is comparable to Psychology, Political Science, and Communication.

The social sciences at UC Davis are ranked very respectably. In the most recent U.S. News and World Report rankings, Economics ranked 28th, History is ranked 26th,
Political Science is ranked 29th, Psychology is ranked 47th, and Sociology is ranked 29th. In economic history, UC Davis ranked 6th nationally on Econphd.net. Note that for Psychology, the intentional lack of a clinical graduate program negatively affects its rankings as the department is somewhat smaller size relative to other universities. Also, the rankings do not adequately reflect the recent growth of excellent new hires in the highly-regarded Center for Mind and Brain, which has very strong ties to Psychology.

Anthropology was ranked 15th nationwide in the last National Research Council (NRC) study. A new NRC study is underway, and the department is expected to be well-ranked.

Communication and Linguistics were not ranked due to their relatively small size compared with other universities. Communication has been in a period of careful rebuilding and has recently launched its graduate program by offering a Masters degree program and in the process of adding a doctoral program as well. Linguistics changed status from a program to a department relatively recently and has expanded beyond its masters program by now offering a doctoral program.

Philosophy was rated near the top 20 several years ago in the Leiter Report, which is widely read in the field. However, it experienced a number of resignations as other universities heavily recruited a number of our faculty. The department has responded by carefully rebuilding with a number of excellent new hires at both junior and senior levels. We expect their rankings to rise to their previous levels in the near future.

Our interdisciplinary programs—East Asian Studies, Middle East-South Asian Studies, Jewish Studies, Science and Technology Studies, and International Relations, all contribute to the intellectual vitality of the Division. MESA and Jewish Studies have been remarkably successful in attracting external funds, while International Relations is one of the most popular majors on campus. The Division will continue to work with the directors of these programs to help them secure external funding—through grants or philanthropic activity—to ensure their vitality.

Complementing these programs, several centers play a key role in the division. The Hemispheric Institute of the Americas has focused its mission and is now seeking external funds. The Center for History, Society, and Culture has played an increasingly prominent role as a vehicle for scholarly and public presentations of interest to the broader intellectual community. The Center for Mind and Brain provides the home for key campus interdisciplinary research on the frontier of psychology, linguistics, and neuroscience. It is positioned to make increasingly important contributions to the campus intellectual life.
III. The Planning Context and 2008

The planning process began with each department being assigned a baseline of FTE. This baseline typically consisted of current faculty, recruitments under way and, in selected cases, additional FTE to compensate for recent excessive recent departures of faculty that have not been replaced in the normal course of hiring. Departments were then asked to develop a plan for maintaining this level of baseline FTE and just replacing new retirements or resignations. They were also asked for their ideas for supplementing this baseline with a modest increase in faculty sizes. The departmental plans, included in the Appendix, offer the details suggestions that the departments have made after their considerable internal consultation.

Baseline FTE

The division’s current baseline ladder faculty FTE is presented below:

### Baseline FTE and Anticipated 7-1-08 FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Baseline FTE</th>
<th>Total Anticipated 7-1-08 FTE *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>39.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Studies</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEPARTMENTAL FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>233.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>220.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS Provisions Held</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIVISIONAL FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>254.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>254.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table indicates, if all departments were at their baseline, the Division would hold approximately 14 FTE. Unfilled FTE provide the Division with financial resources to meet other commitments, for example, for start-ups, supplemental instructional support, and support for programs. At the current time, we have approximately 27 FTE held by the position. These additional FTE are being held as part of the long run financial plan for the position. For academic year 2008-2009, we will conduct nine recruitments. Given past records of hiring and separations, we would anticipate that the number of unfilled positions remaining would stay approximately constant.

**Recruitments for 2008-09**

Despite the challenging campus budget climate, the division was given permission for nine recruitments for 2008-09 as follows:

The first three are positions carried over from the prior year.

1. Anthropology: Public Culture, Assistant Professor (06-01)
2. Communication: Social Interaction, Open Rank, chair search (06-03)
3. Sociology: Macro Sociology, downgraded to Assistant Professor (03-17)

In addition, we will be searching for the following six positions for in 2008-09:

*Economics, macro/international macro* (08-01). This has been a key gap in the program offerings, and we have been required to hire lecturers to routinely fill key courses.

*Economics, international economics* (08-02). This is the most popular subfield for graduate students and we need additional faculty to support both our graduate and undergraduate efforts in this area.

*History, African history* (08-03). Our senior Africanist will be retiring and in order to maintain this field we need to make an additional hire.

*Political Science, international relations* (08-04). Several reviews have called for dedicated support for the International Relations program. This FTE will play an important role in staffing that program. The rationale for the proposed upgrade to Assistant/Associate is that the department has several potential diversity targets at the Associate level that we wish to pursue.
Political Science, methodology (08-05). The department experienced several separations this year and one of them in the key area of methodology.

Sociology, quantitative demographer (08-06). This position fills an important gap in the curriculum and essentially fills a position vacated by James Cramer several years ago.

IV. Longer Range Planning for 2009-2014

Implementing the plans, key issues:

The academic plans raise a number of important issues. Two are primary: recruitment of an outside chair for Communication and timing of replacement searches in History.

During academic year 2008-09, the Department of Communication will be recruiting for an external chair. There are two key factors behind this important search. First, the age distribution in the department is skewed towards the Assistant Professor range and strong senior leadership is required. Second, the department is the process of obtaining final approval for its innovative Ph.D. proposal. Building up this program will be a challenging task and a new chair will play a key role in this process. The new chair should also strive to build closer ties between Communication and related faculty in social psychology and political psychology, where we have strong divisional strengths. The long run strength of the department will depend on fostering these ties across departments.

The Department of History faces a unique challenge in the next several years. They will be experiencing a large number of retirements concentrated in the areas outside of American History, in particular, European and Asian History. Their departmental plan details a multi-year approach to replacing key faculty as they retire. This will be the most important task facing the department and these replacement hires should not be delayed.
Building on areas of current strength and anticipating new demands:

The Dean’s Advisory Committee emphasized that it was important for the Division to build or at least maintain on areas of existing strength. Three such areas identified by the committee were: American history, American political science, and international economics. All of these areas are led by internationally known scholars, all are well-staffed with faculty of different ranks, and all are central to the teaching and research programs in social science.

The new General Education requirements will place additional demands on these areas, which are essential to GE. In addition, departments in the division will face pressures to deliver additional writing to their majors. This will be particularly challenging for the departments with large majors where only limited writing opportunities are offered now (Psychology, Political Science, Economics, and Communication). A strong case can be made to the campus for investing additional FTE in these units, with the proviso that they provide clear plans for advancing the mission of General Education.

Taking advantage of new strategic opportunities

The Divisional Advisory Committee discussed a number of key areas in which the campus could achieve international prominence with relatively modest investments. The two most important of these were “Language Sciences” and “Decision-Making and Computation.

Language Sciences

The University of California, Davis, has been developing a major focus on human language in recent years, with several prominent faculty hires in many units, principally Psychology, Linguistics, Philosophy, and the Center for Mind and Brain. Language research at UCD is sufficiently strong now that a few targeted hires have the potential to elevate it from national to international status.

Language Science is the interdisciplinary study of the structure, development, processing, and neural underpinnings of human language. It involves understanding how language comprehension and production unfold in real time; how language abilities contribute to and depend on other cognitive functions; the relation of language to societal and cultural issues; the similarities and differences among the world’s
languages; how one’s native language is learned; how second languages are acquired; what brain structures support language; and what occurs when these structures are damaged.

The campus has existing strength in a number of different areas including psycholinguistics, neuro-linguistics, neuroscience, and linguistics. Several recent hires have affiliations with the Center for Mind and Brain and serve as a natural interface with the other language scholars on campus. In addition, the Philosophy department has recently hired a number of nationally prominent philosophers of language. UCD also has a strong presence in second language acquisition, including a Second Language Acquisition Institute that is coordinating research in this area.

The existing group on campus has already been involved in projects to coalesce their strengths and build this community. These activities include holding regular meetings, successfully competing for nationally funded conferences, sponsoring international visitors, and a recent NSF submission for an IGERT.

While many research areas are currently well-represented at UCD and are acquiring, or have already acquired, international attention and prominence, world leadership in the language sciences is currently being held back by gaps in certain key areas in which our competitors provide coverage. A relatively small financial investment in the language sciences could provide a huge stimulus to the interdisciplinary efforts of the UC Davis language science faculty.

These needs include investments in:

- **Computational Linguistics**
  - Given the increasing importance of computer modeling in linguistic theory and cognitive science, there is an urgent need for a computational linguist who would be able to do interdisciplinary work integrating linguistics, psychology and computer science. Ideally this person would have interests in areas such as electronic corpus analysis and language learning. The Department of Computer Science has also identified computational sciences as an area of future growth, which could lead to a strong campus-wide collaboration with social science and humanities departments.

- **Speech Perception and Phonetic Science**
  - The language science group currently has strengths in the processing of words, sentences, and discourse. An important gap is the processing of phonemes—the elementary units of language.
A scientist who studies the structure of speech sounds (phonetics) or the processing of them (speech perception) would fill this gap and complement existing research at UCD on the elementary units of signed languages.

Decision-Making and Computation

The Divisional Advisory Committee noted the emphasis on aspects of decision-making in a number of different units on the campus including Psychology, Economics, Political Science, Communication and Philosophy. In all of these areas, there is a recognition that new methods are necessary to explore the variety of complex decisions that individuals and societies must make in the face of limited information, restricted cognitive power, and pervasive uncertainty. One intellectual gap that has been apparent is the presence of computationally-oriented faculty that would bring new perspectives and approaches to these issues. An affiliation with the Center for Mind and Brain would be a logical home for such scholars. As an example, the new emerging area of neuroeconomics bridges traditional decision-making approaches and computational studies and scholars with these interests could be housed in several different units on the campus. The precise field of these scholars is not critical, but what is critical is the ability to harness new methods to tackle

Space Planning for the Division

The division currently has approximately 180,000 assignable square feet (a.s.f.) of space distributed across several on-campus buildings, including the Social Sciences and Humanities Building (SSH), Young and Sproul Halls, and six leased, off-campus sites. The off-campus locations were secured in response to strong divisional growth over the past decade in number of students and faculty that outpaced the campus’ facilities capacity.

A key component of the division’s plan going forward is the renovation of Kerr Hall. Renovation is expected to occur between summer 2008 and summer 2009 with occupancy in time for fall quarter 2009. The division intends to use essentially the entire building of approximately 32,000 a.s.f to house Political Science, International Relations, Communication, Linguistics, and those departments’ support staff. In order to obtain control over essentially all Kerr Hall space, it will likely be necessary to swap some current DSS space in Sproul Hall for current HArCS space in Kerr Hall.
When the Political Science Department vacates its current space in SSH, that space will be reassigned to other divisional uses. Primarily it will be assigned to accommodate the pent-up growth needs of Economics, History, and Sociology.

Psychology and Anthropology jointly occupy Young Hall. Built in 1940, that structure is inadequate to house the needs of both departments. Over the past several years, growth in Psychology and Anthropology was met by additional off-campus space in Davis. Psychology gained space at 202 Cousteau Place, and the affiliated Center for Mind and Brain was developed at nearby 267 Cousteau Place (both more than 2 miles from campus). Anthropology received additional space on Fifth Street and on Pena Drive.

The long-term goal of the campus is to relocate its academic units back on campus; however, in the case of Anthropology and Psychology, this has proved to be rather elusive. Anthropology worked with the Office of Resource Management and Planning to assess the possibility of moving to Hoagland Hall. In the end, the cost of renovation made the move unfeasible. ORMP has also engaged in ongoing dialogue with the division for many years about the possibility of renovating Haring Hall for use by Psychology and/or Anthropology. Again, the cost of renovation to current research standards has been problematic.

The space limitations in Young Hall coupled with the high cost of adequately renovating that space create limitations for the long range plans of the two departments, particularly for Psychology. The division will need to continue to engage ORMP in long term solutions. Psychology awards far more degrees annually than any other department on campus, and it has seen significant growth in the number and quality of its faculty and students (graduate and undergraduate); a fact reflected in sharp increases in extramural awards, and the honors and recognition of its faculty and trainees. However, it suffers significantly from having its faculty dispersed across several different locations across campus and off campus.

The study of contemporary psychological sciences is multifaceted and has evolved to include a wide variety of approaches, including highly sophisticated laboratory science based methods of research. Most major research universities have far newer facilities for psychological research than Young Hall and are therefore better suited to support contemporary research in the psychological sciences, and to recruit and retain the best faculty and trainees. Unless a means can be found to thoroughly renovate Haring Hall for the department’s diverse needs, Psychology’s best solution may be to secure a new building on campus, keeping in line with the other University of California campuses which have modern facilities for psychological science. In comparison to the psychology departments across the ten-campus UC system, the
facilities in Young Hall at UC Davis rank in last place. Remedying this situation should be considered a campus priority.

V. Conclusion

The Division of Social Sciences has a prominent role in research, instruction and service on the Davis campus. The division has shouldered the bulk of the campus’ student growth in the current decade and has expanded its prominence in a wide variety of contemporary research areas. Given the breadth of its disciplines, continued campus investment in faculty FTE and support needs is warranted to allow DSS programs to fulfill their baseline goals. By investing strategically in areas of emerging and historic strength, the division can utilize campus initiatives to evolve thoughtfully while meeting campus General Education needs.

IV. Appendices

A. Call for Academic Plans from Interim Provost and EVC Barbara Horwitz dated November 8, 2007
B. DSS Divisional Advisory Committee
C. DSS Majors by Department 2007
D. DSS Divisional Data 2006-07
E. Unit academic plans
November 8, 2007

SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND DIVISION DEANS
ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR BISSON

RE: Call for Academic Plans

Dear Colleagues:

In 2008, our campus will begin its second century of service and this milestone provides an opportunity for the campus to look ahead to the future and assess and reframe our academic vision that sets direction and determines priorities for allocation of resources. Several systemwide planning efforts are also underway, including a long-range enrollment plan through 2021, to meet a requirement set by the State and a systemwide academic planning process that was initiated by Provost Hume last year. An updated campus academic plan is needed to guide internal campus planning and facilitate the campus’s response to the systemwide efforts. With these systemwide planning efforts as a backdrop, the primary goal of the campus academic planning process is to engage the academic community – the faculty, deans and academic officers – in developing an academic plan that sets the vision and priorities for the campus over the next six or seven years. In some schools and colleges, academic planning efforts have recently been initiated or completed. In these cases, I ask that you review the plans based on the criteria and guidelines below and make any adjustments that might be needed to ensure that the recently completed plans align with the major principles, criteria and planning assumptions described below.

ACADEMIC PLANNING PROCESS AND FRAMEWORK

The specific purpose of this letter is to request academic plans from each school and college, developed after departmental input – i.e., it is envisioned that department academic plans will inform a college, school, or division plan that in turn will inform a campus academic plan. Information about principles, timelines, assumptions and objectives are described in more detail below.

Planning Period: 2009-2014

Our goal is to develop a campus academic plan that can be used for at least the next five years. Although the planning process will largely occur during this academic year, it will extend into a portion of next academic year to ensure that the new Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and the new deans have the opportunity to provide their input into the process. Therefore, the suggested period for the academic plans is 2009 to 2014. As noted above, some units are nearing completion of a plan that has a slightly different time horizon. These plans will be accepted, assuming that some attention is made to ensure that they generally fit with the planning framework articulated by this letter.
Planning Framework

The last campus-wide academic plan focused on guiding the campus through a period of significant enrollment and faculty growth for the general campus and no growth in the health sciences. In contrast, the future enrollment growth trajectory anticipated for the general campus is slow-and-steady (i.e., about 350 to 500 students per year or 1% annual growth), with more significant growth anticipated for the health sciences as described below.

General campus. Faculty hiring during the planning period will be influenced by growth and retirements or other separations. The general campus faculty base is 1,458.3 FTE, and growth during the planning period is expected to add approximately 15-20 new FTE annually (i.e., about 1% growth per annum for the next five years). Moreover, assuming that faculty members retire, on average, at age 65, the campus can expect approximately 50-70 retirements per year. Therefore, in spite of the lower growth trajectory, there could be upwards of 100 faculty hires per year related to growth, retirement and resignation.

Health science. Enrollment and faculty growth in the health sciences has not occurred for many years. However, there have been substantial planning activities at the campus and systemwide levels that have established a framework for growth over the next 5-10 years (refer to the January 2007 report entitled “A Compelling Case for Growth” from the President’s Advisory Council on Future Growth in the Health Professions, available online at http://www.ucop.edu/healthaffairs/). For the Davis campus, growth is planned for our existing schools of medicine and veterinary medicine, and growth is proposed for the new schools of nursing and public health. Each health science school will be expected to review and, as appropriate, update academic plans prepared for the systemwide planning efforts to fit with the campus planning framework articulated by this letter.

Departmental Academic Plan Components

An Academic Plan should set goals, assess availability of resources, develop a realistic strategy to achieve the goals, and identify a methodology for measuring the success of the plan. General campus enrollment growth will vary by department, so department academic plans should address two primary scenarios related to student and faculty growth:

1. Steady state (no growth);
2. Modest growth totaling 5-7% over 5 years.
Academic plans are expected to consider:

- highest priorities, programmatic strengths, and targets for development.
- opportunities to strengthen programs via collaboration with other units/campuses.
- faculty – current size and some discussion of optimal size; projected retirements in next 5-7 years; priorities in terms of new faculty hires; assumptions for start-up packages for hires during planning period; availability of suitable space; diversity goals and opportunities.
- curriculum – describe anticipated changes, discuss current challenges (for example, an issue with a core requirement or course delaying graduation or limiting enrollment in the major, inability to utilize computer classrooms, impacted major, etc.).
- graduate student goals, opportunities, and constraints for departmental based programs (deans are asked to consult with the graduate groups for which they are lead dean).
- assessment mechanisms to measure success.
- resources – describe most significant resource challenges and opportunities in relationship to achieving the goals articulated by the plan, keeping in mind that the state continues to face significant budget challenges.

**Planning Timeline and Process: Fall 2008 through Fall 2009**

As indicated above, we envision as an initial step the development of department academic plans. The departmental plans and advice from faculty, including the Faculty Executive Committee, will be used by deans to develop a school, college or division plan that creates a unified vision for the school, college or division aligned with campus-wide goals and aspirations.

The proposed timeline for the planning process is as follows:

1. Department academic plans submitted to deans by the end of winter quarter (March 23, 2008).

2. Deans complete their consultation with faculty, including their Faculty Executive Committee, during spring quarter 2008 and submit final school, college and division academic plans to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and the Academic Senate no later than August 31, 2008.

3. Academic Senate considers the plans during fall quarter 2008 and provides feedback to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and deans by the end of fall quarter 2008.

4. Campus academic plan developed by the end of winter quarter 2009.
Principles and Objectives for Academic Planning

It is useful to frame planning efforts within overarching principles and objectives. Please keep the following six principles and objectives in mind.

1. The campus’s vision for its future should be developed from both a campus-wide perspective as well as from the perspective of individual colleges, schools and divisions.
2. The plan should preserve current strengths and build on them.
3. The plan should consider new areas of discovery, scholarship and creativity that are essential for the continued academic development of the campus.
4. The plan should identify and support campus-wide areas of academic excellence for UC Davis.
5. The plan should encourage collaboration across organizational boundaries and evaluate opportunities to leverage resources and forge partnerships to maximize scarce resources.
6. The allocation of faculty positions by the Provost and the deans should be guided principally by the priorities set during the academic planning process.

Data

The Office of Resource Management and Planning will send a separate correspondence by early December that provides data and identifies other data resources available to departments to facilitate the academic planning process.

CONCLUSION

I appreciate the advice and input that you provided over the last few months to frame this process. We will continue to discuss academic and enrollment growth planning throughout this academic year to ensure that the framework, schedules, and process described in this letter are meeting our goals and objectives. I look forward to working with you to make this a successful effort.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Horwitz
Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

/dfu
c: Chancellor Vanderhoef
   Council of Vice Chancellors
   Associate Vice Chancellor Ratliff
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<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Peri</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gperi@ucdavis.edu">gperi@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Pickett</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cpickett@ucdavis.edu">cpickett@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Rauchway</td>
<td><a href="mailto:earauchway@ucdavis.edu">earauchway@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Academic Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Roth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sroth@ucdavis.edu">sroth@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Scheiner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:escheiner@ucdavis.edu">escheiner@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Simmons</td>
<td><a href="mailto:csimmons@ucdavis.edu">csimmons@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>MSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie Taylor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lartaylor@ucdavis.edu">lartaylor@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unduplicated</td>
<td>Unduplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Sci. &amp; Intl Relations</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Tech Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duplicated**: Students are counted once for each declared major listed on their student majors in the Banner SIS.

**Unduplicated**: Each of the student’s declared majors are weighted equally, totaling 1.0 for all majors combined (i.e., for a student with two majors, each major will be counted as 0.50 major).

**Source**: Student Information Systems Decision Support

Major Counts by Discipline by Term (report 413)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Under-graduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Total Faculty SCH</th>
<th>Total SCH per FTE</th>
<th>Student Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Total Ladder Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Total Ladder Faculty SCH</th>
<th>Total SCH per FTE</th>
<th>Student Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Grad Student Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>8,081.00</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>6,482.33</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>7,598.50</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2,677.66</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>13,617.50</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>4,910.01</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>11,644.72</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>9,275.33</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>3,591.67</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>1,547.16</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>3,919.67</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>3,015.67</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>9,954.66</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>7,280.33</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>19,881.44</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.44</td>
<td>7,930.20</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>11,911.94</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>4,381.84</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6,072</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6,572</td>
<td>231.20</td>
<td>90,201.10</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>178.80</td>
<td>47,500.53</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

06-07 Divisional Data Final 03/21/08
Steven M. Sheffrin, Dean
division of Social Sciences
College of Letters and Science
UC Davis

Dear Dean Sheffrin:

I have enclosed five-year planning documents from the Department of Anthropology.

As you know the Anthropology Department is divided into two Wings, the Sociocultural Processes Wing (S-Wing) and the Evolutionary Processes Wing (E-Wing). The Wings are largely autonomous with respect to curriculum and program, at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Hence I asked them to respond separately to the planning call.

There is agreement among faculty from both wings that this governance structure has been successful. The inter-Wing commitment to parity in FTEs and graduate funding written into our By-laws is working well.

At present we are at 14 faculty (12.5 FTE) in the S-Wing, and 13 faculty (12.0) FTE in the E-Wing. The first of any new FTE allocated to the Department would go to the E-Wing. As you will note in the planning documents, each wing either has an on-going search or anticipates one or more retirements, so we expect some turnover in this five-year period.

On behalf of the faculty, I look forward to working with you and your successor, with the goal of strengthening the Anthropology Department and our contributions to other units at UC Davis.

Best to you.

Sincerely,

Bruce Winterhalder
Professor and Chair
Five Year Academic Plan
Evolutionary Wing
March 2008

The evolutionary wing (E-Wing) of the UCDavis anthropology department maintains a broad interdisciplinary research focus. Our research program includes study of human culture, biology, and genetics, both past and present, with a scientific approach. It is our common interest in evolutionary approaches, in particular, that focuses our research on the human experience as a dynamic process over time and space. We maintain strong interdisciplinary ties and our faculty and graduate students collaborate across disciplinary lines both within the wing and in a range of departments across campus, including the agricultural, biological, environmental, mathematical, and physical sciences. Moreover, in our quest to understand the broader human experience, we work in field sites across the globe, on nearly all continents inhabited by humans.

The E-wing encompasses five research clusters or themes: archaeology, human behavioral ecology, human evolution (paleoanthropology), molecular anthropology, and primatology. Between one and four faculty members represent each of these clusters. Relative to other programs in the US, our primatology and human behavioral ecology clusters are particularly strong, the latter adding two new FTEs since 2001. Our graduate programs in these areas have been and continue to be successful and attract large numbers of graduate student applications. Our program in molecular anthropology is unusual, as few other departments have such an emphasis, though this field is rapidly growing nationwide. Indeed, many former UCD PhD's are heading up new programs (and labs) in this field. The archaeology and paleoanthropology clusters, though smaller in relative size to comparable institutions, have each added an FTE in the last three years and have revitalized by replacing retired faculty (n=2 in archaeology since 2001), and are gaining in reputation nationwide.

Although separated by name, there is actually significant overlap in the five identified research clusters. Ph.D. committees often include faculty from several and many of our co-authored publications include faculty from more than one cluster. Being able to interact and collaborate on a regular basis with researchers working in different areas of the world or on different data sets (graduate students and faculty), yet sharing a common theoretical focus, is one of the reasons the E-wing has been so successful. PhDs from the wing have placed well in the job market, and faculty and graduate students have been productive in publishing and obtaining external grants to support their research (over $4 million during the last five years).

The structure and characteristics of the E-wing give us a distinct identity within the field of anthropology nationwide. Indeed, the theoretical approach of our wing has been featured in Anthrosource (2005), the newsletter of the American Anthropological Association (AAA), in a column on graduate programs.
Important Resources

Specific resources within the wing that build upon and add to our research strengths include the anthropology museum which houses thousands of archaeological and ethnographic artifacts, primarily from California and Nevada, and is run by two staff curators. The museum also maintains a large comparative faunal skeletal collection of over 1300 specimens, which is heavily used by researchers within and outside the university, including a collection of over 700 fish specimens, the largest of its kind in the US. Likewise, the department maintains an extensive fossil and artifact cast teaching collection, and over 500 non-human primate research skeletons.

The wing benefits from the internationally recognized Molecular Anthropology laboratory, which offers a range of services to identify and characterize modern and ancient human and non-human primate DNA. This laboratory has been involved in a number of notable studies, including those of the famous Kennewick Man from Washington State, and employs a permanent staff member along with graduate and post-doctoral researchers. We also retain strong ties to the California National Primate Research Center (CNPRC; on the UCD campus), where two of our undergraduate courses are taught and several graduate students have pursued research.

Other important E-wing resources include a senior statistician, who interacts, collaborates, serves on graduate committees, and has published with faculty and graduate students. The archaeology program also includes an active publication series through the Center for Archaeological Research at Davis (CARD), which focuses on original monographs in California and Great Basin archaeology. Finally, due to our diverse geographical interests and active field programs, there are a range of field experiences available to both undergraduate and graduate students in evolutionary anthropology, and we regularly take our students into the field to gain hands-on experience in data collection (e.g., an active primatology field research station is currently maintained in Indonesia). In addition, for over 40 years the department has taught an annual summer archaeology field school, where, as part of their Ph.D. projects, graduate students instruct undergraduates in proper excavation and survey techniques.

Goals and Priorities

At present, the priorities of the E-wing are to 1) continue to establish the graduate program as an innovative and internationally-recognized one, and 2) to maintain, and, if possible, build on the resources discussed above.

Most of the resources previously discussed are maintained by faculty and/or are supported by external resources, including funding agencies and private companies that utilize our resources. For example, the molecular anthropology laboratories offer genetic characterization services to the public and otherwise are funded through organizations such as the National Institute of Health; the zooarchaeology laboratory and anthropology museum collect fees from public agencies and private contractors.
External funding and faculty labor ensure these resources will be available to us for data collection and analysis efforts for our respective research programs.

Physical space, though in high demand, has not hindered our research programs. However, the wing has been forced to move several resources off campus. For example, nearly all archaeology graduate students, as well as CARD, have been moved to a location approximately three miles east of campus. This new building (on Peña Drive) has excellent facilities for archaeological research, including large laboratories to lay out artifacts, but removes graduate students from daily activities within the department. Likewise, our graduate students in the other research clusters often do not have office space on campus, which hinders lab or research cluster interaction. This is a weakness of the wing that we are trying to resolve. The wing has formal plans to alleviate some of the pressures on space, by reorganizing and rebuilding some of our existing space in the basement of Young Hall. We are not pursuing this plan at present since demands for space have stabilized (e.g., with the move to Peña). However, if additional space were needed, this plan could be put back into effect.

We also plan to review and make adjustments to our undergraduate major. For example, we recently added a new minor in archaeology. As well, with new faculty in nearly all research clusters (excepting molecular) we have added and plan to add a number of new graduate and undergraduate classes. As a measure of this process, we are beginning to run out of course numbers within the wing, though the use of letters (e.g., 156A and 156B instead of only 156) will alleviate some of this pressure as we tailor and create specialty classes in some fields.

**FTE**

Over the next five years, we anticipate three retirements, one in molecular anthropology, one in paleoanthropology, and one in primatology. Given that our reputation has been built upon common theory but diverse topics, replacing these individuals and maintaining our topical breadth is a top priority for the E-wing. Current understanding is that retirements are to be replaced, and we would seek to replace these individuals with junior faculty with similar topical interests.

Under the current distribution of FTE and agreements to equally divide new FTE between the S- and E-wings, the next new position would be applied to the E-wing. With no growth over the next five years, such a position would have to wait until a better economic climate. Under a scenario of slow growth at the university level (1-4% over 5 years), and given the rapid expansion in human evolutionary molecular studies internationally, the wing maintains an avid interest in adding new FTE in this region. Thus, were new FTE to be allocated to the department, we would seek to expand our interests in this direction, with an eye towards using molecular approaches to bridge different research clusters. Laboratory space for such an individual would come from a division, or sharing, of the current molecular anthropology laboratories.
Additional FTE, if allocated, would go towards additional bridging positions between the subfields of the E-wing. The wing has previously expressed great interest in adding research interests in the evolution of human diet, health, life history and aging. For example, such a position would be used to strengthen our interests in human culture and evolution as reflected in such topics as nutrition, disease or life history. Space for such an individual would be carved out of existing laboratory, teaching, and/or office space within the department. An additional collaborator with a common methodological and theoretical perspective would go far toward strengthening our international reputation as a cohesive and interdisciplinary unit.

**Measuring Success**

We will continue to measure our success through several metrics. First, our rankings through agencies such as the National Research Council provide a gauge of our efforts relative to other universities. We have been previously ranked in the top 20 and plan to maintain or improve on this ranking. This metric does blend our ranking with that of the S-Wing, but because such organizations rank at the department level there is no way around this. There are no “evolutionary anthropology” organizations that would specifically rank our wing. However, other organizations, such as the Society for American Archaeology and the Paleoanthropology Society occasionally generate rankings, which can be used to gauge the success of individual research clusters. For example, the Ecology Graduate Group, which includes seven of our E-wing faculty, was recently ranked as the top ecology program in the country by the journal *Conservation Biology*.

Second, the number and quality of graduate student applications provides a measure of our reputation. As we become further established as a research unit with a distinctive theoretical and methodological focus, we believe applications will continue to rise, though spaces are likely to stabilize given finite faculty time and NRTF constraints. Over the last several years acceptance rates have ranged between 10-20% for the wing. We will measure and track the quantity of applicants to the wing as well as our acceptance rate. These measures could be standardized against the overall number of graduate applicants to the university.

Third, we will measure our success through graduate student placement following matriculation. For example, of the 96 Ph.D.s produced by evolutionary faculty (86 of which could be tracked) over a 35 year period, 1971–2006, 45 (52%) have attained faculty or academic positions, 18 (21%) obtained jobs with government agencies (which includes conservation, zoos, museums, and departments of transportation and health), and the remainder (n=23; 27%) are employed with private cultural resource management companies, or are in scientific publishing and consulting. This extremely high rate of employment within the field speaks to the long-standing success of this program.

Fourth, we will measure our success through the number of external grants we receive to support our field and laboratory work. As mentioned in the opening section,
E-wing faculty have generated over $4 million in external support during the last five years. This money has come from a range of sources including National Science Foundation, National Institute of Health, Wenner Gren Foundation, LSB Leakey, National Geographic, National Park Service, California State Parks, and the Heinz Foundation. We have supported many graduate and undergraduate students on these grants, contributing greatly to their educational opportunities. We will continue to track the number, diversity and size of research grants as a measure of our success.
Strength and Weakness

The Sociocultural Wing is composed of social, cultural, and linguistic anthropologists committed to understanding how people organize their lives and interpret their circumstances in the modern and postmodern world. It has grown to fourteen faculty (one position to be filled through a continued search next year), three of whom have joint appointments with other programs (two in Science, Technology and Society, one in Women and Gender Studies).

Current faculty give particular emphasis to issues of politics, the economy, science, cultures of history, technologies of vision, memory, and history; geographical areas of study include the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, South, Southeast, and East Asia. All of us undertake ethnographic fieldwork and many of us also do archival (historical) research. We are interested in the understanding of global processes as well as specifically local engagements that may or may not acquire universal traction. The S-Wing is very strong, especially as regards its coverage of contemporary institutions and developments in the following areas: science and technology studies (including environmental anthropology); film and visual anthropology, global social movements, neoliberal urban spaces and global cultures, political economy (particularly how local views of development are culturally constructed); gender and sexuality studies; historical anthropology and the cultural construction of the past; notions of race, ethnicity, and nationality; colonial/neocolonial/postcolonial studies; religion/religious movements; and studies of conflict/war/violence and their aftermaths. Critical analysis of liberalism and neoliberalism, unpacking "globalization" and its discursive and material implications and critical analyses of other universalizing discourses (such as human rights) are thematics that run through the work of many of the S-Wing scholars. Intellectual rigor grounded in empirically rich research is a hallmark of the work of the S-Wing.

Most regions of the world are represented to some degree, with considerable strength in "American Studies" (broadly defined), African Studies, and East/Southeast Asian Studies. In the future, we would like to expand our coverage to other important regions. The Sociocultural Wing also maintains strong intellectual connections with the interdisciplinary graduate programs in Social Theory and Comparative History, Cultural Studies, Women Studies, Science and Technology Studies, and Critical Theory.

The S-Wing faculty has distinguished itself by winning highly prestigious national grants and awards (National Endowment of Humanities, National Science Foundation, Fulbright, American Philosophical Society, Mellon Foundation, Ford Foundation, Wenner-Gren, Population Council, Guggenheim Foundation, and International Development Research Center for example). Collectively, in the past five years, they
have been awarded nearly $3 million in grants. Their success as researchers is recognized by major foundations who recruit them to serve on review panels. Three currently sit on different review panels of the National Science Foundation, and others have/do serve on the review panels of Wenner-Gren, the Social Science Research Council, and the Guggenheim Foundation.

The S-Wing faculty has risen to national leadership in a number of professional societies (including the Editor of a leading anthropology journal, American Ethnologist, executive boards of the Society of Cultural Anthropology and the Society of East Asian Anthropology, and the Social Studies of Science Society), and founding, co-founding a number of professional societies and journals (Association for Middle East Women’s Studies, Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies, Arab Families Working Group, Middle East Section of the American Anthropological, and BioSocieties).

S-Wing faculty have taken campus leadership, chairing the East Asian Studies Program, the Science and Technology Studies Program, the Middle East/South Asia Studies Program, and the Center of History, Society, and Culture; working in critical campus Administrative posts (such as Director of the Teaching Resources Center); and serving on key campus committees (such as Search committee for Dean of Division of Letters and Sciences, Chair of Faculty Committee of School of Education, Chair of Faculty Committee of School of Law, and the Pacific Rim Research Grant Review). The S-Wing also serves the campus through teaching large courses to help fulfill university requirements. In response to the growth of the campus undergraduate population we have been developing new lower and upper-division courses and increasing the size of the classes that we currently offer.

Our faculty has been highly productive in research. Our publications over the past five years include a number of influential books, numerous peer-reviewed articles and book chapters, one widely screened ethnographic film, and a six volume encyclopedia. Some of the books won prestigious awards from anthropology, sociology, and STS. Almost all of us constantly reviewed book and article manuscripts for major university presses and journals.

The S-Wing has received increasing graduate applications over the past five years. As our reputation has grown so has the pool of applications and competition with other top-tier universities. We have attracted some outstanding students who are also accepted by other top universities such as Yale, Harvard, Stanford, and UC Berkeley, and Fulbright international students. At present, our primary limitation is the lack of an ability to offer financial packages competitive with these universities.

S-Wing graduates have been very successful in obtaining grants and jobs. They successfully compete for the most prestigious grants: SSRC (three in a row is quite unusual for any public university anthropology department—we may be the only one), Wenner-Gren, Charlotte Newcombe, Pacific Rim Research from the President’s Office (four). In terms of employment, from 1968 to 2004 there were a total of 77 Ph.D.s produced by the S-Wing (including linguistics). Among them, 34 have attained faculty
positions, three in university administration, six in government, nine in private sectors and 25 unknown.

**Priorities and Goals**

**A. FTE**

We first need to conduct a continued search of a position we did not fill successfully in 2008. The second is a crucial retirement replacement of one faculty who will retire in 2008, who is a nationally recognized scholar of capitalism. In addition, we hope to obtain a new FTE. We have identified the following four topics as our priorities in order to strengthen and expand the wing’s current focuses by filling in some important yet missing topical areas. Although our search is usually not defined by geographic focus, we would like to give certain preference to people working on Europe, North America, and North Africa. The wing expects to make the three hires that will cover some of the priorities listed below.

1) Medical Anthropology

Medical Anthropology is a significant field within Sociocultural Anthropology and in high demand among undergraduates at UC Davis, especially pre-meds, and graduate students who find health and disease inseparable from their topics of study, and those who desire a well-rounded anthropology education. We currently lack the faculty to teach a basic medical anthropology undergraduate class, which could easily be a large lecture class, as well as more specialized medical anthropology topics. Such a faculty member would be in high demand and help us in recruiting both graduate students and undergraduate majors. In turn, we are an attractive department because of the UC Davis Medical School, the School of Public Health, and the new Nursing School. Therefore we seek a sociocultural anthropologist of medicine, biomedicine, or cross-cultural medicine, with preference for field expertise in the above-mentioned geographic regions.

2) Anthropology of Law and Legal Theory

We seek a scholar whose work critically interrogates the foundations of law, legal institutions, and legal practices from historical and cultural perspectives. Of particular interest is an assessment of the contributions of critical legal studies, feminist critical legal studies, and postcolonial critical legal theory. The intersections of legal studies, critical race theory and feminist theory are especially important. Analysis of key issues such as international law and international conventions (for example, human rights conventions), intellectual property laws, environmental laws, conditions of legal pluralism, the constitution and meaning of citizenship in state and post-state contexts, and the contestation over the nature of the legal subject (or the subject of law). Studies of law making, legal practices, legal activism in cross-cultural perspectives historically and in global perspectives today.
3) Anthropology of Capitalism

The analysis of large-scale economic structures has been a strength of the S-Wing for some time. With the departure of Roger Rouse and the retirements of G. William Skinner and Carol Smith, however, this area of emphasis has been significantly weakened. This will allow us the opportunity to bring fresh anthropological perspectives on the economy into the S-Wing and into conversation with current strengths on science and technology studies; religion and globalization; gender and sexuality studies; and history and historical anthropology.

The focus of anthropological studies of the economy has changed over the past two decades. Before, anthropologists were concerned principally with what lay "outside" capitalism—even if capitalism conditioned its existence. Recent work, in contrast, has turned to the very heart of capitalism itself with ethnographic studies of high finance; the way that markets actually, rather than theoretically, work; the ways that "risk" is configured and the effects this calculation has on social relations of all kinds; how property and ownership are socially and culturally constituted; and how a certain kind of personhood, necessary for such kinds of social relationships, is reproduced. A young anthropologist who could bring some of these interests and fresh perspectives into the S-Wing would round out our profile in significant ways.

4) Media/Visual Practice and Theory

We would like to hire a specialist who is accomplished in both written research and video production. This person should also specialize in one or more of the following fields: visual anthropology, media studies, film studies, popular culture and cultural studies. As the power of the image in public discourse grows, it becomes increasingly important that scholars are able not only to study and criticize the power of images, but to also work with them. This knowledge and methodology complements more traditional methodologies of sociocultural ethnographic research.

This position will build on existing abilities in the faculty and make instruction in visual research techniques a strong suit of the department at a time when visual research has become important to the discipline. This position will satisfy the urgent need among graduate students for incorporation of video into their research projects. It will meet the strong demand among undergraduates for media and communication-related courses in anthropology. Finally, this position will build up the department’s growing strength in, and reputation for, innovative research methodologies, through a stronger presence in the department of anthropologists working in multiple mediums.

B. NRTF

More NRTF support is crucial for maintaining a successful graduate program. We are competitive for graduate students, but not with our peer institutions (such as top-ranked private schools) because we cannot offer large financial packages to out-of-state or foreign students. In recent years, we have been successful in attracting international
students with Fulbright scholarships, but negotiating NRTF with limited resources (block grant) is always the most difficult part. Typically, the foundations require us to pay for these students’ tuitions and fees. Faculty can try to hire our students as RA with their research grants, but their grants usually are not allowed to be used to cover tuitions. It is particularly important for the S-Wing to train international students. Many of them return to their home country upon graduation and become invaluable contacts and resources for our faculty and future students who conduct research in those regions.

C. Other Issues

We need more I.T. equipment and technical support for faculty and students. Our educational equipment is getting old yet we have little funding to replace them now. We are also understaffed and faculty often cannot obtain necessary technical support in a timely fashion. Visual anthropology is a developing strength in the department, but resources for cameras, computers, storage and other necessities are insufficient to support anthropology’s engagement with visual media.

Availability of Resources

Our faculty have been successful obtaining external grants and fellowships such as NSF, Fulbright, NEH, Guggenheim and Wenner-Gren. For example, Dr. Joseph has received a $600,000 grant from the Department of Education (including matching funds from the university) to support development of the ME/SA program. But most of the grants are for faculty research and/or RA support for our graduate students, rather than program development. University support is still key to graduate program development.

We will continue to encourage faculty to seek external grants aggressively and identify more potential agencies for support.

Evaluating Success

We measure our success in two main ways:

- Faculty productivity—for example, courses taught; the numbers of publications, research grants, awards, invited lectures, and professional services.

- Student productivity—for example, job placement, research grants, conference participation, and the number of graduate applications each year, time to degree.
Department of Communication Five-Year Plan: 2009-2014

Introduction

Although the process of devising and implementing long-range plans in a highly dynamic and uncertain funding environment is fraught with both risk and potential frustrations, the present document presents a five-year academic plan for the Department of Communication. This plan will commence in 2009. The plan is predicated on two possible scenarios: (1) no growth during the 2009-2014 period, and (2) 5-7% growth over the five years; moreover, the plan presumes a ladder faculty base of 11 FTE as of fall quarter 2009 and the current complement of Unit 18 Lecturers.

This five-year plan first provides a brief overview of progress that has been made since the current five-year plan was developed and implemented during the 2004-05 academic year. A description of the program is then provided. Goals to be pursued and plans for achieving them under the two possible 2009-2014 growth scenarios will then be presented. Finally, new ladder FTE positions will be adumbrated.

Progress during 2004-08

Graduate Program. When the current five-year plan was formulated during fall quarter 2004, the Department’s M.A. program was inactive, but Graduate Council was considering its reactivation. Subsequently, the M.A. program was reopened and the first class commenced its studies in fall quarter 2006. Currently, there are 10 students enrolled in the program. More than 50% of those who apply to the program are international students, most of them from East Asia. Thus, even though the reincarnated M.A. program’s history is a short one, it has already gained a significant measure of international visibility. The Department currently has eight (8), full-time teaching assistantships; a number that represents an increase of one (1) teaching assistantship during the current five-year plan period. These assistantships are associated with CMN 1 (Public Speaking) and CMN 3 (Interpersonal Communication Competence). In addition, graduate students are supported by block grant funds.

At the time the M.A. program was reactivated, the Graduate Council explicitly charged the Department to develop a plan for a departmentally-based Ph.D. program in Communication. This plan was developed during the 2005-06 academic year and submitted to the Graduate Council for its approval during 2006-07. The Graduate Council has approved the proposal contingent upon the approval of the Budget and Planning and Library Committees. The Ph.D. proposal is displayed in Appendix A. The previous five-year plan stipulated that the Ph.D. program would require a ladder faculty consisting of 11-12 FTE. Currently, the Department has 10 ladder FTE; hence, filling one (1) more ladder faculty position during the 2008-09 academic year will achieve the Department’s 11 FTE base and satisfy the number of faculty required for the Ph.D. program.

Undergraduate Program. During fall quarter 2004, there were just under 800 Communication majors and there were only six (6) ladder faculty, two (2) full-time and three (3)
part-time lecturers. Because of the highly unfavorable student/faculty ratio (SFR), impacted major status had already been implemented and reduced the number of majors from a high of over 1,000 earlier in the decade. Impacted major status as well as the somewhat attenuated growth in the undergraduate population during the period has further reduced the number of majors to 536 during 2006-07. However, as the figure below demonstrates, the rate of decline of undergraduate majors is clearly decelerating. There was a 17.22% decrease in the number of Communication majors from 2002-03 to 2003-04. In stark contrast, there was only a 4.45% reduction from 2005-06 to 2006-07. In all probability, this large difference in the decline rates signals that impacted major status has exerted its full impact on reducing the number of majors.

Although the long-term decline in the number of majors appears to have reached an asymptote with respect to a limit in the low 500 range, as the figure shows, there are indications of a nascent reversal of this downward trend. The possibility of such a rebound was discussed at the time impacted major status was implemented. As of fall quarter 2007, there were 567 Communication majors, 31 more majors than the 536 reported for 2006-07.

While the number of ladder faculty has increased from six (6) to 10 during the current five-year plan period, in historical terms the present SFR remains problematic. During the early 1990s, the current number of ladder FTE served a population of majors that was less than half of the present number. Moreover, during the more recent period of 2000-01 to 2006-07, while the Communication SFR declined from 64.21 to 45.23, the SFR for the Division of Social Sciences for the same two years was 28.00 and 26.38 respectively. Thus, even with the substantial decline in the Communication SFR during this period, the Communication SFR remains some 71.46% higher than the Division of Social Sciences average. Given the declining rate of decrease in the number of Communication majors and the potential reversal of this decreasing trend during the
current year, additional faculty FTE will be required to bring the Communication SFR into line with the Division of Social Sciences SFR.

One important consequence of the continuing imbalance between the numbers of ladder faculty and undergraduate majors is the Department’s inability to offer more upper division courses that feature a writing experience. Although the Department was able to alter some upper-division classes (CMN 143, CMN 144, CMN 146, CMN 165, CMN 172) to include a writing component by limiting class enrollments to no more than 50 students, and occasionally offering proseminars (CMN 189a-d) that enroll fewer than 20 students, many upper division offerings continue to be taught as large lecture sections (90-150 students) with grades exclusively determined by examinations. The classes that include a writing component currently have no teaching assistants associated with them, thus making it impossible to open these classes to larger enrollments. Thus, although undergraduate enrollment in the major has declined, at least until the present academic year (2007-08), while the number of ladder faculty increased during the current five-year plan, there remains further need to augment the number of ladder faculty in order to enrich the undergraduate learning experience. This is especially critical if the numbers of Communication majors continue to rebound from their apparent 2006-07 low.

Program Purview

The Department of Communication’s curriculum continues to emphasize two areas of study: Social Interaction and Media. Consistent with the faculty’s research orientation, the curriculum focuses on understanding communication processes by recourse to scientific theorizing and quantitative research methods. The Department’s relatively small size has necessitated limiting the scope of the substantive areas and research methods represented in the curriculum.

Social Interaction. Social Interaction theory and research concerns communication that occurs in and is constitutive of everyday encounters between people. Researchers in this domain of inquiry seek to understand the content and structure of the give and take that characterizes social behavior. By necessity, these inquires consider the roles both linguistic and nonverbal communication modes play in enabling social interaction. In addition to examining fundamental processes subserving social interaction such as message production, message comprehension and message interpretation, these researchers seek to explain how various goals, for example, social influence and compliance-gaining, are pursued and achieved during social encounters. Although other disciplines, including psychology, sociology, linguistics and anthropology are concerned with the study of social interaction, communication researchers contribute uniquely to understanding the nature, uses and effects of verbal and non-verbal codes in human interactions.

Media. As instantiated in the academic realm writ large, media studies can include research concerned with media industries, cultural and critical studies of media, and the sociological and psychological effects of media. The Department’s purview in this regard is, by choice, substantially narrower. In addition to viewing the study of mass communication and new media technologies from a “media psychology” perspective, one that focuses attention on the effects of media messages on individual beliefs, attitudes, behaviors and values, the Department’s media emphasis also includes the examination of effects that occur beyond the
individual media consumer or mere aggregations of individual consumers. This latter approach examines interactions among macro-, meso- and micro-level effects employing a variety of hierarchical modeling approaches. The Department continues to have no interest in covering such allied “practical fields” of mass communication as journalism, advertising and public relations.

The Social Interaction and Media areas are not mutually exclusive. The recent spate of innovation in the communication technologies domain has led to the possibility of synchronous and asynchronous social interaction using mediated communication channels. Computer-mediated social interactions now take place in a variety of formats. Some faculty members engage in research that falls within both areas. For instance, faculty members investigate the cognitive processing of both interpersonal messages and messages presented on the media. Another faculty member addresses questions about physician-patient interaction and media portrayals of health-related messages. Faculty members with interests in political communication study the effects of political messages delivered through both traditional and new media, as well as the effects of political information exchanged during face-to-face encounters between citizens. When it is both possible and desirable to do so, the Department encourages individual researchers to integrate the two areas into their theorizing and empirical work. In all likelihood, future developments in communication technologies will serve to blur further the once sharp distinctions between these two domains of inquiry.

Excluded Areas. Given the Department’s relatively small size, there are several sub-areas of communication that cannot be covered in any depth. For example, such areas as organizational communication and intercultural communication, although vast in their scope, are not represented by the current ladder faculty. The Department’s goal has been and continues to be to develop an international reputation in Social Interaction and Media areas first and then expand beyond these two areas if additional resources are made available.

Faculty Distribution Between Areas. Currently the Department has 10 ladder faculty members who are equally distributed between the Social Interaction and Media foci. Professors Bell, Berger, Feng, Hughes, Motley and Palomares develop theory and conduct research that falls under the Social Interaction rubric. Professors Bell, Berger, Cho, Hwang, Taylor and Yegiyan carry out research within the Media domain.

Faculty Retirements. Faculty retirements that may occur during 2009-2014 will threaten the current balance between the two areas. Two potential retirements during this period would result in the Social Interaction area being underrepresented in relation to the Media area. To forestall this possibility, a near-term hiring priority should be to augment the Social Interaction area in anticipation of the two projected retirements.

No Growth Scenario

For the Department of Communication there are at least two sub-scenarios that must be considered within the general no-growth context. One of these sub-scenarios would postulate no growth in undergraduate majors; while the second would assume that the number of undergraduate majors will continue to rise, probably not to the 1,000+ levels seen at the turn of
the millennium, but perhaps as high as 600-650. Because there are already indications that the second of these two scenarios is more likely to materialize in the future, for the Department of Communication the so-called “no growth” scenario may be tantamount to a “resource depletion” scenario, not merely a “steady state.”

Under these conditions, perhaps the only way to prevent resource erosion with no additional resources would be to increase the requirements associated with impacted major and thus dampen growth in the number of majors. One way this could be done by raising the GPA requirement from its current 2.50 in certain preparatory courses and/or by requiring more preparatory courses.

Assuming that a “steady state” could be achieved, there are goals that could be attained, assuming a ladder faculty consisting of 11 FTE, two full-time lecturers and two part-time lecturers and the current complement of 8 teaching assistants.

**Implementation of the Ph.D. Program.** As indicated previously, the proposed Ph.D. Program in Communication has been conditionally approved by the Graduate Council. As the Ph.D. proposal indicates, few new resources will be necessary to implement the program; moreover, the Department’s base of 11 FTE comports with the minimum FTE necessary to deliver the program. Because the Department is currently delivering the M.A. program and the Ph.D. proposal stipulates that over time the M.A. program will be gradually supplanted by the Ph.D. program, there are no significant barriers to implementing the Ph.D. program, even within a no-growth environment.

**New Upper Division Courses.** Over the past few years the Department has added several new faculty members who have brought with them new research and teaching interests. Given the faculty and teaching assistant parameters articulated above, it should be possible for new faculty members to develop a limited number of new upper division courses in the major while at the same time offering current upper division courses, including those required for the major. The implementation of these new courses should be preceded by a review of the current curriculum to see whether extant courses might be modified or eliminated. The new courses should be implemented slowly to ensure that existing courses, especially those that are required, are being offered frequently enough to meet student demand.

**Writing in Upper Division Courses.** Again assuming very attenuated growth in the number of Communication majors, it might be possible that a few, perhaps only one or two, of the new upper division classes could be limited to no more than 50 students so that the classes could include a writing experience. However, these new classes, as well as those that are already offered in the major, would not satisfy the “writing in the major” requirement contained in the latest version of General Education proposal. This requirement stipulates that students complete six (6) units in the major that include a writing regime consisting of multiple paper drafts that receive extensive feedback from instructors. This multiple-draft requirement cannot be implemented in the Department’s current writing courses and it could not be implemented in any new courses that include a writing component. Given this state of affairs, all Communication majors would have to satisfy the six (6)-unit writing in the major requirement outside of the major, as allowed in the current version of the General Education proposal.
Oral Skills Instruction. The proposed changes in the general education requirements stipulate that students fulfill an oral skills requirement. Although there are some courses offered in the University that might satisfy such a requirement, CMN 1 (Public Speaking) is among the more obvious courses that students could take to fulfill the requirement. In fact, CMN 1 is already required by some majors. Although it is not the Department’s goal to increase CMN 1 enrollments, if the General Education proposal is implemented in its current form, this contingency could arise. Given that every quarter CMN 1 has wait lists in the range of 60-100 students, this situation would only be exacerbated by the new oral skills requirement. In a “no growth” environment, there is little that could be done to meet this increased demand.

Modest Growth Scenario

As was the case with the no-growth scenario, the modest-growth scenario (5-7% over five years) must be tempered by the reality that the Communication major may be entering a period of renewed growth. If this is the case, then growth in resources may eventuate in merely maintaining a “steady state,” and little tangible increase in the quality of the undergraduate program. However, if growth in the undergraduate major can be attenuated or fails to materialize, not only can the goals articulated above be achieved, including the Ph.D. program, a ladder faculty consisting of 12 FTE and at least six (6) additional teaching assistants would enable still other goals to be realized.

Writing in Upper Division Courses. As previously observed, without additional resources, the Department is unable to offer upper division courses that meet the proposed “writing in the major” requirement. However, with an additional ladder FTE and a minimum of six (6) teaching assistants, two upper division courses could be offered that include the “multiple drafts” regime that is currently part of the General Education proposal. This would enable Communication majors to complete this requirement by taking courses in their major rather than being forced to shop for the required writing classes in other departments. If writing in the major has tangible benefits for students, such benefits would be realized if these resource requirements were met.

Oral Skills Instruction. If the oral skills requirement prompts increased enrollment pressure on CMN 1 (Public Speaking), a number of possible plans could be implemented to cope with the increased numbers. Because of the limited number of lecture halls that can accommodate class sizes in excess of 200 students (there are only nine (9) such lecture halls on the UC Davis campus and only three (3) that can accommodate 300 or more students), the strategy of expanding the size of the current lecture session beyond the current 200+ students and adding teaching assistants to cover additional discussion sections may prove to be problematic. It is already extremely difficult to schedule the CMN 1 lecture session in the large lecture halls. Thus, it may become necessary to create a second lecture session with some additional teaching assistants to split the enrollment between two lectures. This approach would necessitate hiring a lecturer to teach the additional CMN 1 lecture session and additional teaching assistants above and beyond the six (6) required to deliver the “writing in the major requirement.”

The small increment in ladder faculty (one [1] new FTE) under this modest growth scenario would not permit the Department to embark on the expansive project of widening its
substantive purview beyond the Social Interaction and Media areas. Perhaps three (3) or four (4) more new hires in the Social Interaction and Media areas beyond the 12 FTE would fulfill these needs. Beyond these additional hires in the two extant areas, it would require perhaps four (4) or more new FTE to initiate a new research area in the Department. Defining these new research areas is a topic for future five-year plans.

Although the 5-7% modest growth scenario would eventuate in only one (1) new FTE for the Department, because of the Department’s continuing and unusually high SFR relative to the Division’s SFR, the following section lists descriptions of three new FTE positions within each of the two areas. These position descriptions are rank ordered in terms of their priority.

**New Ladder FTE**

**Social Interaction Area**

*Nonverbal Communication.* For this position we would seek a scholar with a research program that focuses on the impact of nonverbal cues in basic social interaction processes. This scholar would investigate how nonverbal aspects of messages, such as kinesics, vocalics, and haptics, impact outcomes such as impression formation, persuasion, social support, and judgments of message veracity. Preferably, this person would attempt to discern when and why the nonverbal components of a message can modulate or altogether alter the interpretation of the verbal components of a message.

*Strategic Social Interaction.* This position would be for a scholar whose primary research interest is strategic message production and processing in interpersonal-communication contexts. Such a research program would examine senders' and receivers' goal-directed behavior in social interaction. Interests may include any of the following: goal formation, language behavior and effects, persuasion, deception, impression formation, relational development, communication routines, compliance gaining and resistance, and other issues surrounding how messages are generated and understood in social interaction.

*Cognition and Emotion in Social Interaction.* This position would seek a scholar whose primary research interests focus on the influences of cognition and emotion on the message comprehension, interpretation, and production processes in interpersonal communication contexts such as compliance gaining, conflict management, and negotiation. Examples of research programs in this area include attitudinal and motivational factors in communication; the influence of emotion in decision-making; and the interaction between emotion and cognition in social interaction.

**Media Area**

*New media/technology.* This position would be for a scholar who conducts research on the use and effects of new media and communication technologies. Specific interests would include individual and social use of new media (e.g., psychological motivation for new media use, social adoption of communication technologies); and social impacts of new media and communication technologies (e.g., new media and social life, new media and democracy).
**Psychological and/or Societal Effects of Media.** For this position, we would seek a scholar who has research expertise in the study of media effects with emphasis in one or more of the following areas: the effects of entertainment media on attitude and behavior change; cognitive and emotional responses to mediated messages; the effects of news media on public opinion; media and socialization; and media and public participation.

**Human Computer Interaction.** For this position, we would seek a scholar whose primary research interests center around the psychological interaction between individuals and computers. Examples of research programs in this area include psychological effects of human-computer interface (e.g., interactivity, multi-modality, and the sense of presence); psychological response to digital human representation; social interaction through computers; and virtual reality and identity.

**Epilogue**

Since the new millennium’s beginning, the Department of Communication has evolved from a unit in which a very small number of ladder faculty and lecturers did their utmost to deliver a high quality undergraduate curriculum to more than 1,000 majors to a department with 40% fewer majors, an active M.A. program and an increased but still modest number of ladder faculty. Today, communication majors have more opportunities to hone their writing skills in the Department’s upper division courses than they did in the year 2000; nevertheless, still more needs to be done to enhance these opportunities for undergraduates.

In contrast to the situation that existed at the beginning of the new millennium, highly talented and capable graduate students, some of them from China, Korea and the Philippines, now acquire the conceptual and methodological tools necessary to conduct significant communication research while, at the same time, acting as teaching assistants in the Department’s lower division courses. When the M.A. program was re-opened, Department faculty members were highly optimistic about its future. Their optimism is already being vindicated: Among the first class of M.A. students who will graduate in June, 2008 is a student from Korea who will embark on her Ph.D. work in communication at Stanford University and another student who will do further M.A.-level work in Public Health at UC Davis. Given these very positive outcomes, it is clear that the Department is capable of offering a high quality Ph.D. program.

Although UC system budget constraints may be significant in the short term, even modest investments in the Department of Communication during this period are likely to produce large incremental gains. For the Department of Communication is poised at a threshold that when crossed will propel it into the highest strata of Ph.D.-granting Communication programs in the United States and abroad.
Appendix A

PROPOSAL FOR A PROGRAM OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION
AT UC DAVIS FOR THE PH.D. DEGREE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Aims and Objectives

Communication research concerns how people create, transmit, interpret, evaluate, and respond to messages to inform, relate to, and influence one another interpersonally, in small groups, in organizations, in public settings, and across cultures. Communication scholars work toward illuminating these processes and effects in various contexts, channels and media. Although communication is studied from both humanities and social scientific perspectives, the overarching purpose of the proposed Ph.D. program is to produce students who will develop communication theories and be highly skilled in the use of quantitative methods to evaluate them. This will not be an applied program, but one predicated on the view that theoretical understanding of phenomena enables more effective application than does practical intervention not informed by theory-based explanation.

The program will focus on two distinct but related areas of communication inquiry, social interaction and mediated communication, two areas of study represented in our extant M.A. program. Within each of these domains of study, students may address a range of research questions such as the following:

- How does the use of new communication technologies alter face-to-face social interaction?
- What processes enable individuals to detect each others’ goals and intentions during both face-to-face and mediated social encounters?
- Why and to what degree does engaging in anonymous computer-mediated communication lower users’ inhibitions to the point that they are willing to flout conversational maxims?
- What mechanism or mechanisms explain relationships between exposure to violent media content, including violent video games, and manifestations of aggressive behavior in children and adults?
- How does information about co-interlocutors’ emotional states, obtained both explicitly and implicitly, influence interpretation of message content and subsequent responses to messages? What mechanisms enable these effects?
- Why do particular message features tend to promote adherence in message recipients, as when parents advise their children or doctors prescribe particular medications for their patients?
- How does exposure to particular types of content available on traditional media and the Internet influence the degree to which individuals become civically engaged?

These questions, as well as the many more we anticipate our Ph.D. students would ask, require that students be highly conversant with theories germane to processes subserving the production
and processing of verbal discourse and text. These theoretical perspectives also seek to explain communicative action manifested or expressed nonverbally. These fundamental processing issues cut across both the social interaction and mediated communication areas, and these fundamental processes span numerous specific contexts subsumed within each of the two domains of inquiry. Research designed to illuminate these processes requires in-depth training in both quantitative methods and research design; consequently, the program will provide students with a rigorous set of courses in these areas. Because the program will train students to develop communication theory, regardless of their particular area of focus students will be required to become well steeped in alternative meta-theoretical perspectives for developing communication theory and they will gain practical experience in theory construction.

Given the ubiquity of communicative activity in everyday social commerce, achieving an understanding of fundamental communication processes holds great promise for addressing a wide array of practical communication problems and social concerns. The proposed program will provide its students with the conceptual and methodological tools necessary to study and understand these processes. Quantitative, social-scientific approaches to communication research have become dominant in the communication discipline. Moreover, the Department of Communication’s faculty members, all of whom conduct communication research within this quantitative, social scientific purview, as well as the Department’s home in the Division of Social Sciences combine to support the desirability of establishing a social-scientifically focused, quantitatively-oriented Ph.D. program in Communication. This constellation of circumstances ensures that such a Ph.D. program will flourish at UC Davis.

Specific attributes of the proposed program and the dimensions along which it differs from the few other doctoral programs in communication offered in California are discussed in several sections that follow—see especially I-4, I-5, III-3, III-4, and III-6.

2. Historical Development of the Field and of Departmental Strength in the Field

The historical roots of the study of communication are often traced to classical Greece, where such philosophers as Aristotle articulated principles of rhetoric and effective persuasive discourse. The social-scientific study of communication, the focus of the proposed program, emerged during the early decades of the 20th century. At that time, communication research was not conducted within a single institutional entity; rather, researchers from the then-emerging disciplines of sociology, psychology, political science, marketing and advertising sought to understand the role print, film and radio might play in producing a variety of effects in their audiences. During this period, the journalist Walter Lippman wrote extensively about media, public opinion and democracy, and the Chicago school of sociology initiated a number of media effects studies, including the ways in which newly-arrived immigrants used the press to orient themselves in American society. The voluminous Payne Fund Study of the late 1920s and early 1930s examined the potential deleterious effects of movie attendance on youth. The political scientist Harold Lasswell’s extensive work on propaganda during this period was also influential in shaping the development of communication research.
During World War II, several social scientists with interests in communication worked in government agencies conducting research in areas related to morale and propaganda. In addition, beyond the war effort, research aimed at understanding the impact of political information disseminated by the mass media during election campaigns on voting behavior was initiated in 1940 by the influential sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld. Inspired by psychologist Kurt Lewin’s innovative studies of group decision making during World War II, researchers began to study face-to-face communication in groups under the rubric of group dynamics. Researchers of that time came to realize that face-to-face interaction could serve an important function in altering the effects of media-disseminated messages, thus suggesting the importance of understanding social influence processes in groups. Although several communication researchers of this early period explicitly embraced the idea that communication theory could be bootstrapped out of their decidedly applied research projects, little theory was actually generated.

At the end of World War II, many communication researchers who had worked in the government returned to academic institutions and established communication research programs. Carl Hovland initiated a highly productive research program devoted to the study of communication and persuasion at Yale University. Institutes for the study of communication were established at the University of Illinois and Stanford University, and the Annenberg School for Communication was instituted at the University of Pennsylvania. A second Annenberg school was later established at the University of Southern California. At the same time, the social-scientific study of communication began to find an institutional home in existing journalism, broadcasting and speech departments, which, heretofore, had been concerned mainly with communication skills instruction.

Although the great bulk of communication research published during and before World War II was applied, focused on mass media effects, and animated by commercial and social concerns, commencing in the 1960s communication research became increasingly motivated by theory and expanded beyond the media effects domain. Inspired by the meta-theoretical perspectives afforded by Shannon and Weaver’s *Mathematical Theory of Communication*, Wiener and Ashby’s writing on cybernetics and control theory and von Bertalanffy’s general system theory, theory development became a central activity in the discipline. Beginning in the early 1970s, social interaction researchers also expanded their research purview well beyond that represented by the communication and persuasion paradigm prevalent in the 1950s and 60s.

Today, in addition to studying social influence processes, social interaction researchers examine the role verbal and nonverbal face-to-face interaction plays in the development and maintenance of relationships, deceptive communication, interpersonal conflict and negotiation. Research specialties devoted to studying social interaction both within formal organizations and across cultures have become quite large and highly active, and both social interaction and media effects researchers have established growing area specializations in health, political and instructional communication. Advances in communication technologies that enable mediated social interaction (computer-mediated communication, Internet, mobile telephones) have spawned increasing interest in the social and psychological effects these technologies have on their users as well as how attributes of the technologies shape communication praxis.
The Department of Communication at UC Davis has shown a similar pattern of evolution over the past 40 years. Established as the Department of Rhetoric in 1966, its primary focus was on humanistic approaches to communication study in the tradition of classical rhetorical scholarship. The Department established a masters program in 1971. With the addition of faculty trained in the social sciences, the Department’s name was changed to Department of Rhetoric and Communication in 1987. The advent of a divisional structure in the College of Letters and Science in 1995 led the Department to become part of the Division of Social Sciences. In 1998 the Department became the Department of Communication, housing a faculty exclusively concerned with quantitative, social scientific approaches to the study of communication. Current faculty members’ research interests in the social interaction and the technological mediation of communication mirror major research areas that have developed in the field at large.

We feel that with the current Academic Senate faculty of 10 Department of Communication FTE, which will be augmented by one (1) new FTE for whom we will be searching during the 2008-09 academic year and at least one additional new FTE before the program is in place, plus the three (3) faculty members from Psychology and Political Science who are already affiliated with our M.A. program in Communication should put us in the position of offering a distinctive and high-quality doctoral program focused on the two core areas of social interaction and mediated communication.

3. Timetable for the Development of the Program

The program’s development can be considered with respect to a number of dimensions, the most important of which are curricular, financial, and outreach. In terms of curricular development, several of the courses currently included in the M.A. Program in Communication, including courses in theory construction, communication theory, experimental and survey research methods, social interaction theories and mediated communication theories, are part of the proposed Ph.D. program. Sequences of methods courses required in cognate areas outside of the proposed program are taught on a regular basis. In addition, eight courses germane to the proposed Ph.D. program have been developed and will be submitted for approval pending final approval of the proposed program (see Attachment A).

Within the financial domain, we will seek to augment extant avenues of funding for graduate students and identify and pursue new funding sources. This effort will involve continued expansion of the number of teaching assistantships, as has been done in recent years, and identifying and pursuing new funding sources. These new sources may involve research grants and private benefactors.

Finally, in terms of outreach we recognize the necessity of doing all that is necessary to attract students to apply for admission. We have employed multiple communication channels, including the Internet, to publicize our M.A. program with significant results; approximately one-third of those who have applied for the M.A. program have been from East Asian countries. This strong international response indicates the potential for the Ph.D. program to attract a highly diverse applicant pool.
As has been the case with the M.A. program, we anticipate that the Ph.D. program will very quickly attain a high level of domestic and international visibility. During its first year, the program will probably enroll 3-4 students; similar numbers of students will be added in ensuing years. When it is fully operational the program will enroll approximately 10-15 students at any given point in time.

4. Relation of Program to Existing Programs and to the Campus Plan

The program’s two major interest areas intersect with those represented in other Ph.D. programs. Most of these occur within the Division of Social Sciences in the College of Letters and Science. The Ph.D. program most similar to the one we propose is the Ph.D. in psychology; both programs are essentially quantitative in nature, and there is some theoretical and methodological overlap between the two, providing opportunities for collaboration and cross-training. This is particularly true in the areas of cognition and perception and social psychology.

Other Ph.D. programs in the Division of Social Sciences, though less closely related, offer courses which are likely to be of interest to some Communication Ph.D. students. Interest is likely to center on courses in Political Science, but may also extend occasionally to courses taught in Linguistics, Anthropology, and Sociology. In spite of these areas of overlap or intersection, examination of recent course schedules indicates that there are no graduate courses in communication theory or research presently being offered in any of the above-named departments.

Communication Ph.D. students will be required to complete a quantitative methods sequence currently offered in Psychology, Sociology or Political Science. The chairs of each of these departments have been contacted and given their assurance that there will be room to accommodate Communication Ph.D. students in their courses (see Attachment B). Because Sociology 207 may not be offered every year, students completing their quantitative methods sequence during such a year will do so in either Psychology or Political Science.

The proposed program is consonant with the mission and vision of the University of California at Davis. That vision stresses achieving “the highest level of intellectual excellence within a diverse, collaborative community.” The program will be highly selective, recruiting only young scholars with the potential for outstanding intellectual work. Further, by encouraging students to take related courses in other departments, the program will encourage collaboration across multiple disciplines. The university’s commitment to “discovery through research” is clearly reflected in the program’s emphasis on training future scholars with strong theoretical orientations rather than professional practitioners.

According to the campus’s strategic plan, UC Davis’s distinction lies in its “unparalleled breadth of superior academic and extracurricular programs.” The program we propose adds a graduate program in a distinct branch of the social sciences, namely Communication, which is presently not represented at Davis, nor in most other campuses of the University of California. Its existence adds to the breadth that makes Davis distinct in the UC system.

5. Relation to other Programs in the UC System
Only two other UC campuses offer doctoral programs in Communication; neither program is housed on a Northern California UC campus. The UCSD doctoral program is highly interdisciplinary and deals with sub-areas that do not overlap with the proposed program, namely cultural studies and the study of media institutions.

UCSB’s doctoral program bears some resemblance to the proposed program in that it offers work in the general areas of social interaction and mediated communication; consequently, there may be some opportunities for collaboration with the UCSB program. However, the UCSB program encompasses sub-areas of the discipline that the proposed program will not, including intergroup and organizational communication, and the courses that make up the proposed program will emphasize the goal-directed nature of both social interaction and mediated communication to a greater degree than do those offered by the UCSB program.

In addition, the proposed program’s secondary emphases will include somewhat more work in such areas as health and political communication than is available in the UCSB program, which has tended to emphasize human development and language. Neither UCSB nor UCSD offers a Master’s Degree in Communication except as a part of progress toward the Ph.D.

This UC Davis Ph.D. proposal was transmitted to the Department chairs of both the UCSB and UCSD communication programs for their consideration and comment. After examining and discussing the proposal, faculty members of both programs indicated strong support for the UC Davis proposal; moreover, UCSB faculty members indicated their interest in the potential for future collaboration with the UC Davis faculty and graduate students (see Attachment C).

The following table summarizes the just-adumbrated similarities and differences among the three programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed UC Davis Program</th>
<th>UCSB Program</th>
<th>UCSD Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Areas of Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>Interpersonal and Mediated Communication</td>
<td>Interpersonal, Mediated , Intergroup, &amp; Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Areas of Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Health, Political communication</td>
<td>Human development, Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of Inquiry</strong></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PhD Program administered by</strong></td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Background</strong></td>
<td>All senate faculty hold advanced degrees in Communication</td>
<td>Most regular faculty hold advanced degrees in Communication,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship to MA program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to MA program</th>
<th>Exceptional MA students may enter the PhD program</th>
<th>MA is received as part of PhD process; no independent MA program available</th>
<th>No independent MA program available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Administration of the Program

The program will be administered by the Department of Communication, which is currently administering the Communication M.A. program. By-laws of the M.A. program have recently been revised to comport with Graduate Council Guidelines.

Students accepted into the program will be assigned to a preliminary major professor by the Graduate Committee of the Department of Communication. Assignments will be made with the understanding that they are temporary and subject to change at the student’s request in consultation with the Graduate Committee and the prospective major professor.

The Graduate Advisor will act as an independent advocate for the student, providing academic advice to ensure students are properly prepared to write their qualifying papers.

### 7. Evaluation of the Program

This process will be carried out as it is for our M.A. program, by a committee appointed by the Graduate Council’s review committee. The Ph.D. Program will be reviewed 5 years after the first class of students is admitted. Thereafter, the Ph.D. and M.A. programs will be reviewed jointly based on the periodic graduate program review cycle of 7 years.

### II. PROGRAM

#### 1. Preparation for the Program

The proposed Ph.D. program is designed for students with backgrounds in communication or a cognate field, e.g., psychology, sociology or political science. Students entering the program with insufficient undergraduate background in communication theory and statistics will be required to make up these deficiencies before undertaking graduate-level course work. Entering students will work with their respective advisors to determine: (1) the adequacy of their backgrounds in communication theory and statistical methods, (2) the nature of any necessary remedial work and (3) their future course of study.

#### 2. Language Requirements
Oral and written competence in English that is sufficient to complete all degree requirements. There is no foreign language requirement.

3. **Program of Study**

   a. Specific areas of emphasis

   - Social Interaction
   - Mediated Communication

   b. Plan: Doctoral degree, Plan C (3 member dissertation committee and 3 member oral defense committee).

   c. Unit Requirements

   A total of 56 units are required for the degree. Of these, 16 units are Communication Theory courses, 20 units are Research Methodology courses, 12 units are Emphasis Elective courses, and 8 units are General Electives that may be taken from within or outside the Department of Communication. The student’s plan of study must be devised in consultation with the student’s major professor and approved by the Graduate Advisor. The plan of study should be submitted by the end of students’ first year in residence.

   d. Required and Recommended Courses, Including Teaching Requirement

   **Communication Theory Requirements (16 Units)**

   All students must complete the following communication theory courses. (Courses designated with an asterisk* are new courses developed for the Ph.D. program):

   - CMN 201 Communication Theory (4)
   - CMN 202 Theory Development in Communication Inquiry (4)
   - CMN 230 Social Interaction Theory and Research (4)
   - CMN 240 Mediated Communication Theory and Research (4)

   **Research Methods (20 Units)**

   All students must complete the following communication research methodology courses:

   - CMN 210 Experimental Methods (4)
   - CMN 211 Survey Methods (4)

   In addition, all students must complete one of the following 12-unit statistics sequences, earning no less than the grade of B in each course:

   - **Option A:**
     - POL 211 Research Methods in Political Science (4)
POL 212  Quantitative Analysis in Political Science (4)
POL 213  Quantitative Analysis in Political Science (4)

Option B:
PSC 204A  Statistical Analysis of Psychological Experiments (4)
PSC 204B  Causal Modeling of Correlational Data (4)
PSC 204C  Applied Psychometrics and Measurement Theory (4)

Option C:
SOC 206  Quantitative Analysis in Sociology (4)
SOC 207A-B  Methods of Quantitative Research (4-4)

Emphasis Electives (12 Units)

Students selecting the *Social Interaction* emphasis must complete 12 units from the following list of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMN 220</td>
<td>Persuasion and Message Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 221</td>
<td>Communication and Cognition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 222</td>
<td>Communication and Affect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 231</td>
<td>Goal-Directed Social Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 232</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 233</td>
<td>Communication in Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 234</td>
<td>Relational Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 242</td>
<td>Computer-Mediated Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 280</td>
<td>Special Topics in Social Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 282</td>
<td>Special Topics in Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students selecting the *Mediated Communication* emphasis must complete 12 units from the following list of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMN 220</td>
<td>Persuasion and Message Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 221</td>
<td>Communication and Cognition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 222</td>
<td>Communication and Affect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 241</td>
<td>Theories of Media Audiences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 242</td>
<td>Computer-Mediated Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 243</td>
<td>Media and Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 244</td>
<td>Media and Public Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CMN 245</td>
<td>Media Technologies and the Political Process</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 281</td>
<td>Special Topics in Mediated Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 282</td>
<td>Special Topics in Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Electives (8 Units)

Students must take 8 units of elective course work from within or outside the Department of Communication, selected in consultation with his or her major professor and with the approval of the Graduate Advisor (see Attachment D).

Teaching Requirement

Students are encouraged to become a teaching assistant during their period of study. All students assigned to a teaching role must complete CMN 396 (Teaching Assistant Training Practicum) (1-4 Units). Units earned in this course may not be counted toward the satisfaction of degree unit requirements.

e. Licensing and Certification

Not applicable. The proposed degree program has no licensing or certification requirement.

4. Field Examinations

There are no field examinations.

5. Qualifying Examinations

The qualifying examination will consist of a written examination followed by an oral examination. The examining committee will evaluate the written examination before the oral examination takes place; however, the student will receive an evaluation of the qualifying examination only after completing the oral examination. The oral examination will serve two purposes. First, the student will be given the opportunity to clarify any answers deemed to be problematic on the written examination. Second, the student will be required to expand answers given to the written questions.

The written examination will be conducted in two primary areas: (1) general theory and research methods, and (2) the student’s area of specialization, social interaction or mediated communication. Questions asked in the general theory and methods examination will assay the degree to which the student is conversant with significant theories across the communication discipline and the extent to which the student is able to design research to test these theories. Questions posed in the student’s area of specialization will assess the students’ command of both theory and bodies of research germane to that area.

Consistent with UC Davis Graduate Council Policy (Revised 1 February 2006), a qualifying examination committee consisting of five (5) members, at least three (3) of whom will be members of the student’s graduate program and at least one (1) of whom will be external to the student’s program, will devise the questions. Students will be given 48 hours to complete each area examination. The two area examinations should be taken during successive weeks. Before undertaking the written examinations, the student will be told the general areas in which the
questions will be asked. The oral examination will take place within one month after written examinations are completed. The same committee members who read the written examination responses will conduct the oral examination.

At the conclusion of the oral examination, the committee may elect one of three outcomes: Pass, Not Pass, or Fail. Those receiving a Pass can be admitted to candidacy. Those receiving a Not Pass will be given the opportunity to retake all or part of the examination and complete any additional requirements. An exact timetable for completing these tasks will be stipulated. If the retake is satisfactorily completed, the student can be admitted to candidacy; however, if the retake is judged to be unsatisfactory, the student will receive a Fail for the entire examination. Students will be permitted to retake the examination only once. A student who receives a Fail on either the first administration of the qualifying examination or in response to the retake as part of the Not Pass option will be awarded a terminal M.A. in Communication, provided all requirements for the M. A. degree have been satisfactorily completed.

The student must file for advancement to candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy immediately after passing the qualifying examination. Typically, students will sit for the qualifying examination at the conclusion of fall quarter of the third year, as indicated in the sample programs. Filing for candidacy should take place no later than the end of the student's third year of study. At this point, the student and his or her major professor will submit the membership of the student's dissertation committee to the Graduate Advisor for approval. Upon approval, the Graduate Advisor will forward the committee nomination to the Dean of Graduate Studies for final approval.

6. The Dissertation

A dissertation topic must be selected by the candidate and approved by the candidate's dissertation committee. In accordance with Graduate Council Policy the dissertation committee will consist of three (3) members. Under almost all circumstances, the committee’s three (3) members would have served on the qualifying examination committee. The intended Chair of the Dissertation Committee (commonly known as the Major Professor) may be a member of the QE committee but may not serve as its Chair. The dissertation must be theoretically grounded and address an issue intrinsically related to human symbolic behavior. The dissertation committee must ensure that the dissertation research is of a scope and quality that is sufficient to merit conferring the doctoral degree.

7. Final Examination

The entire dissertation committee will conduct the final oral examination. The dissertation and final examination procedures proposed here comport with those specified in the document REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGHER DEGREES (Section 520, C, 1,2,3,4, c, Plan C).

8. Special Requirements over and above Graduate Division Requirements

This is not applicable.
9. **Relationship of Master’s and Doctor’s Programs**

Once the doctoral program has been established, students seeking the terminal M.A. degree will continue to be admitted to the M.A. program. Those who successfully complete the M.A. program and who meet the Ph.D. program’s admission requirements may continue on in the Ph.D. program. For students admitted directly to the Ph.D. program, an M.A. will be a milestone as they pursue their Ph.D. There will be two exceptions to this policy, however. First, the M.A. will be a terminal degree for any student who is judged to be an unsuitable candidate for the Ph.D. on the basis of their Qualifying Examination but who has otherwise fulfilled all requirements for the M.A. degree. Second, the student who concludes for personal or professional reasons that earning the Ph.D. is no longer an appropriate objective will be granted the M.A. if all requirements for the Master’s degree have been satisfied.

The M.A. and Ph.D. programs differ substantially along two dimensions. First, students enrolled in the Ph.D. program will be required to complete significantly more quantitative methods courses than those enrolled in the M.A. program. Second, Ph.D. students will attain greater depth of knowledge in specific areas of study by taking the specialized courses proposed for the Ph.D. program. Thus, a student who completes the M.A. program and is admitted to the Ph.D. program would have to complete one of the quantitative methods sequences outlined previously and any special methods courses germane to the student’s research interests. Furthermore, as a Ph.D. candidate, the student would complete additional theory courses aimed at developing specialized knowledge within research areas of interest to the student and would represent that knowledge in a substantial dissertation.

10. **Special Preparation for Careers in Teaching**

This is not applicable.

11. **Sample Four-Year Programs**

**Emphasis Area:**

**Social Interaction**

**Year 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMN 201</td>
<td>Communication Theory (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 202</td>
<td>Theory Development in Communication Inquiry (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 230</td>
<td>Social Interaction Theory and Research (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 240</td>
<td>Mediated Communication Theory and Research (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 210</td>
<td>Experimental Methods (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN 211</td>
<td>Survey Methods (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[24 Units]

**Year 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMN 221</td>
<td>Communication and Cognition (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CMN 231  Goal-Directed Social Interaction (4)
PSC 245  Social Psychology (4)
PSC 204A  Statistical Analysis of Psychological Experiments (4)
PSC 204B  Causal Modeling of Correlational Data (4)
PSC 204C  Applied Psychometrics and Measurement Theory (4)

[24 Units]

Year 3

CMN 242  Computer-Mediated Communication (4)
CMN 280  Special Topics in Social Interaction (4)
CMN 299D  Dissertation Research

[8 Units]

Qualifying Examination taken at the conclusion of fall quarter.

Year 4

CMN 299D  Dissertation Research

Emphasis Area:

Mediated Communication

Year 1

CMN 201  Communication Theory(4)
CMN 202  Theory Development in Communication Inquiry (4)
CMN 240  Mediated Communication Theory and Research (4)
CMN 230  Social Interaction Theory and Research (4)
CMN 210  Experimental Methods (4)
CMN 211  Survey Methods (4)

[24 Units]

Year 2

CMN 220  Persuasion and Message Design (4)
CMN 244  Media and Public Opinion (4)
POL 261  Political Behavior
POL 211  Research Methods in Political Science (4)
POL 212  Quantitative Analysis in Political Science (4)
POL 213  Quantitative Analysis in Political Science (4)

[24 Units]

Year 3

CMN 245  Media Technologies and the Political Process (4)
CMN 281  Special Topics in Mediated Communication (4)
CMN 299D  Dissertation Research
Qualifying Examination taken at the conclusion of fall quarter.

Year 4

CMN 299D  Dissertation Research

12. Normative Time from Matriculation to Degree

As depicted in the sample programs, the normative time from matriculation to degree will be four (4) years. This estimate assumes that the student is full time and enters the program with no deficiencies. However, we anticipate that students who matriculate in the program with M.A. degrees in Communication or related areas may be able to complete the program in a shorter time frame, especially if they have received extensive methodological training as part of their M.A. degree.

III. PROJECTED NEED

1. Student Demand for the Program

There has been explosive growth in the number of students earning degrees in communication during the past three decades. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, the number of Bachelor’s degrees conferred in communication increased drastically from 10,324 in 1970-71 to 55,760 in 1999-2000. Considering that the total number of Bachelor’s degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions for the same period increased only by 47%, from 839,730 to 1,237,875, this more than five-fold increase bespeaks of strong student demand for communication programs. Likewise, for the same period, the number of Master’s degrees awarded in communication tripled (from 1,856 to 5,605) and that of Doctoral degrees more than doubled (from 145 to 357). Given such robust student demand, it is particularly regrettable that California is currently under-served by Research-1 doctoral programs in communication. Once the program has been approved and we are able to advertise our program, we have little doubt that we will experience a strong demand for admission to it.

Our program will have two specific areas of emphasis: social interaction and mediated communication. Those who emphasize “social interaction” will be encouraged to examine fundamental processes of human communication, namely message production and reception. On the one hand, they may wish to investigate how people produce messages to further their goals in social interactions by examining, for example, cognitive planning and the selection of interpersonal tactics and message strategies. Specifically, they might focus on how people seek and provide various forms of support (e.g., advice, emotional support) and what makes more or less effective supportive behaviors. They may also study how people use various communicative devices to initiate, maintain, escalate, and terminate their relationships.
On the other hand, students may focus on the message reception and study how individuals detect each other’s goals and the consequences that follow from such inferences. They may also investigate the factors that affect the way people process information; how this processing may be biased; and how such biased processing moderates social influence attempts.

The second area of emphasis will be “mediated communication.” One area of scholarly interest within this track is the psychological effects of media messages on health-related outcomes. For example, students may choose to examine how different types of sexual content on television influence attitudes toward risky sexual behavior and how media portrayals of ideal body types influence various precursors of eating disorders. At the same time, students may wish to specialize in the design and evaluation of public health campaigns, focusing on how to get information about important public health issues to consumers and to health care providers more effectively and how to persuade the at-risk population to engage in healthier activities.

Political communication is another area students may pursue with the “mediated communication” emphasis. They may wish to investigate the influence of mediated information on public opinion and political decision-making and the role that mass media, particularly the Internet, play in encouraging engagement in civic and political life. Related research topics include media framing and cueing, agenda-setting and priming effects of news media, the potential for news media and communication technologies to create social capital and foster civic engagement.

A few other examples of projects that might be developed by Ph.D. students within this track entail social and psychological effects of communication technologies. For instance, students may wish to explore how communication technologies influence individuals’ social networks, consumer behavior, and educational attainment. Also, they may investigate how the restrictions of text-based computer-mediated communication alter the way people make inferences about interaction partners, form group identity, and react to group norms, as compared to traditional, non-mediated interpersonal communication.

Current UCD faculty members whose research lies in the areas discussed above have had numerous inquiries over the years about prospects for doing doctoral work related to these research foci at UC Davis.

2. Opportunities for Placement of Graduates

Individuals who earn a doctoral degree in communication have career opportunities in both academic and non-academic settings. The demand for academic job candidates with doctoral degrees in communication outweighs the supply. For academic jobs, both the National Communication Association (NCA) and the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) provide job listings in the field of communication. Eadie (2005) analyzed the teaching positions advertised in NCA’s Spectra (monthly newsletter) advertisements, NCA’s CRTNET (a daily e-mail listserv) news posts, and advertisements listed by AEJMC.

---

According to Eadie, 1379 open faculty positions in communication were posted between July 2002 and November 2004, or an average of 591.9 positions per year. The number of academic positions posted outweighed the number of communication doctorates earned per year. The Doctoral Data Project, a study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, provides data on the number of doctoral degrees awarded in communication related fields (see http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/sed-2003.pdf). Specifically, 566 doctoral degrees in communication were granted in the 2002-2003 academic year. Additionally, most of the advertised academic positions were at the rank of assistant professor (64.5%) or were open rank/unspecified (11.5%).

Inspection of the percentage of NCA and AEJMC job postings categorized by specialization area reveals that some communication specializations are in higher demand than others. Our program’s specialization areas of social interaction and mediated communication overlap with the more frequently advertised teaching specializations.

Several specializations fit in the domain of social interaction including general communication, interpersonal, strategic communication, and health communication. Of the positions advertised for the July 2002 to November 2004 time period, a total of 23.3% of the postings fell under the larger category of social interaction. The specialization area of mediated communication comprised another 16.5% of the advertised positions. Given the strong demand for faculty with a specialization in either social interaction or mediated communication (39.8% of postings), graduates from our program will be eligible for a large percentage of academic positions in the field of communication.

Our program will endeavor to produce competence in social scientific research methods and therefore will prepare graduates who are able to thrive in either academic or non-academic careers. Of those individuals who earn doctorates in communication but opt for a career outside of academe, the employment options are numerous. Examples of non-academic career opportunities include opinion polling research, computer interface usability research, marketing research, political consulting, audience research, health campaign design, and consumer analysis.

3. Importance to the Discipline

The proposed doctoral program would have an important impact on the communication discipline in at least two discernable ways. First, the program will address the high demand for individuals with communication doctorates. The number of academic jobs available in communication exceeds the number of doctoral degrees granted. With nearly 600 academic jobs available each year, the communication discipline clearly is growing. According to the National Communication Association (NCA), however, only 74 U.S. universities grant doctoral degrees in communication (as of 2005), and only eight of these universities reside in states along the West Coast, making the demand particularly high in that region. Moreover, only a few of these eight programs are at R1 institutions and even fewer highlight social interaction and mediated communication. The addition of the proposed program would address the demand for doctorates in the communication discipline, particularly from R1 institutions on the West Coast.
A second way in which the proposed program will contribute to the communication discipline is to encourage students to develop communication theories that focus on fundamental processes subserving communication across multiple contexts. Extant doctoral programs in the communication discipline tend to foreground communicative contexts over fundamental processes by promoting depth in a small set of contextually-defined communicative domains. The proposed program will add to the discipline by approaching theory development from a perspective that strongly emphasizes the fundamental processes of communication that span specific contexts. That is, students will be encouraged to seek to understand and explain basic mechanisms that animate communicative activity across a wide range of contexts. Giving students the conceptual and methodological means to study and understand fundamental processes that transcend communicative contexts would allow the program to produce scholars who will make important contributions to the discipline.

4. Ways in which the Program will Meet the Needs of Society

Due to communication’s ubiquitous nature, the study of communication has the potential to make important contributions to addressing social issues and concerns. Communication is an indispensable element in activities such as information sharing, social organization, and adaptation. Furthermore, basic societal institutions such as commerce, health care, politics and the media all rely on the sharing of relevant information.

Given that the activities that are essential for the functioning, and even betterment of society, all depend on the basic process of communication, communication scholarship has the potential to generate research that facilitates understanding and subsequent efforts to promote positive social change. Because communication is a central process, a theoretically-based approach to studying communication has the potential to generate knowledge that is of great public value. Our program is designed to produce scholars that have a theoretically-based understanding of the communication process. How our graduates will ultimately bridge the gap between theory and action depends on whether they pursue a career in academe or a research career in the public or private sector. Regardless of the route our graduates follow, the training they receive in our program will facilitate their efforts to generate high quality, theoretically-driven research.

Graduates who opt to employ their social scientific training in an applied setting, such as working as a research consultant for the government or a non-profit organization, can apply their knowledge of basic communicative processes to address the needs and concerns of their employer. For example, if employed by the consulting firm IFC, a graduate from our program could not only advise the government agency Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) on how more effectively to run a risk communication campaign about lead poisoning but the graduate could also orchestrate efforts to evaluate the campaign’s success. On the other hand, graduates who pursue academic careers will generate research that continues to further what is known about the basic processes underlying communication. This theoretical knowledge will be disseminated to future professionals (i.e., our undergraduates), current professionals, and inform the research endeavors of other scholars conducting related lines of research. Ultimately, communication scholarship has the potential to inform decision making in countless contexts, including the construction and implementation of public policy, parents navigating the unexpected outcomes
associated with how technological advances influence their children, and how employees choose to communicate with their superiors.

A theoretically-oriented approach to understanding communication processes will allow for generation of informed suggestions for bettering social policy, organizational structure, health care delivery and partnerships, media consumption and production, and social interaction. For example, research on the impact of violent and sexual media content on the behaviors of children and adolescents has the potential to inform public policy decisions and individuals’ child-rearing practices. Additionally, given the explosion of portable communication devices (e.g., cell phones, PDAs with Internet capabilities) and Internet based methods of interacting (e.g., blogs, chat rooms, email), knowledge of how the process of communication differs depending on the channel can not only inform industry but also individuals. Research in this area is beneficial to society because the speed at which new technologies are introduced into the marketplace far exceeds the understanding of how these innovations will affect society’s fabric. A theoretically-based understanding of technology’s role in the communication process can suggest strategies for ameliorating unintended negative consequences of technological innovations. Also, understanding of the communicative process underlying health care provider-consumer relations and health information dissemination can improve the effectiveness of health care services.

5. Relationship of Program to Professional Interests of the Faculty

As is evident by examination of the faculty’s CVs (see Attachment E), both the Department of Communication faculty and the faculty affiliated with the program have active and continuing research programs and teach courses directly germane to the social interaction and mediated communication foci of the proposed program.

6. Program Differentiation from other UC and non-UC programs in CA

There are no Ph.D. programs in northern California that resemble the one we propose, but there are two in southern California -- USC’s and UCSB’s. Both of these feature social interaction and mediated communication, as will ours. UCSB’s program has several sub-areas that are not found in the proposed program (e.g., intergroup communication, organizational communication, group communication, globalization), as does USC’s (e.g., rhetoric, organizational communication, and information & society). We may or may not add some of these sub-areas as we expand.

Other UC communication Ph.D. programs bear virtually no resemblance to the one we are proposing. UCSD offers a Ph.D. in communication featuring the sub-areas of social force, communication as culture, and information processing. Nearly all of their 20 or so faculty hold degrees in such disciplines as philosophy, anthropology, sociology, psychology, American studies, journalism, political science, city planning, visual studies, linguistics, and education. UC Berkeley offers a Ph.D. in rhetoric, but theirs is a humanities program concerned with classical and ancient rhetoric, philosophy, and critical theory.

Stanford offers a Ph.D. centered in journalism and mass media but no social interaction emphasis.
In short, at present the only Ph.D. programs in California with emphases similar to our proposal are UCSB and USC. In Northern California, there is none.

IV. ACADEMIC STAFF

The following individuals are members of the current Graduate faculty in Communication:

Robert A. Bell (Professor), Charles R. Berger (Professor), Jaecho Cho (Assistant Professor), Bo Feng (Assistant Professor), Mikayla Hughes (Assistant Professor), Hyunseo Hwang (Assistant Professor), Michael T. Motley (Professor), Nicholas Palomares (Assistant Professor), Laramie Taylor (Assistant Professor), Narine Yegiyan (Assistant Professor), Rina Alacaly (Emeritus, Communication), Albert A. Harrison (Professor of Psychology), Robert Huckfelt (Professor of Political Science), Joel T. Johnson (Professor of Psychology).

V. COURSES

Several of the courses needed for the proposed Ph.D. program are already in place, either in Communication or, for a number of electives, in other departments. It is anticipated that none of the courses would need to be taught more than once a year. Some courses in each area of concentration could be offered in alternate years, depending upon students’ specific interests. This would make it possible to staff the courses without subtracting courses from other areas of the curriculum.

VI. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS (FIRST FIVE YEARS)

1. Faculty FTE: The Communication Faculty, with the support of some of the affiliated faculty, will be able to offer the program upon its approval. As this proposal is moving forward, we anticipate increasing the Department of Communication faculty by one (1) FTE during 2008-09 and by at least one more over the next two years. Other faculty needs will arise during the next five years, however, we do not anticipate that these needs will be related to our ability to offer the program as described in this proposal. We have assurance from our Dean that we will be able to recruit for these faculty members (See Dean’s letter in Attachment F).

Additional Faculty FTE needs

   New Communication Technologies: Although we have two faculty members with interests in the effects of traditional mass media, we need to augment the sole faculty member whose research is focused on the effects of new communication technologies (computer-mediated communication, Internet, mobile telephones).

   Social Interaction: We anticipate that within the next five years, at least one individual whose research interests represent this area of inquiry will retire.

   Mediated Communication: We see need for additional future growth in this area.
2. Library Acquisitions: No additional resource requirements anticipated  
3. Computing Costs: No special costs  
4. Equipment: No special costs  
5. Space and other Capital Facilities: Current plans for the move to Kerr Hall in 2008 or 2009 include adequate laboratory space for a Department of Communication faculty that is three FTE larger than the current faculty.  
6. Other Operating Costs: There are no other operating costs.  
7. Staff Support: At the present time, a full-time staff person, dedicated to administering graduate programs within the Social Sciences Administrative unit, is responsible for administering the Department’s M.A. program. This individual would be able to also administer the Ph.D. program.

VII. GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT

At present the department offers eight (8) teaching assistantships in addition to block grant funds. We are currently seeking to increase this number to nine (9) beginning in fall quarter 2008. Currently, all of these teaching assistantships are dedicated to lower division courses. If the undergraduate enrollment in lower division grows, we will seek additional Teaching Assistantships. We also intend to request additional teaching assistantships for some of our upper division courses. These resources will become an absolute necessity if writing-intensive instruction within the major, which has been proposed in the revised general education requirements, is implemented. Occasionally there will be less certain sources of support such as teaching assistantships in other departments, and research assistantships via extramural funding. Our intention is to expand the number of Teaching Assistantships to match the projected number of students in the program once it is fully operational (10-15 students).

We expect the normative time for this program to be four (4) years. Assuming that there will be 12 students (range 10-15), we plan to support them as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Available TAships</th>
<th>Other Sources: Block Grants + Fellowships + Grant Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because students will be supported on Teaching Assistantships for three (3) years, in the program’s fourth year, three (3) Teaching Assistantships will become available for entering students. As the number of Teaching Assistantships increases beyond nine (9), more students can be admitted to the program. As indicated previously, the Department already has eight (8) Teaching Assistantships available and will expand this number to nine (9) next year.

**VIII. CHANGES IN SENATE REGULATIONS:** No Senate regulations need to be changed.
New Course Descriptions and Potential Instructors

**CMN 222: Communication and Affect (Professor Hughes)**

Explores how affect is intertwined with the process of communication. Differing approaches to conceptualizing affect, mood, and emotion will be examined. Theory and research documenting the ways in which the experience of affect can impact the processing of social information will be presented. Also, how the experience of emotion can impact goal selection, message production, and interpersonal dynamics will be addressed. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 232: Language and Communication (Professor Palomares)**

Covers theory, concepts, and research regarding language use in communication. Topics may include conversation analysis, turn-taking, conversational coherence and topics, maxims, speech acts and intentionality, face management and politeness, linguistic variation/styles, common ground and referential communication, linguistic category model, power in language, linguistic determinism and relativity, language and gender, language and influence, language acquisition, language attitudes and effects. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 233: Communication in Medicine (Professor Bell)**

Research, discussion and writing on a selected topic related to communication in health care contexts. Potential topics include mutual influence in the patient-physician relationship, communication and health care disparities, physician and patient communication styles, cultural influences on patient-provider interaction, and communication strategies for motivating patient adherence to treatment. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 234: Relational Communication (Professor Feng)**

Seminar will study variables that operate upon, or result from, various communication variables and messages within close relationships – family, friendship, romantic, and perhaps others. While the topical outline will vary somewhat by instructor, a typical version might include research on conflict within relationships, relational satisfaction, support messages, relationship stages, and male-female friendship. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 241: Theories of Media Audiences (Professor Taylor)**

Explores theories of why and how audiences select and use specific media channels and content. Course readings will focus on both trait- and state-level factors in the selection of media content including a broad range of needs (e.g. the need for identity development, need for information).
and wants (e.g. entertainment, alleviation of boredom) that drive media choices. In addition, the course will also interrogate whether these needs and wants are fulfilled by the selected media content. In addition, we will explore how audiences interact with the content they select. Course readings and discussion will include both theoretical articles and empirical articles that have bearing on these issues. (4 units)

**CMN 243: Media and Health (Professor Taylor)**

Research, discussion and writing on a selected topic related to how the media represent and affect the public’s health through news, entertainment and advertising. Possible topics include media effects on adolescent sexual behavior; body image, eating disorders, and obesity; drug, alcohol and tobacco use; attitudes toward mental illness; and interpersonal violence. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 244: Media and Public Opinion (Professor Cho)**

Examines theory and research on the ways public opinion is formed and shaped by mass communication. Course will focus on (a) political audiences (motivational processes underlying media use, informed citizen vs. cognitive miser, etc.), (b) political messages (mass media and elections, agenda-building, negativism in mass media, news frames, etc.), and (c) the effects of media on public opinion (cognitive complexity, social and political judgment, evaluations of political actors, etc.). (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)

**CMN 245: Media Technologies and the Political Process (Professor Hwang)**

Examines the influences of communication technologies (mass media, the Internet, etc.) on democratic citizenship. Topics covered will include media influences on political learning and deliberation, political socialization, social capital, and political mobilization. For each of these topic areas, the interrelationship between media and interpersonal discussion among citizens will be also discussed. (4 units; course may be repeated when topics vary.)
Attachment B

Assurances of Accommodation in Political Science, Psychology and Sociology Methods Sequences
Hi Charles,

First, your students are certainly welcome in the seminar. The sequence has gone through some recent changes. 210 is now a research design course. 211 through 213 is a stats sequence. 210 and 211 are taught in the fall, 212 in the winter, and 213 in the spring.

We also conduct a math boot camp in the summer to get students ready. Before students enroll in the sequence, they should talk to the grad advisor. Some students may be best served by opting out of 211. Others may not be prepared for what comes. All four courses are basically required of all our students.

Second, I would be happy to serve has a mentor for Jae Ho Cho. Could you let me know the expectations for mentors?

I hope all is going well. Good luck with the proposal!

Best,
Bob

On Wed, 23 Aug 2006. Charles Berger wrote:

> Dear Professor Huckfeldt:
> 
> Request #1: The Department of Communication is in the process of developing a proposal for a Ph.D. program in Communication. The program will be quantitatively oriented.
> 
> As part of our program, we would like to have some of our students enroll in one or more of the following offerings in your Department, depending upon their methodological interests: POL 211, POL 212 and/or POL 213.
> 
> We anticipate that because the Ph.D. program will not be large, only a handful of Communication students (perhaps 3 to 5) would enroll in these classes each year. Moreover, some of our students may have interests in areas more akin to those represented in Psychology and might elect to enroll in the Psychology methods sequence, thus reducing these projected numbers.
> 
> Is there any chance that our students could be accommodated in these classes, provided, of course, that they have satisfied the prerequisites for them?
> 
> For purposes of our proposal, the Graduate Council needs to know the typical enrollments in these classes and the number of Communication
Our typical incoming class in the Psychology graduate program is about 10-14 students per year. Because our first-year statistics courses (PSC 204A, 204B, 204C, and 204D) are typically taught in classrooms that hold at least 24 students, our department should be able to accommodate the additional 2-5 students you plan to admit each year into the Communication graduate program.

Keith Widaman
Professor and Chair
Department of Psychology

-----Original Message-----
From: Charles Berger [mailto:crberger@ucdavis.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2006 4:46 PM
To: kfwidaman@ucdavis.edu
Subject: A Request

Dear Professor Widaman:

The Department of Communication is in the process of developing a proposal for a Ph.D. program in Communication. The program will be quantitatively oriented.

As part of our program, we would like to have some of our students enroll in one or more of the following offerings in your Department, depending upon their methodological interests: PSC 204A, PSC 204B, and/or PSC 204C.

We anticipate that because the Ph.D. program will not be large, only a handful of Communication students (perhaps 3 to 5) would enroll in these classes each year. Moreover, some of our students may have interests in political communication and might elect to enroll in the Political Science methods sequence, thus reducing these projected numbers.

Is there any chance that our students could be accommodated in these classes, provided, of course, that they have satisfied the prerequisites for them?

For purposes of our proposal, the Graduate Council needs to know the typical enrollments in these classes and the number of Communication students that might be able to enroll in them.

If you can grant our request, could you please do so in a short memo that could be attached to our Ph.D. proposal?

If you require any further information or clarification, please contact me at 530-757-7133.
Dear Charles, thanks for this inquiry. Your new program sounds quite interesting. The sociology department should be able to accommodate the methodological training needs for students in your new program. We have greater flexibility with Sociology 206 than we do with Sociology 207, however. Here is the relevant information. Please consider this a memo of approval for your request.

Sociology 206 typically has the entering cohort of students (0-12) plus a few graduate students from other programs. Ideally we'd like to have 15 or fewer in the seminar, given the instructor/TA workload and the size of the Mayhew room (the room where 206 usually is taught). But in the past we have had close to 20 students so if you are admitting 3-5 per year, I don't think it will be a problem for them to get into 206.

Sociology 207 AB can have as few as 5 students and as many as 15 students. When it is offered we should not have any trouble accommodating your students. The limitation is that we do not offer 207 annually although we strive to do so. Our ability to offer it depends on whether we have a faculty person who can teach it in any given year. We have ample regular faculty who CAN teach it but it does not always work out to find someone who WILL teach it in any given year.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Best,
Vicki Smith
Professor and Chair, Sociology

Charles Berger wrote:
> Dear Professor Smith:
> >
> > The Department of Communication is in the process of developing a proposal
> > for a Ph.D. program in Communication. The program will be quantitatively
> > oriented.
> >
> > As part of our program, we would like to have some of our students enroll
> > in one or more of the following offerings in your Department, depending
> > upon their methodological interests: SOC 206, SOC 207A-B.
> >
> > We anticipate that because the Ph.D. program will not be large, only a
> > handful of Communication students (perhaps 3 to 5) would enroll in these
> > classes each year. Moreover, some of our students may have interests in
> > political communication and might elect to enroll in the Political Science
> > methods sequence, thus reducing these projected numbers.
> >
> > Is there any chance that our students could be accommodated in these
> > classes, provided, of course, that they have satisfied the prerequisites
> > for them?
> >
> > For purposes of our proposal, the Graduate Council needs to know the
> > typical enrollments in these classes and the number of Communication
> > students that might be able to enroll in them.
Attachment C

UCSB and UCSD Letters of Support for the Program
3 May 2007

Professor Charles Berger,
Chair
Department of Communication
One Shields Avenue
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616

Dear Professor Berger

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposal for the development of a Ph.D. program within the Department of Communication at the University of California, Davis. We have carefully reviewed each of the elements of the proposal and the accompanying support materials. At the department meeting of 2 May 2007 ladder faculty voted unanimously to endorse for the program. We wish you every success in the implementation of the program and look forward to many years of intellectual collaboration.

All the best

Michael Stohl
Professor and Chair
May 3, 2007

Charles Berger, Professor and Chair
Dept. of Communication
University of California
Davis

Dear Prof. Berger;

The Department of Communication at UCSD is happy to support the proposal for a Ph.D. program in Communication at U.C. Davis. Communication is a growing field, demand for new Ph.D.'s is strong, and the significance of Communication scholarship in the wider academic landscape continues to grow. It makes sense to have more Communication Ph.D. programs in the U.C. system, and Davis is clearly well-positioned to begin one. The proposal seems well-crafted.

The Davis program is clearly very different from our own, and would have little impact on our program. I would characterize the distinction a little bit differently than the way it is presented in the Davis proposal. It isn't so much a difference between a program based on empirical research and a "critical-humanistic" one. We all do empirical research at UCSD--aside from those who are media production faculty. That research just isn't primarily based on experimental or survey methods, but on historical, ethnographic, comparative, semiotic and other forms of methodology. In any case there would be a clear division of labor between our programs, and we would draw on different pools of graduate applicants.

Daniel C. Hallin

[Signature]

Professor and Chair
### Attachment D

Courses for areas of emphasis and suggested electives for the Ph.D. degree in Communication

#### Area of Emphasis

1. **Social Interaction**

   - CMN 220  Persuasion and Message Design
   - CMN 221  Communication and Cognition
   - CMN 222  Communication and Affect
   - CMN 230  Social Interaction Theory and Research
   - CMN 231  Goal-Directed Social Interaction
   - CMN 232  Language and Communication
   - CMN 233  Communication in Medicine
   - CMN 234  Relational Communication
   - CMN 280  Special Topics in Social Interaction
   - CMN 282  Special Topics in Methods

   Elective courses appropriate for this area of emphasis

   - PSC 204A  Statistical Analysis of Psychological Experiments
   - PSC 204B  Causal Modeling of Correlational Data
   - PSC 204C  Applied Psychometrics and Measurement Theory
   - PSC 205C  Structural Equation Modeling
   - PSC 205D  Multilevel Models
   - PSC 230  Cognitive Psychology
   - PSC 245  Social Psychology
   - PSC 263  Topics in Cognitive Psychology
   - PSC 264  Topics in Psycholinguistics

2. **Mediated Communication**

   - CMN 220  Persuasion and Message Design
   - CMN 221  Communication and Cognition
   - CMN 222  Communication and Affect
   - CMN 240  Mediated Communication Theory and Research
   - CMN 241  Theories of Media Audiences
   - CMN 242  Computer-Mediated Communication
   - CMN 243  Media and Health
   - CMN 244  Media and Public Opinion
   - CMN 245  Media Technologies and the Political Process
   - CMN 281  Special Topics in Mediated Communication
   - CMN 282  Special Topics in Methods

   Elective courses appropriate for this area of emphasis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POL 211</td>
<td>Research Methods in Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL 212</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis in Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL 213</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis in Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL 215</td>
<td>Introduction to Modeling Political Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL 261</td>
<td>Political Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL 283</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 206</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis in Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 207A-B</td>
<td>Methods of Quantitative Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 205C</td>
<td>Structural Equation Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 205D</td>
<td>Multilevel Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 212A</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology: Cognitive and Perceptual Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 212B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology: Social, Emotional, and Personality Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 230</td>
<td>Cognitive Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 263</td>
<td>Topics in Cognitive Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment F

Division of Social Sciences Dean’s Letter of Support

April 27, 2007

SHRINI K. UPADHYAYA
Graduate Council Chair

Dear Professor Upadhyaya:

I am writing in support of the Ph.D. proposal in Communication. The Department has progressed nicely in the last decade, with excellent hires and a dedicated faculty. They are now at the stage to support a high-quality Ph.D. program. I am very supportive of this program and believe it would enrich the graduate offerings of the Davis campus.

The program fits in nicely with our other social science areas within the Division of Social Sciences including social psychology and political communications. Its empirical and quantitative emphasis also matches our core strengths in the division. In terms of staffing the program, we have two hires planned for next year and an additional hire is allocated for the near future, in time for the offering of the Ph.D.

Overall, this is a strong proposal and I am pleased to endorse it.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Sheffrin, Dean
Division of Social Sciences

+Most important
*Items attached
March 15, 2008

To: Dean Steven Sheffrin
FR: Chia-ning Chang, Director, East Asian Studies
RE: East Asian Studies: Academic Planning

Report on East Asian Studies

Among interdisciplinary/inter-departmental programs at UC Davis, East Asian Studies (EAS) has a rather unique position of being a unit within the Division of Social Science while its faculty affiliates have formal FTE appointments within departments and units in both HArCS (primarily in East Asian Languages and Cultures [EALC], Comparative Literature and Religious Studies) as well as in the Division of Social Science (History, Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, etc.) Likewise, its graduate student constituency is dispersed widely across the campus within various divisional units, with its largest component in History, Art History, Comparative Literature, and Anthropology. Not having vested FTEs of its own, the mandate of EAS is to operate as an umbrella organization bringing together and thereby galvanizing research interests and serving the diverse faculty needs in the fields of East Asian society, politics, history, literature, and culture.

For many years, one of the defining qualities of EAS in Davis has been its outstanding faculty in both Chinese and Japanese studies, many of whom are distinguished senior scholars with important publications in English as well as in other Asian languages and whose reputations are recognized not only in this country but also widely in China, Hong Kong, and Japan, as the case may be. Some have published prize-winning books at various stages of their career, sat on governing or editorial boards of major journals in their fields, served important positions within the Asian studies community in the U.S., and received prestigious grants such as those from the Fulbright Foundation, American Council of Learned Society, the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation, and the Japan Foundation. Despite the national and international prominence of many of our scholars and continuing interest in East Asian studies among our students, however, EAS faces important and, in some areas, serious challenges in the next decade. It will require a conscientious renewal of our sense of purpose and strong, sustainable institutional will and support to guide its development into the future.

One of our most urgent tasks is to fill conspicuous gaps in major areas of Chinese and Japanese studies, positions that have not been filled for many years despite their critical needs. For example, the department of East Asian Languages and Cultures has made it known to the administration of its desire for an additional hire in Ming-Qing literature/culture, a China position. Another
priority for the same department is a position in Japanese in post-1945 literature, or the literary/cultural history of the Edo period (1600-1868). The vision statement drafted by my predecessor Li Zhang in December 2004 indicated a need for a political scientist in the China field, to be housed in the Department of Political Science. The EAS faculty have also for a number of years spoken in strong favor to fill a long-vacant position in Japanese art history to augment existing strength in Asian art. We project these positions to be of the highest priority in the next 5 years, and when filled, would enable us to sustain our growth and enhance our increasing prominence as a center of East Asian studies on the West coast.

One feature of EAS that requires serious attention is clearly the disproportionate number of specialists among its Chinese and Japanese faculty. There are only 7 tenured or tenured-track Japanologists, while all the rest of our EAS faculty affiliates are China scholars—their number is more than 15—in a broad variety of disciplines and research areas. Granting that this trend is true not only in Davis but also in many other comparable institutions in the U.S., this preponderance of the Chinese faculty over Japanese is still a matter of concern. Such a pronounced imbalance in their respective strengths has created inequities in terms of funding appropriations, in their respective visibility on this campus and beyond, and in their relative ability to attract students. To address this issue, one natural solution is for the university to make a special effort to hire more Japanese faculty members. As it stands today, three especially glaring gaps in the Japan area lie in contemporary and Edo period literature/visual culture, Japanese art history, and a specialist in sociology, a situation that has existed for some two decades.

An additional area in East Asian Studies that the university should explore in the not-too-distant future is Korean studies. There are about 72 million speakers of Korean language; there are 350,000 Korean speakers in California alone. The demand for Korean language on this campus in particular has often been a top priority in student surveys. The intellectual community at UC Davis currently consists of at least two faculty members who are actively engaged in Korean studies. Kyu Huyn Kim (History) has an active research agenda on Korean colonial history under Japanese imperialism in the early twentieth century and modern Korean film. Richard Kim in Asian American Studies has research interests in Asian American history, Korean American Studies, U.S. immigration history, race and ethnicity, colonialism and nationalism, globalization, transnationalism, diaspora, and is currently working on a book manuscript on Korean immigrant nationalism and diasporic politics as well as a volume on Asian Americans in rural America. There may be other faculty members in EALC and at other units who share an interest in Korean studies, even although Korea may not be the focus of their current intellectual endeavors.

Meanwhile, EAS must need to continue to operate effectively in order to increase our regional and national visibility and to build connections with scholars and
institutions from other parts of the US and the world. Bringing prominent scholars to speak at our EAS Speakers’ Series and supporting workshops, film screenings, and other East-Asian-related symposia have been the primary instruments of such scholarly interactions, but other avenues have to be explored. Under the auspices of EAS and other department units, faculty exchange with other universities both within and outside the US, along with the institution of a Resident Scholar Program, are initiatives we need to seriously investigate in the coming years.

In the next five years, EAS will need to continue to attract undergraduate majors into our program through active campus recruitment initiatives, information-sharing opportunities with potential students, and continuing publicity of our program in classes. Graduate students in EAS must continue to have adequate resources and institutional support to interact more fully with faculty through various EAS initiatives. The EAS Undergraduate and Graduate Fellowship Program must continue to be an important instrument toward accomplishing this goal.
Academic Plan, 2009-14

Department of Economics

University of California, Davis

March 18 2008
This plan covers the hiring priorities of the department for the years 2009-14 under the scenario of no net growth in FTE. The current baseline in the department is 33 FTE: 32 faculty in place, and one committed recruitment.

1. Characterizing the Department

One way to characterize the department is by the nine graduate fields currently offered (with the numbers of faculty in place or committed in hiring by their primarily affiliation in brackets):

1. Econometrics (4)
2. Economic History (3)
3. Macroeconomics (6)
4. Industrial Organization (3)\(^1\)
5. International Economics (5)
6. Labor Economics (3)
7. Public Economics (3)
8. Microeconomic Theory (5)

This makes 32 faculty, plus one open position that is not currently assigned to a field.

Ideally we would have at least three faculty in each field, but since some faculty span multiple fields there is some hiring flexibility. Macroeconomics overlaps with the International and Economic History fields. Empirical Public Economics and Labor Economics also have considerable overlap in methods, and the faculty in these areas are able to cross between them easily (and indeed one graduate course is common to both fields). The Department regards these overlapping, complementary intellectual interests as a substantial strength, and seeks to enhance them in its hiring.

2. Faculty Needs

A. Undergraduate Instruction.

The Department has a very heavy undergraduate teaching load by university standards.

We have 900 majors, the fourth most popular major on campus, with 6% of all degrees granted to students majoring in Economics. In addition we provide large introductory courses for students in the Managerial Economics and International Relations major, and for the GE curriculum. We further supply upper division courses for both Managerial Economics and the popular International Studies major. Undergraduate demand

\(^1\) The Transportation Economics position which is most closely related to IO is included here.
for our classes continues to outstrip the ability of the Senate faculty to provide the instruction, particularly with the recent expansion of our graduate program. We have increasingly turned to non-Senate faculty.

As a result in 2007-08, the Department is filling 70 courses, counting the summer sessions also, with non-Senate faculty. This is the case even though Student Credit Hours per Senate Faculty member in economics in 2007-8 is 889, above the average for the Division of Social Sciences in 2006-7 of 786, and well above the average for the university as a whole. At a standard four-course load, non-senate faculty are equivalent to 17.5 FTE. Table 1 breaks down the unstaffed courses by broad areas. In terms of the undergraduate curriculum there are needs in almost all areas.

B. GRADUATE INSTRUCTION.

Table 2 provides information on the demands for supervision of graduate Ph.D. theses by area. It thus provides some information about demand for faculty by area compared with the numbers of FTE primarily associated with those areas. Some care must be taken in interpreting the table. The same faculty supervise students in different areas (classification is by the topic of the student thesis), even though they do not identify primarily with those areas – that is, they do not or are unlikely to teach in graduate field courses in those areas. Some demand reflects the qualities of particular individuals rather than the popularity of fields.

One thing that stands out is the increase in numbers of graduate students writing theses within the past 5 years. For the years before 2004-5 the average numbers of theses completed within economics per year averaged 6. Since then that average has risen to more than 10 per year, in line with an expansion of the numbers of students in the graduate program in the late 1990s.

Compared with current and committed hires the need for further faculty for graduate instruction is clearly greatest in International.

C. DEVELOPMENT FROM STRENGTH.

The Department has considerable breadth of talent across fields and members in all fields have achieved significant recognition. Overall the department ranks well compared to UC-Davis as a whole in comparisons of research universities. A recent ranking based on journal articles, for example, placed the economics faculty at Davis as #30 in the US in average productivity in 1994-2003 (and #38 in the world). In comparison UC-Irvine ranked #51 in the US, UC-Santa Barbara #54, UC-Santa Cruz #55, and UC-Riverside #79.

The two areas with the greatest outside recognition are International Economics and Economic History. International Economics at Davis is a contender for being one of the top 15 programs (it has been ranked as high as 14 in the US News and World Report rankings.

2 http://www.econphd.net/rank/irallec.htm
of graduate programs). The 2004 article rankings shows Davis as #13 in the world in terms of total International Trade article production.

Robert Whaples (Journal of Economic History, June 2002) shows our department as second to Harvard in overall publication in the main journals in economic history and as having eclipsed Harvard in recent publications. The same 2004 rankings of journal publication referred to above shows Davis as #4 in the world in terms of total Economic History article production, after Harvard, MIT, and Stanford.

There are arguments for hiring in areas of strength such as these. Assistant Professors of higher quality can be more readily attracted where the department has a strong reputation among its established faculty.

4. Recruiting Priorities – New Hires

In allocating the one committed hire, and in replacing faculty who retire who are not core members of the eight graduate fields, the faculty has established the following set of priorities.

Hiring should proceed in order in terms of the following list:

1) International Economics
1) Macroeconomics
3) Industrial Organization
4) Public Finance

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THIS RANKING

INTERNATIONAL. The position is strongly justified by teaching needs at both the graduate and undergraduate level, by the popularity of the field for Ph.D. candidates, and by the fact that it is one of the strengths of the Department. The three International courses at the undergraduate level (ECN 160A, 160B, and 162) all serve a large number of IR majors, as well as being very popular within the Economics major.

MACROECONOMICS. This position is justified by a chronic shortage of faculty for both graduate and undergraduate teaching (Both Introductory and Intermediate Macroeconomics is required for Economics, Managerial Economics and some IR majors), and by its popularity as an area of Ph.D. research. Any one subspecialty within this complex would alleviate the teaching needs, and there are substantial complementarities among the subspecialties.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION. Though this has not been a traditional area of strength in the department, there is a recognition of growing opportunities in this area. The development of interdisciplinary programs in Transportation and Energy presents new possibilities of collaboration between economics and engineering that should be fruitful. The employment prospects for graduate students specializing in this area are excellent in
both academic and non-academic settings. Increasing numbers of graduate students are being attracted into this area.

**PUBLIC FINANCE.** The empirical side of public finance, in combination with empirical labor economics, has been an area of growing strength in the department, attracting considerable numbers of external grants and graduate students. There is, however, a need in public for more theoretical perspective to compliment the strong empirical focus, and enrich the possibilities of the field.

### 5. Recruiting Priorities – Replacement Hires

The department anticipates at least one retirement in 2009-14 in the core faculty of a field which will necessitate an immediate replacement hire. Alan Olmstead has announced he will retire at the end of the academic year 2008-9, at the beginning of the first year of this planning period. This will leave economic history field at Davis with only two faculty primarily in History (Meissner and Clark), and without anyone with expertise in US economic history. The case for maintaining three faculty in history is a high undergraduate teaching demand, and the fact that it is one of the strengths of the Department.

Should any other core faculty in the eight fields depart in the years 2009-2014, the presumption would be that there would be an immediate replacement hire.
Table 1.  
Temporary Staffing Needs for 2007-08  
(Based on SS'07 – Spring '08, Non-Senate Instructors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Micro Principles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Intermediate Micro</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Core Micro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Macro Principles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Intermediate Macro</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Core Macro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110A</td>
<td>Economic History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110B</td>
<td>Economic History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111A</td>
<td>Economic History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111B</td>
<td>Economic History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115B</td>
<td>Macro Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121A</td>
<td>Industrial Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Game Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total IO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Public Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Public Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Heath Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151A</td>
<td>Labor Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151B</td>
<td>Labor Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Public/Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Money and Banking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Monetary Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Monetary Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Money/Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160A</td>
<td>Micro International</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160B</td>
<td>Macro International</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total International</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Student Demand for Graduate Fields by Ph.D Thesis (1997-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>1994-2003</th>
<th>2004- (including in progress)</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Econometrics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field assignments are by content of the thesis as judged by the title.
April 10, 2008

The Hemispheric Institute on the Americas will respond to its severe budget cut (a reduction in operating costs from $40,000 to $25,000) in the following ways.

* We will hire an undergraduate (or two) rather than a GSR for 2008-09. We are looking into keeping our current GSR, Moises Park from the Spanish & Portuguese Department, as our webmaster on a part-time basis.

* We will not hold any national or international conferences. We had discussed an event on the situation in Venezuela (Chávez) and Bolivia (Morales) or one on the new left in Latin America. We hope to do so in 2009-10.

* We will continue to invite Davis and Bay Area people for our brown bag series rather than those from southern California or out of state. We began an “in-house series” with campus scholars with great success. I have been in touch with Herb Klein, the director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Stanford University, and we will co-sponsor some events, greatly reducing costs.

* This summer we will initiate a summer research fellowship for graduate students working on Latin America. The steering committee deemed this HIA’s top priority. We are using the money that we have left from this year (approximately $6,000, after reducing events for Spring) and have been requesting money from different divisions. We will apply for a Tinker Fellowship ($15,000) for these fellowships for 2008-09. We can only apply if we have a track record (making the support of graduate student travel funds for this summer essential) The strong possibility of being awarded this institutional Tinker Fellowship necessitates we spend all our resources on funding graduate student research this summer. The gamble means we will not be able to carry forward unspent funds from the current fiscal year into the coming one, as recommended.

While the budget cut is both challenging and discouraging, we will continue our efforts to increase our presence on campus and to serve a growing community of Latin Americanists at UCD and beyond.

Charles Walker
March 19, 2008

TO:  Steven Sheffrin, Dean, Division of Social Sciences

FROM:  Ted Margadant, Chair, Department of History

RE:  History Department Five-Year Plan, 2008-2013

During the past ten years, the history department has grown substantially, from 27 F.T.E. in 1998 to 40 F.T.E. in 2008. This growth has enabled us to strengthen our program in U.S. history, which has grown from 8 to 11 F.T.E., and to build new areas of strength in Latin American history (from 2 to 4 F.T.E.), Middle Eastern and South Asian history (from 1 to 3.5 F.T.E.), African history (from 1 to 2 F.T.E.) and Jewish history (from 0 to 2 F.T.E.). Only two broad areas, European history and East Asian history, which were already strong in 1998, have not added faculty since then, apart from a new position in Iberian history that links our European and Latin American programs. We currently have 15 F.T.E. in U.S. and Latin American history, 13 F.T.E. in European history from antiquity to the twentieth century (including 1 position in Jewish history), and 12 F.T.E. in African, Middle Eastern, South Asian, and East Asian history (including one position in Jewish history of north Africa and the Mediterranean world and one position in non-U.S. environmental history that we hope to fill this year with an environmental historian of north Africa and the Middle East). In comparison with history departments in other research universities, this configuration is very well-balanced and gives us a youthful faculty in expanding areas of historical research that cross conventional boundaries of regions and nation-states. Recent hires have enabled us to develop thematic and trans-national approaches to history in accordance with the goals put forward in our previous academic plan (in December 2004).

Over the next five years, however, we face a serious loss of faculty in several areas of our program due to retirements. We estimate that ten of our full professors will retire during this period. Retirement dates are definite for seven of these faculty: One in June 2008 (Cadden) and one in December 2008 (Brantley), one in June 2009 (Holloway), three in June 2010 (Hagen, Margadant, and Mann), and one in June 2011 (Cl. Walker). Another three faculty (Price, Borgen, and Spyridakis) are likely to retire by June 2012. In the absence of replacements, this wave of retirements would reduce our FTE by nearly 25%, from our current baseline of 40 to 30.5. Not surprisingly, the areas that experienced the least growth since 1998 will be the hardest hit by these retirements: 3 FTE in the European field and 2.5 in the East Asian field. A retirement in African history will place our graduate program in this area at risk, and a retirement in European history of science will have the same effect on this field of graduate study. Two retirements, one in Latin American history and one in U.S. history, also create risks as well as opportunities in these inter-related areas of our program.

Consequently, the goal of our five-year plan is to rebuild areas of our program where these retirements are concentrated. Our plan gives equal weight to two considerations: the need to replace faculty in areas of our graduate program where we offer fields of study for the
PhD degree that cannot be covered by a single faculty member (African history, Chinese history, history of science); and the need to replace faculty in areas of our undergraduate program that generate considerable interest among our own majors and those in other social science departments and programs such as International Relations, Political Science, and Sociology. In keeping with our larger goal of emphasizing themes that integrate geographical areas and time-periods, we have also configured replacement positions in ways that offer fresh ways of approaching particular fields of historical study.

In order to maintain the strength of our department, it is imperative that we rebuild systematically, so our plan is organized around four annual phases of rebuilding between 2008-2012. During this period, we are requesting only replacement positions, two per year, so that we can rebuild our program at a steady pace rather than all at once. Despite budgetary constraints that are likely to continue beyond next year, we are convinced that this plan offers the Division of Social Sciences as well as our own department opportunities to use the limited resources of the division wisely. Start-up costs for historians are low, and the salaries of historians at various ranks have not been compressed as much in recent years as those in some other departments of the division. UC Davis also has a competitive advantage in recruiting young historians because of our department’s reputation for excellence. In four of our five most recent searches, we have succeeded in recruiting our top candidate and we hope to do so in the fifth search, which has not yet been completed. As for leaving FTE lines vacant and hiring lecturers to teach the courses of our retiring faculty: that assumes that our temporary instructional budget will not be cut, but, in fact, we face a 10% cut that prevents us from hiring lecturers to teach most of the courses next year of retiring faculty and almost none of the upper-division courses taught by faculty on leave. Furthermore, it is our experience that undergraduate enrollments are notably higher in courses when our ladder faculty teach these courses, and that lecturers hired to teach lower-division courses rarely inspire students to take other courses in our department. Furthermore, the proseminars (History 102a-x) that we require of all our majors are taught exclusively by our ladder faculty, who provide students with an educational experience that emphasizes active learning through discussion (the courses are capped at fifteen) and intensive writing assignments. Finally, our graduate program, which ranks among the top thirty graduate programs in history nationally as measured by the number of PhDs produced since 2002, depends primarily on our ladder faculty, although we do have two non-departmental members of our graduate group.

Each position request is linked to a vacant FTE, but our plan is not determined exclusively by the order of retirements. In part, this is because our baseline of FTE does not take into account the retirement of an historian of modern Russia three years ago whose replacement is essential for our program. We need to use another retirement position in order to regain this position. Thus, we propose to apply the FTE vacated in June 2008 through the retirement of Joan Cadden, who is an historian of medieval science, to a position in Russian history, and then apply an FTE vacated in June 2010 by the retirement of William Hagen, who is an historian of Germany and Eastern Europe, to a reconfigured position in the history of science. Our plan is also influenced by the need to anticipate another retirement of a senior historian in the modern European field in June 2010, that of Ted Margadant. Thus, we are requesting authorization to search for a position in nineteenth-century European history in 2009-2010, the year before the FTEs held by Margadant and Hagen will be vacated by their retirements.
Finally, we are delaying by one year a position request in the field of African-American history that will be vacated by the retirement of Clarence Walker in June 2011. This delay will enable us to fill the position in modern Chinese history vacated by the retirement of Susan Mann in June 2010 before a second senior historian of China, Donald Price, retires in 2011 or 2012. It will also enable us to fill the position in the history of science after a delay of only two years instead of three years. A final point is that we do not know when Stylianos Spyridakis will retire so we have added his position in ancient history to the end of the list of replacement positions. His upper-division courses (History 111A-B-C) regularly enroll over three hundred students per quarter, and he generates nearly 5,000 student credit hours every year for our department and for the division. It will be indispensable to replace him when he retires.

As for growth positions, we have decided not to request any additional positions until we have completed our rebuilding. Nor have we specified any recruitments for 2012-2013, although we have new positions in mind, such as contemporary history and diplomatic history, that would help meet anticipated increases in undergraduate enrollments on the Davis campus. Before our department resumes its growth, we need additional funding for our graduate program, whose block grant funds from the Division of Social Sciences have been cut substantially in the past two years. If these funds can be increased instead of being cut, we are prepared to forgo growth positions in order to make our graduate program more competitive and to increase it to a more optimal size.

Replacement positions in 2008-2009

1. **East Africa/Indian Ocean**: with Brantley’s retirement at the end of this year (2008), we will have only one faculty member teaching the history of sub-Saharan Africa. We currently have six graduate students enrolled in this area of our program, which we began four years ago when we hired a second Africanist (Lawrance). Graduate programs in African history are rarely large. Only fifteen history departments have three or more Africanists listed in the current AHA directory of history departments in the United States, and among these programs, those producing PhDs in African history between 1988-2003 accounted for only 44% of all the PhDs in this field, as compared with 43% produced by programs that currently have two Africanists [data compiled by Lawrance from Dissertation Abstracts International, Sept. 1988-July 2005]. While this evidence is imprecise due to the changing composition of programs in African history since 1988, it strongly suggests that a department can run a competitive PhD program in this field with two Africanists. This has certainly been the case with respect to recruitments of new students recently into our program. However, programs with only one Africanist have rarely produced any PhDs. Our department is one of only three in the UC system with more than one Africanist (UC Berkeley has two and U.C.L.A. has five). A replacement position for Brantley’s FTE will enable us to continue our graduate program in sub-Saharan African history. It will also enable our majors to study African history as their major field of concentration, which requires four upper-division lecture courses and a proseminar in African history, and it will provide the same opportunity for other undergraduates at UCD to study African history in depth. Brantley’s replacement would be expected to teach the history of East and Central Africa (History 115B) and the history of South Africa (115C), as well as sharing responsibility for teaching thematic courses in
African history (115D, 115E, and 116), our lower-division survey of African history (History 15), and our graduate courses in the field (201P and 202E). Finally, by giving preference in the job description to an historian with knowledge of Indian Ocean cultures and empires as well as East, Central and Southern Africa, we will seek to increase the linkages between African history and South Asian history in our program.

2. **Russia/Eastern Europe:** since the retirement of our Russian historian (Daniel Brower) in June 2006, we have relied for two years (2006-2007 and 2007-2008) on temporary lecturers to teach two upper-division courses in Russian history (from a three-quarter sequence, History 138A-B-C), along with a section of our course in modern world history (History 10C) that Brower developed and taught on a regular basis. We will continue this stop-gap measure in 2008-2009, but we will no longer be receiving funds from Brower’s FTE line to do so because the FTE has not been included in our baseline of 40 FTE. To regain this position, we must sacrifice another retirement position in the European field, which is what we propose to do as described above. The history of Russia is an indispensable part not only of European history but of world history, especially in the modern period of imperial expansion, world wars, and global rivalries involving Russia. Among the top fifty history departments in the United States as measured by the production of Phd degrees since 2002, forty-eight have at least one Russian historian and thirty-two have at least two Russian historians. Our own department had two Russian historians until the early 1990’s and continued to offer graduate training in Russian history as part of our modern European graduate program until Brower’s retirement. Undergraduate enrollments in two of Brower’s courses, the history of the Russian Revolution (History 138A) and the history of the Soviet Union (138B) exceeded 90 students in his last year of teaching, when he also taught 164 undergraduates in History 10C. These three courses generated 1,080 student credit hours that year, well above the current average among our ladder faculty of around 900. In our previous departmental plan (2004), our chair at that time (Susan Mann) wrote, “In planning for future growth, the department has taken special note of opportunities afforded by pending retirements. Thus, for instance, should our Russian historian retire in the next few years, a replacement position in Russian history would automatically trump other priorities on this list.” Looking ahead to Hagen’s retirement, which will leave us without an historian of Eastern Europe, it is all the more crucial to regain this position. In keeping with our programmatic emphasis on trans-national and global inter-connections, we envisage a modern Russian historian who has knowledge of Russia’s imperial expansion and of its relations with Eastern Europe.

**Replacement positions in 2009-2010**

1. **Modern Europe (19th century):** The retirements of Margadant as well as Hagen in June 2010 will leave us without a social and political historian of nineteenth-century Europe unless we replace one of them in 2009-2010. We propose to apply Margadant’s FTE to this position, which is a thematic field essential to our graduate program in modern European history and important for our undergraduate enrollments. We seek an historian of continental Europe (excluding Russia) with knowledge of broad themes such as industrialization, warfare, nation-building, and imperialism. Such themes link
European history in the nineteenth century to larger processes of historical change that affected other areas of the world. This historian would teach the core course in our European graduate program on nineteenth century historiography (History 201E); either our lower-division course on the history of modern Europe (History 4C), which Margadant has been teaching every year) or our world history course in the modern period (History 10C), which Hagen has been teaching every year); and upper-division courses likely to attract substantial numbers of students, such as Margadant’s course on war and revolution in Europe from 1789-1918 (History 145), his course on the history of France since 1815 (History 141), Hagen’s course on the history of Germany since 1789 (History 144B) or new courses on comparative topics such as socio-economic and political transformations in nineteenth-century Europe, or European colonialism and imperialism in the modern era. Margadant and Hagen have each been generating over 900 student credit hours when teaching a full load in recent years, and we are only requesting a single replacement position to cover their courses, some of which can be used to satisfy major requirements in the international relations program (4C, 10C, 145) and the political science department (4C, 10C).

2. Caribbean Basin: Holloway’s retirement in June 2009 opens up the prospect of reconfiguring his FTE in Brazilian history into a position in the history of the Caribbean region. Another of our Latin Americanists, Victoria Langland, has expertise in Brazilian history in addition to the history of women and gender, which is the thematic focus of her position. We envisage a replacement position that would not be limited to the Spanish Caribbean but would include areas of the Caribbean colonized by the British and the French as well as adjacent areas of Mexico, Central America, Venezuela and northern Columbia. The position would also encourage linkages between the history of Latin America and the United States through a thematic focus on comparative issues such as slavery, colonialism, or trans-national relations. We would consider scholars of the colonial as well as the modern (or post-colonial) period. Recruiting a Caribbeanist with comparative interests would not only cement our Latin American group as one of the strongest in the UC system but add a new dimension to our graduate program in U.S. history. We currently have thirteen graduate students pursuing the PhD degree in Latin American history and we offer graduate seminars in this field that attract students from other fields and departments. This position would also serve our undergraduate program well by diversifying our course offerings on the history of Latin America, which is an area of the world from which large numbers of immigrants have come to California in recent years. Indeed, Latin, although comprising only 12% of undergraduates in the UC system today (as compared with 35% of California’s overall population), are the fastest-growing segment of our student population.

Replacement positions in 2010-2011

1. Late-Imperial/Modern China: The retirement of Susan Mann in June 2010 will leave us with two Chinese historians, one of whom (Price) plans to retire in June 2011. We cannot maintain our graduate and undergraduate programs in this field without at least two historians, so it will be essential to recruit Mann’s replacement in 2010-2011. Among history departments that offer the PhD degree, forty-five have at least two
Chinese historians, and within the UC system, six of the eight history departments have at least three Chinese historians. Although our graduate program in this area is relatively small—we currently have seven graduate students in Chinese history—it has an excellent reputation. The resources of Shield’s library, whose large collection of research materials in Chinese history has been built over the past forty years, also facilitates the training of graduate students in this field. Our third Chinese historian, Beverly Bossler, is a specialist on the high imperial period of Chinese history (Sung dynasty), so we are requesting a replacement position in the late imperial/modern period. At the undergraduate level, this faculty member will teach at least two of the three upper-division courses that we offer on this period (History 191C-D-E-F) and will share responsibility for teaching our lower-division survey on the history of Chinese civilization and its modern transformations (History 9A). History 191F, our course on the history of the People’s Republic of China (History 191F), had an enrollment of 86 students last year and History 9A, which we offer twice a year, regularly enrolls around 130-135 students. We anticipate increasing enrollments in these courses because China has become a global economic power in the twenty-first century and because we have growing numbers of Asian Americans on our campus who are interested in studying Chinese history. The position in modern Chinese history that we seek will not be defined thematically, although we would be interested in recruiting an historian of women and gender because of the outstanding reputation of our current faculty in this field.

2. **History of Science:** with Cadden’s retirement, we are left with only one historian of science, Daniel Stolzenberg, who works on the early modern period. It would be difficult to recruit a specialist in the medieval history of science and medicine, which is Cadden’s area of expertise, because this is a very small research field. Consequently, we want to reconfigure this position to encompass the history of science in any period, with a preference for the modern era, and with a global orientation that includes the history of science in cultures beyond Europe. History of science is a specialized field of graduate study offered by around thirty history departments in the United States, including five in the UC system. Our program, which emphasizes the social and cultural context of science, fits well with the interdisciplinary program in Science and Technology Studies (STS) that is located in the Division of Social Sciences. To maintain it, we need two historians of science. The position that we seek will also enable us to offer undergraduate courses on the history of science in the modern period, which will contribute to the STS program and attract undergraduates majoring in the biological and/or physical sciences.

**Replacement positions in 2011-2012**

1. **Slavery and African-American:** With the retirement in June 2011 of Clarence Walker, an historian of African-Americans and race relations in the United States, we will need a replacement position in this vital area of our program. We have a second historian, Lisa Materson, who teaches one course in African-American history on a regular basis (History 177B), but her research and teaching is centered on the history of women and gender. Walker’s two-quarter course on the history of race in America (History
178A-B) and his course on the history of black people and American race relations from the African background to Reconstruction (History 177A) are among the most important courses in our department that fulfill the diversity requirement of the General Education program. This position will also help our department achieve diversity among our graduate students. We will seek an African-American historian with broad training in American history who can teach one of our core graduate courses in the historiography of the United States. Thematically, this position may work in tandem with the Caribbean position, especially with respect to themes linking the history of the American South and the Caribbean basin such as race and slavery.

2. **East Asia**: The definition of this position in East Asian history, which is a replacement position for Don Price, will be influenced by our search for Mann’s replacement. It may also be influenced by the likely retirement of Bob Borgen by 2012. Borgen, who has a joint appointment in the history department (.50 FTE) and the department of East Asian languages and cultures (.50 FTE), is a specialist in early Japanese literature and history. We will be especially interested in configuring this position to establish linkages between China and other East Asian societies.

**Replacement Position, Year Uncertain**

1. **Ancient History**: This replacement position will need to be filled as soon as Stylianos Spyridakis retires. His courses on ancient history (111A-B-C) are the largest courses taught in our department, with enrollments regularly exceeding 300 students. The great interest of undergraduates on the Davis campus in ancient history gives us confidence that a position in this field will make a substantial contribution to our undergraduate program and to enrollments in the Division of Social Sciences. It can also contribute to the major program in the department of Classics, which has a track in classical and Mediterranean civilizations. One member of the classics department (Emily Albu) is a member of our graduate group and our medievalist, Sally McKee, has published research on Mediterranean history (Italy and Crete), so we would encourage whoever fills the position in ancient history to work with them in recruiting and training graduate students.

**Growth Positions in 2012-2013:**

Such positions, which would emphasize areas where we anticipate considerable interest among students majoring in other departments of our division as well as among history majors, are a lower priority at this time than expanding block grant funding for our graduate program.

*Unless otherwise noted, I have compiled the data on numbers of history faculty in various departments from the *Directory of History Departments and Organizations in the United States*, 32nd edition, 2007-2008. I have also used this source (28th-32nd edition, 2003-2008) to tabulate the number of PhD degrees given over the five-year period from 2002-2007 by each of the 145 history department in the United States that has a PhD program, and used this data as a crude measure of the rank of these programs. Our department is tied for 30th in this ranking.*
Three UC departments rank above us by this measure (U.C.L.A. #2, Berkeley #3, Santa Barbara #17) and four rank below us (Riverside #36, San Diego #49, Irvine #54, and Santa Cruz #84).
August 29, 2008

Professor Steven Sheffrin, Dean
Division of Social Sciences
University of California Davis
Davis, CA 95616

Dear Steve:

Attached is the strategic plan of the International Relations Program. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Cordially,

Zeev Maoz
Professor of Political Science
Director, International Relations Program
International Relations Program: Strategic Plan, 2008-2010

Zeev Maoz
Director, International Relations Program

1. Introduction: State of the Program

As noted in my response to the TPPRC report (November 27, 2007), the IR program has 860 declared majors and about 520 undeclared majors during the 2007-08 academic year. It had 267 degrees conferred in 2006-7. Both in terms of declared majors and in terms of the number of IR degrees conferred, the program grew at an annual average pace of over 12 percent over the 2002-08 period. This compares to an average annual growth of five percent in terms of undergraduate degrees conferred at the UCD campus. By all measures this is a growth rate that is more than double the UCD undergraduate growth rate over the same period. (See appendix.)

Data on the credit hours contributed by IR students to various departments suggests that our majors help significantly improve the credit hour standing of a number of key departments on campus, contributing as much as forty percent to anthropology and 35 percent to political science. This figure also suggests consistent growth over time.

The IR curriculum has also developed considerably over the same period. We have added new courses to the program and expanded the number of sections for required courses in the various tracks. Finally, we provided fellowships to our students on the EAP and supported undergraduate student research assistantships.

Paradoxically, however, the IR program received no additional resources despite the fact that it has doubled in size over the last five years. This imposes considerable constraints on our ability to grow and—more important—on our ability to modernize the curriculum and require students to take additional methods classes as part of their required course package.

2. Goals of the Program

One of the core assumptions of the program is that it would be supported by one FTE given to the political science department in support of the core teaching requirements of the IR program (IRE 1, POL 123, POL 132, POL 124). Under this assumption, and given that we will be able to recruit one faculty member, we also plan to reach an agreement with the political science and sociology departments to incorporate their methods courses (POL 51, SOC 046B) into the required IR curriculum. We also plan capping the number of majors in the program at 860 students under the current budget constraints, as we are confronting major difficulties in terms of providing our students with reasonable access to required courses. This prevents us to face all too often dilemmas of substituting required courses for students whose graduation might be delayed because they could not enter the required courses when those had been offered. Unless we can increase the number of sections of our required courses significantly, we may not be able to meet the requirements of our own curriculum.
Under zero growth in resources, we also expect to cut down on our ability to provide travel and research fellowships to students, as well as our support for speakers’ series and other activities (e.g., peer advising, support for International Affairs Journal). My plan over the next year is to invest considerable effort in fundraising for these activities, by contacting our alumni, as well as prospective donors who are interested in international affairs.

3. **Long Term Goal**

If and when we are back to a period of growth, my plan is to develop a professional M.A. program in international affairs. The purpose of this program will be to provide an advanced degree to students who are interested in professional careers in international affairs, including in government agencies, international organizations, and NGOs. This would be a terminal master’s degree with an emphasis on applied training. My experience in developing such programs in the past suggests that such a program can utilize existing resources on campus and become an important resource for the departments that contribute to it. This, however, will require certain startup investment by the university. A more detailed plan can be developed upon request.
Appendix: Data on IR Program

Figure 1: Number of Declared and Undeclared IR Majors, 2002-07

Figure 2: Proportion of IR Majors to Total UCD Undergrads
Figure 3: Average Credit Hours of IR Students in Social Science Departments

Note: Figure 3 displays the proportion of IR student credit hours as a function of total students’ credit hours in selected courses in the most commonly selected disciplines by IR majors. Other commonly selected courses by IR majors are in the Spanish department and community development.
Five Year Plan for the Jewish Studies Program

Jewish Studies is a young but active and growing program at UC Davis. Over the past few years, it has been offering approximately 25 courses, including Hebrew language instruction, Literature, History, Religious Studies, Political Science and Sociology. Enrollments per annum are up to about 900 students. Approximately five students are graduating annually with a Jewish Studies minor. A sub-committee of the Jewish Studies Program Committee will be focusing on revising the minor this year and working on increasing the numbers of students who take a minor in JS.

The Jewish Studies Program has been offering an annual speakers’ series showcasing the research of UCD faculty. That series is now in its third year. In addition, the program has brought several prominent speakers to Davis every year. This year we will have a one-day conference on “Contemporary Challenges to American Jews.” Next year, we will have a series tentatively entitled “Israelis on Israel,” drawing on Israeli scholars, focused on social problems in Israel such as gender, immigration, human smuggling, and the environment that will build and draw on UCD faculty working on those issues within a different context. The main purpose is to focus on Israel as a site of multiple problems beyond the Palestinian issue and to create dialogue and cross-fertilization among colleagues with similar interests.

Despite its very small size, Jewish Studies is playing an active role on campus. Indeed, it offers more variety in its courses than other UC campuses in Northern California.

One major weakness of the program is that the majority of our courses are offered by part-time lecturers and are funded by soft money. In other words, the Jewish Studies Program is unusually and overly dependent upon outside funds and non-line faculty. There is only one line faculty member who is centrally located in Jewish Studies, David Biale, who holds an endowed chair in History. Prof. Naomi Janowitz, Chair of Religious Studies, teaches one Jewish Studies course most years even though this is her area of expertise. Professors Zeev Maoz in Political Science and Diane Wolf in Sociology have been able to offer one course per year in Jewish Studies through their departments the past few years. Annual course planning is rife with uncertainty over outside funds as well as the availability of high quality lecturers since there is considerable turn-over. Because our situation as it stands now is neither sustainable nor desirable, our main priority is to increase the number of line faculty associated with Jewish Studies and decrease our dependence on soft money and lecturers.

The History Department successfully completed its second search for someone who focuses on Jews of the Mediterranean and Middle East. Professor Susan Miller, an expert on Jewish history in Morocco, will join the History and Jewish Studies faculty next year and will be offering new courses on Jewish history and culture in the Middle East.

Short-term Goal

The Program is in dire need of someone who can teach the courses we are supporting in Religious Studies. The Religious Studies Program has experienced significant growth recently.
and added world-class scholars of Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism. At this point, Judaism is barely represented since Professor Janowitz must teach other RST courses and can rarely teach a JS course. It is essential that another line faculty who is squarely in Jewish Studies be added to the Religious Studies Department. We are seeking outside funding for the first three years of such an appointment with the hope/agreement that it will be a line position taken over by Harcs. This appointment is essential because it is impossible to offer any kind of viable Jewish Studies Program without someone with training in ancient texts.

Our goal is to develop a major in Jewish Studies once we have these three positions in place. By then, we will have a solid core of faculty who can be depended upon to offer certain courses and to develop new ones. We also hope to build on the momentum at UC Davis in ME/SA and possibly work on offering some joint comparative courses.

Our “no growth” scenario is to add this line so that we can maintain our basic courses for our program. Although it adds a faculty line, technically it does not add an additional person to our program since we have to use a lecturer to teach such courses now.

**Long-term Goal**

Finally, another goal is to add a position in the area of Jewish Culture. We need a faculty member who can focus on the rich area of Jewish literature, an area that is well represented in other Jewish Studies Programs at UC and nation-wide. That person could be located in Comparative Literature, German, English, or some other department, and ideally, would do interdisciplinary work. For example, we can imagine having a faculty member who works in some combination of English, Hebrew, Yiddish, Ladino or Arabic and focuses on Jewish literature in those cultures. Such a position would complement others already at UC Davis and would create a Jewish Studies Program in solid standing nation-wide.

Diane L. Wolf
Director, Jewish Studies Program
March 21, 2008
Background
Over the last dozen years Linguistics has developed from an Interdepartmental Program into a Department with an affiliated Graduate Group that now offers a Ph.D. Departmental status was accorded in 1999, and our Ph.D. program was approved in Fall 2003, with the first cohort of doctoral students entering in Fall 2004. The Department offers an increasingly popular undergraduate major in general linguistics, along with two minors (one in general linguistics, the other with a focus on language pedagogy). At the graduate level we continue to offer an M.A. in applied linguistics. Our Ph.D. program now attracts students interested in a range of issues. Since 2004 we have hired three senior faculty (Robert Bayley, David Corina and John Hawkins). However, there has been a net growth of only one in this time period, since two of the hires coincided with retirements. The department now has 10 FTE.

The Department comprises considerable breadth of expertise both in the core areas of linguistics (phonology, syntax and semantics) and in interdisciplinary areas, especially psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics. The Ph.D. program currently has two areas of emphasis: second language acquisition and development and structural/theoretical linguistics. Graduate students are expected to have a solid foundation in the core structural areas and may choose to specialize in any area of structural or applied linguistics that is addressed by the faculty of the Linguistics Graduate Group.

Hiring priorities
Foremost in our thinking about hiring possibilities is our desire to foster the evolution of a fledgling Ph.D. program in Linguistics that has thus far seen considerable success in attracting high caliber applicants and enrollees and has the potential to achieve a high ranking among graduate programs oriented toward applications of linguistics. The hiring priorities identified below envision adding expertise in applied research areas that give the program needed breadth, complement research interests of current departmental faculty, and build ties with other departments and research centers on campus where linguistics should have a significant presence. These potential hires also stand to strengthen the Ph.D. program in Linguistics by increasing extramural funding in the Department and by adding faculty expertise in areas in which large-enrollment GE classes, which add interesting options for TA support, can be developed.

Priority 1 — Given the increasing importance of computer modeling in linguistic theory and cognitive science and the various opportunities for applying linguistics in computer science, we would like our first hire to be a computational linguist who would be able to do interdisciplinary work relating language issues to psychology, computer science, and/or education. Ideally, this person would have interests in areas such as corpus-based analyses, machine translations, and language learning, i.e., domains that straddle several disciplines and that are becoming prominent in the field. We would like this person to be able to develop a large-enrollment GE course that would focus on the relationships
between two of the most important things in people’s lives today: language and computers. This person would also be expected to attract funding from extramural sources and to train graduate students to do the same.

**Priority 2** — For a possible second position, we would like to hire someone that would be able to interface well with other departments and programs that can attract research funding and Ph.D. support for our graduate students. Areas of specialization might include applications of linguistics in the domain of medicine and neuroscience (language impairments following brain injury, autism, severe language impairment in children, etc.), child language development, or public health (in local immigrant communities, for example). The first two of these specializations would build on existing strengths in the broad area of language and mind/brain; the second might give language and linguistics a presence in the proposed School of Public Health and would add a new dimension to the second language development strand of our Ph.D. program.

**Scenario 1: Modest FTE growth**
Given the possibility for an increase in the number of ladder faculty in the next five years or so, we would follow the hiring priorities given above.

**Scenario 2: No FTE growth**
The number of undergraduate majors in Linguistics has steadily increased over the past 5 years. Moreover, there has been continuous growth in the Department’s student credit hours. We envision being able to sustain these trends as well as increase the average student credit hours of our ladder faculty, which have been lagging. We plan on doing this by continuing to offer multiple sections of our lower-division GE course, Linguistics 1, by developing other courses of this kind (such as Linguistics 6, which will come online in 2008-09), by possibly offering larger sections of Linguistics 1, by stimulating enrollment growth in our upper-division courses, and by ensuring that ladder faculty are routinely scheduled to teach high-enrollment courses. Although our current ladder-faculty allotment in Linguistics stretches us thinly over the courses needed for this plan and the courses needed for the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Linguistics, we don’t envision serious difficulty with this allotment, even in the face of expected modest growth in our graduate programs, provided that we have adequate support from supplementary instructional funds for TAs, associate instructors, and readers, the need for which grows with increases in undergraduate enrollments.

Should we face any retirements or attrition in the next five years, it will be imperative that we hire appropriate replacements. It is likely that Lenora Timm will retire in this time period. Should that occur, we would follow the hiring priorities given above for her replacement, because her areas of expertise (sociolinguistics and multilingualism) are adequately represented by other members of the Department and the Graduate Group and we consider it most important to develop expertise in the identified areas, which are currently underrepresented in our course and research offerings. In the event of any other faculty loss, our need to replace the lost disciplinary focus would likely supercede the needs represented by the hiring priorities discussed above.
Summary
The Linguistics Department with its affiliated Graduate Group, has this year seen members of its first cohort of doctoral students complete their dissertations, and we believe that we are on the path to establishing a national reputation for our Ph.D. program with its breadth of interests. While we have added new faculty in recent years, we are underrepresented in the area of computational linguistics and given the vitality of this research domain, and our expanding Ph.D. needs, it seems crucial for us to have it be part of what we are able to offer. Should there be an additional hiring possibility, we would like to hire someone whose research applies linguistics in an area with campus research strength and broadens our existing departmental strengths in the domain of language and mind/brain or second language acquisition and development.
MIDDLE EAST/SOUTH ASIA STUDIES MAJOR PROGRAM
LONG TERM PLAN, APRIL 9, 2008

To: Dean Steven Sheffrin
From: Suad Joseph, Director, ME/SA
Re: ME/SA Long Term Plan

Dear Dean Sheffrin:

While we regret that ME/SA will not have any FTE allocated to be housed in ME/SA, we understand that you nevertheless have invited our priorities for DSS possible FTE development. Accordingly, we have discussed long-term planning around Middle East/South Asia Studies at UC Davis. We propose the following FTE, to be housed in the appropriate departments/programs. Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.

I. Academic Priorities and Goals
   A. Languages:
      1. ME/SA’s highest priority is to stabilize Arabic and Hindi/Urdu at the advanced level, with 2 sections each for first and second year and one of advanced. This will require two lecturers for each language and an FTE for each language. This level is consistent with the recommendation of the HArCS Language Task Force in 2007. This also means the release of the FTE for Advanced Arabic and Advanced Hindi/Urdu for the searches to take place as early as possible in 2008-09, so that the faculty are in place by Fall of 2009. Unfortunately we lost some momentum in the development of these languages, when the tenure-track faculty were not in place in 2007-08, as had been hoped. This means that the students taking year two ARB and HIN will not be able to take advanced Arabic or Hindi/Urdu at Davis next year. It would be a terrible loss for additional students, for the program and would contribute to destabilizing the languages if the FTE are not hired and in place by Fall 2009. The Language Task Force strongly urged that any language developed at UC Davis be offered through the advanced level. The FTE have been allocated for this to take place. This offers a tremendous opportunity to serve undergraduate students, graduate students and faculty research, greatly strengthening not only the ME/SA major, but other programs, such as Comparative Literature and graduate programs across campus.

      Critical to the stabilization of the languages is housing Arabic and Hindi/Urdu in their new home in an appropriate Language Department or program. The Language Task Force and Language Assembly recommended French and Italian in their reports in 2007. Classics has also been proposed as a possible home by the Dean. Either of these choices could be made to work. It is important that a decision be made very soon to allow a reasoned and rational transition of the languages to their new homes. A lot of work needs to be done and it would best be done in conjunction with the new department/program as soon as possible so that those faculty can be involved in some of the decision that ME/SA is now having to make on their behalf. It is also critical that the two languages are housed together in the same department/program. The Lecturers and the FTE faculty who are to be hired need to work together to develop the program
as we think ahead towards the possibility of a major in Middle East/South Asia languages and literatures. Separating the languages would create intellectual, pedagogical and programmatic problems in stabilizing and building the languages. Arabic and Urdu share a script and Hindi and Urdu share profound linguistic histories, vocabularies and grammars. We sincerely hope that the planning of the housing of these languages entails the recognition of their close linking intellectually, pedagogically, and programmatically together.

2. ME/SA’s next highest priority for language development is Persian. The Language Task Force listed Persian as one of the top three (the three were unranked). Persian is used by a number of ME/SA faculty in their research and has a significant heritage student constituency at UC Davis. As one of the languages on the Department of State top security languages, it will draw non-heritage students as well. Now that the History Department has hired a historian of Iran (comparative Safavid, Moghul and Ottoman empires), UC Davis will have faculty leadership in supervising Persian. As with Arabic and Hindi/Urdu, so it is the case with Persian – if we expect to retain fine scholars who do research in these languages, we must develop the languages so they can train graduate and undergraduate students and support their research.

3. In the future, ME/SA would be pleased to see the development of Punjabi, Turkish and other Middle Eastern and South Asian Languages.

B. Committed FTE
Two FTE from the Islam, Culture, and Society initiative (in addition to the Arabic and Hindi/Urdu FTE), have not been released to programs. The Faculty Advisory Committee recommended those FTE to Asian American Studies (for an Arab and Asian Muslim Diasporas position) and to Women and Gender Studies (for an Islam, Gender and Justice or Human Rights position). While the Faculty Advisory Committee recommended these positions joint with ME/SA, we understand that ME/SA is not to house FTE at the moment. We suggest the assignment of these FTE as recommended by the Faculty Advisory Committee, for 2008-09.

C. New FTE
1. For new FTE, ME/SA strongly recommends a scholar of Middle Eastern and or South Asian film. Middle Eastern and South Asian film production is among the largest in the world. Not only is production among the largest in the world, but so is the consumption of film production from this region which circulates with increasing expansiveness across the globe. Indian, Iranian, Egyptian, Algerian, Tunisian, Turkish, Lebanese, Israel cinematic production are shown around the world. The field has a long history and a substantial body of scholarship. In 2008-09, ME/SA will dedicate its lecture series and conference to a film series and film festival from the Middle East and South Asia. We currently have one scholar in Women and Gender Studies (Gopinath) who works in this field. An FTE in this topical area will significantly add to the important scholarly developments on campus in Anthropology, Film Studies, Cultural Studies, Women and Gender Studies and support the critical interdisciplinary work being carried out by ME/SA faculty.
2. ME/SA’s second priority for new FTE is for a sociologist of the Middle East or South Asia. Sociological research in South Asia is among the leading theoretical intellectual formations in the world. Sociology of the Middle East has gained in rigor and theoretical contributions significantly in the past two decades. The scholarship in Sociology on South Asia and the Middle East is stellar. We would be particularly interested in a sociologist whose research focuses on war, violence, political movements, refugees, forced migration. These interests would intersect with the research of faculty and graduate students in almost DSS and HArCS Departments and cover a much-needed area of work in a much-needed discipline.

3. ME/SA’s third priority for new FTE is for an economist or political economist, who focuses on globalization, world economies (especially oil), labor, capitalist and postsocialist transformations. The Middle East and South Asia are undergoing dramatic economic transformations. India leaped onto the world stage as one of the foremost economic engines. Middle Eastern oil economies continue to be touchstones for the world economy. Labor movements into and out of and between these regions is changing the face of their social worlds and world society. It is critical for ME/SA and for UC Davis to have a scholar who addresses these issues.

4. Note: The topics addressed in #1-3 could actually be housed in any of several departments.

D. Teaching Assistants
   The Dean’s office has provided ME/SA for reader funds for MSA 100 since 2005. With the launching of the ME/SA Major in Fall 2008, we expect enrollments to significantly increase in MSA 100, MSA 180 (both required for the Major) and several new MSA courses which are being introduced. We will request TA support for these courses starting in 2009-10, as reader funds are no longer sufficient. Indeed, MSA 100 is under-supported with reader funds relative to other DSS courses, as its enrollments are comparable to courses with TAships in DSS departments.

II. Availability of Resources
   A. Offices:
      ME/SA will launch the ME/SA Major in the Fall of 2008. We expect considerable student interest in the Major, and have already been fielding the questions of numerous students who are taking courses in advance to prepare for the Major. To launch and stabilize the major, we expect to need a minimum of two offices (one for staff, and one for TA’s, the 3 student assistants, and ME/SA peer advisor) – after Arabic and Hindi/Urdu languages, Lecturers and TA’s have been relocated physically to their new home department/program. Our current two offices, each about 150 square feet, each house 4 people. This means, staff, lecturers, GSR’s, student assistants, TA’s each have about 37.5 square feet to work in – about a total space of 6’ X 6”, including walking space. Issues of confidentiality of student and personnel files, space for addressing student and faculty questions, room to carry out with dignity and decorum basic obligations of the job are risks. One lecturer indicated that the space situation was so unacceptable that it would be a factor in whether this lecturer was willing to return to teach at UC Davis. We have brought this dire situation, which presents numerous pedagogical, cultural and
B. Staff:

ME/SA has been very fortunate to have hired an outstanding staff in March of 2008. She has served with incredible dedication to help us build ME/SA. However, she regularly does more work than one staff should have to do. With the coming of the ME/SA major, ME/SA will need an additional .5 to 1.0 FTE for a second staff person. Not only will the major need attention in terms of students, but more ME/SA courses will be regularly offered. In addition, the work of coordinating the courses offered by numerous departments, collecting information, disseminating to the students and faculty and our very active scholarly programming require at least a total of 1.5 to 2 FTE staff. We have managed so far by the extremely dedicated help of undergraduate and graduate student assistants. This, however, can only be an interim solution as we work hard to stabilize the program and expand its many initiatives and offerings. Given the nature of the work of a program with an enormous heritage student-base, it is critical that the ME/SA staff remains dedicated autonomously to ME/SA rather than absorbed into a staff pool. The fact that ME/SA fall and spring student welcome and Hafla/Mela regularly draw 150 students is indicative of the critical role that ME/SA is now playing for this heritage community. The staff is vital for maintaining the profile of the program with the students. These are students who, regardless of major, feel that ME/SA is their home. ME/SA needs to continue to offer these students educational services.

III. Strategy to meet these goals:

FTE for Arabic and Hindi/Urdu tenure track positions have been designated in the Islam, Culture and Society Initiative and have been confirmed by the Deans. One lecturer for each language has also been confirmed by the Deans. ME/SA is grateful to the Deans and the Vice Provost for these allocations. We look forward to an additional Lecturer for each of these languages from the Deans and Vice Provost’s office.

ME/SA has supported the ME/SA Major and the languages worked on donor development and grant writing for the past three years and achieved some significant success. We will work towards those objectives as within our means to do so.

IV. Method of Evaluating Success of Plans

Our best method of evaluating success if the student enrollment and faculty productivity. These measures will speak for themselves in the coming 3-5 years.
Academic Plan 2009-2014
Department of Philosophy
March 21, 2008

Priorities and Goals
At the time of the previous academic plan (December 2004), the UC Davis Philosophy Department was ranked among the top 20 departments in 7 subspecialties and 27th overall (Philosophical Gourmet/"Leiter Report"). Since then the department has gone through dramatic faculty losses, partial rebuilding, and reconfiguration of some areas of strength. The 2004 plan identified strengths in: (1) core analytic areas of metaphysics and philosophy of language, (2) ethics and philosophy of law, (3) philosophy of mind and psychology, and (4) philosophy of science (physics and biology). Some of those strengths rested on the reputation of a single prominent faculty member. At the time, the department aspired to build to its strengths while redressing a gap in covering the history of philosophy, which is not only critical to the teaching mission of the undergraduate and graduate programs, but also provides an important avenue of integration of faculty research interests transcending contemporary analytic specialties. Two areas identified for strengthening in 2004 were groups of faculty specializing in “bio-mind” (philosophy of mind, psychology and biology) and “normative” (ethics, political philosophy and philosophy of law).

The last decade has seen unprecedented mobility of philosophy faculty nationwide. The small size and high quality of the Davis philosophy faculty left it vulnerable to “raiding” by higher ranked and/or better supported departments in both public and private universities at a time when UC salaries and research support lagged even more severely than today. Our hiring pattern of the last 5 years has been one step forward, one step backward. Until the completion of our current searches in 2007-08, we will have remained in approximate steady state in terms of size, but turned over dramatically in seniority (to a much younger faculty) and area (with dramatic improvement in philosophy of language, but significant losses in normative philosophy, philosophy of science, philosophy of mind, and history of philosophy).

Faculty losses over the last four years pushed the department toward catastrophe. In 2004, we lost two (full) and gained two (one associate, one assistant). In 2005, we lost four more (all senior or approved for tenure). In 2006, we lost two more but gained eight due to a massive recruitment and rebuilding effort, leaving us with a net gain of two compared to the faculty roster of 2004. In 2007, we lost one of those hired in 2006 and another due to retirement—both full professors. Finally, we will lose one more this year (an assistant professor who was approved for accelerated tenure) as well as see the end of the recall appointments of two distinguished full professors, leaving us with a net loss of one FTE since the last academic plan. We have 5 senior offers outstanding at the moment, but are also in a retention battle for one tenured faculty member. If we succeed in the retention and with the five offers, we will have a net gain of four FTE compared to 2004, for a faculty roster of 15 (14.5 FTE) which regains strength in ethics, completes our strengthening in philosophy of language, contributes partially to rebuilding philosophy of science, and establishes new strengths in philosophical logic and philosophy of mathematics. The new hires would restore a balance in seniority and improve gender diversity substantially. These new hires bring our FTE total up to the baseline set by Dean Sheffrin on November 8, 2007 for purpose of this academic planning exercise.

In the wake of losing three of four faculty identified in 2004 as contributing to the Bio-Mind group (including all of the Mind side of that group) and two of three faculty identified as contributing to the normative group, plus the retirement and end of recall of two of four contributors to the history of philosophy, we must now reformulate our goals and aspirations for the next five years. The
prospects are bright, but the trajectory is different than previously envisioned. Despite the shift of emphasis embodied in our aggressive move into the philosophy of language, some goals remain the same as in our previous plan, because part of our contribution to the character of the Davis campus depends on supporting a variety of strengths and traditions on the campus. Our ethical, political theory and law group, for example, has historically had ties to both the Law and Medical Schools. Given the current impetus on the campus to research on stem cells, nanotechnology, genetically-modified foods, global warming, invasive species, and other issues where science and society meet, the need for normative consultation and collaboration is an obvious one. The Dean of the Medical School has said that she believes an important component of stem cell research ought to focus on the ethical issues involved. Other links, through questions about evolutionary psychology, the evolution of morality, and the moral status of non-human and endangered species, connect the Normative group and the Department’s group in the Philosophy of Biology.

Our history since the last plan is best described in three phases: (1) Loss phase: senior losses in 2004-05 that put our whole program at risk of collapse, (2) Recovery phase: an aggressive recovery in 2005-06 supported by Dean Sheffrin to hire four assistant professors (philosophy of language (2), metaphysics (1), and mind (1)), two associate professors (history of ancient philosophy, philosophy of biology), and two full professors (epistemology, philosophy of language), and (3) Reconfiguration phase: the current searches 2007-08 leading to five senior offers which will establish areas of niche strength and delimit areas needing modest future investment to complete our growth to a mature, stable, and excellent department of philosophy.

This new academic plan envisions, over the next five to eight years, two further phases, regardless of whether we plan for zero growth in the next several years or modest growth: (4) consolidation and (5) completion of the rebuilding. If we are successful in our current hiring, phase 4 will involve the integration of the reconfigured faculty, tweaking of the recently revised graduate curriculum, revision of the undergraduate curriculum to reflect our recent changes of scholarly emphasis, and strategic hiring within the limits of zero growth (due to retirements and replacements) or modest growth. In broad outline, our goals are consistent with the 2004 plan: build to strengths and cover the gap in history of philosophy.

Following the consolidation phase would be phase 5, completion of rebuilding, in which we again grow modestly to a “mature” size (hopefully in a better budget climate than we anticipate for phase 4). Our mature size will be a size which is stable to the loss of an individual faculty member in a key area or for which another “raid” would not push us to the brink of disaster—a size which affords sufficient depth in our chosen areas of niche specialization and curriculum offerings that we have a strong chance of becoming a great philosophy department, one which is securely in the top twenty programs overall, highly ranked in each of our niche specializations, and which attracts the best graduate students nationwide.

Upon James Griesemer’s becoming Chair (7/1/05), Dean Sheffrin set our target mature size as 15-16 FTE. Chair Griesemer has steadfastly argued that 17-18 is minimal for a mature size competitive with top-20 departments. (The 2004 academic plan argued 18-19 is an appropriate target size.) On a zero growth model, phase 4 will tell whether Dean Sheffrin or Chair Griesemer is right. Further retention challenges and consequent continued threats of declining rankings and curriculum delivery challenges due to continued faculty losses will provide evidence that 15 FTE is not a sustainable minimum. On a modest growth model (1 to 2 new FTE in the next five years), phase 4 would permit us to complete the rebuilding of niche strength in ethics and in philosophy of science or to consolidate areas now minimally covered such as philosophy of mind and history of philosophy, or some combination of these. The Davis department has a long tradition of excellent faculty hires who combine several analytic specialties or one of these with history of philosophy. We
cannot foretell what opportunities there may be to hire faculty who combine interests in ways that would afford a maximally efficient rebuilding (e.g. a “mind & science” hire, or a “history & ethics” hire). We cannot complete all of the above-stated goals as independent efforts under the modest growth model of 1-2 new FTE in the next 5 years. (To reach beyond minimal mature size in order to be competitive with top departments in depth of core areas, we will require 3-4 new FTE, beyond the scope of “modest growth” as defined for this planning exercise.) Our strategy must remain maximally flexible, however, if we are to reach our goals with modest new resources. With zero growth, we will remain at some risk for the foreseeable future.

A key premise of our academic plan for 2009-2014, based on the experience of the last five years, is that the future is wildly unpredictable. No one foresaw the dramatic changes of fortune (both bad and good) that befell the department shortly after the last academic plan was completed. We conclude from this that a plan which merely orders or prioritizes the next series of a small number of hires is highly likely to become irrelevant soon after the ink is dry. What we offer here is a strategic vision, with tactical proposals to be made in light of the most current information available at the time. Deep budget cuts loom and the outcome of our current rebuilding phase is yet to be determined.

We remain committed to the goal of being recognized as a great philosophy department, ranking among the top 20 departments, but with a new configuration of analytic specialties anchored in philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and ethics. A feature of emerging distinction for our program is a broad appreciation of the sciences in the way we approach core philosophical problems, e.g. of the significance of relativity theory, quantum mechanics and contemporary biology in metaphysics and philosophy of science, of theoretical and empirical linguistics in philosophy of language, and of contemporary cognitive science and psychology in philosophy of mind. We view the interplay of theoretical aspects of normative philosophy (metaethics, legal and political theory, and normative principles) with other core areas of philosophy (mind, science, language, knowledge, metaphysics) as well as interaction with practical ethical problems to be fundamental to the pursuit of normative philosophy. We seek diverse faculty who bridge traditional core areas and history of philosophy in ways that make for an interactive and cooperative group of scholars and who create a collegial, collaborative environment for faculty and students.

It is our view that being a first-rate department in a few areas of niche strength is a stepping stone to becoming a great department overall, as recent cases show, notably the rise of Rutgers in the 1980s and 90s to the top five. Now that our rebuilding efforts are coming to fruition, our approach to the next five years (assuming success with our current senior offers) will be to consolidate our gains with another hire in ethics (anticipating the retirement of Distinguished Professor Gerald Dworkin) and with modest growth to remedy our continuing gap in history of philosophy to sustain a rich and vital teaching program, and to bring philosophy of science back to strength and prominence after the retirement of Paul Teller. Finally, we seek to consolidate our rebuilding efforts in ways to insure that junior faculty in the analytic specialties (especially metaphysics and mind) have appropriate senior mentors either in their field or closely allied fields to facilitate the long-term development of the faculty and to support our goal of improving gender diversity of the faculty.

Zero net growth cannot achieve all four of these goals, but negative impacts could be mitigated through continued careful attention to replacements and success in retentions. Modest growth in the next five years could achieve one or two of these goals but not all four, unless we are lucky enough to find just the right combinations of interests and accomplishments in carefully crafted searches, as we have in the case of several of our current candidates. We refrain from prioritizing these goals because all are important to our vision of a great, if smaller than typical, top-twenty
department and because new hires this year may lead to discussions about priorities next year that would make any decisions we make today obsolete.

**Curriculum Development**

We recently put in place substantially revised graduate program requirements (approved by Graduate Council for 2007-08 academic year). Over the next five years, we expect to make minor adjustments to reflect the completion of our rebuilding and reconfiguration of the faculty. New realities include increased pressure on teaching the history of philosophy due to declining faculty representation and new opportunities to differentiate the graduate offerings based on recent and ongoing hiring in several specialties.

TPPRC review of the undergraduate teaching program was postponed two years ago due to our need to concentrate fully on faculty recruitment, but with the conclusion of our faculty rebuilding effort, the undergraduate program is due for formal review and, most likely, revision in light of changes in faculty composition and expertise.

**Resources Available**

Philosophy Department faculty growth needs are, roughly speaking, consistent with the expectation of no Divisional growth in the next 2-3 years and modest growth for the remainder of the 5-year period of this planning exercise. The greatest resource pressures are expected to rest on support for graduate students (and possibly costs of retention if we are unlucky). With an increased faculty size, we now have the opportunity to grow the graduate program, which has been as undersized as the faculty has been to achieve our goals. Our typical entering classes of 4 new graduate students per year should be increased to about 6 in order to create a vibrant cohort of graduate students, serve the increased and diversified faculty interests, and permit undergraduate enrollments to grow. We continue to pass up admission of some of the strongest graduate students because they are foreign nationals and our small block grant is insufficient to support even a single international student.

We do not expect significant (if any) increases in block grant funds or supplemental instructional funds to support an increase in our graduate program size within the scope of this academic plan, so we anticipate increasing our efforts to seek extramural funding through training grants in the very few areas where these are open to us (e.g. philosophy of science through NSF) and through collaborations with other campus units which have or can generate such funds where appropriate (e.g., NSF REACH and NANOTECH IGERTs, which both include Philosophy faculty involvement). We intend to work with the new Divisional Dean to explore fund-raising at department- as well as Division-level that might lead to enhanced support for the graduate program.

**Methodologies for Assessment of Success**

Our main tools for assessment of our success are: ranking of the department and specialties in “The Philosophical Gourmet” reputational survey (http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/); recruitment success, placement record and time to degree data for graduate students; and number of majors, degrees conferred, and undergraduate student credit hour data. The discipline of philosophy has never been well-represented in national studies, such as by the NRC, but we will scrutinize what measures these can provide to establish trends in our performance in the upcoming 5-year period compared to the last two.
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GOALS

The Department of Political Science at UC Davis aspires to excellence in its research and teaching by building an intellectual community dedicated to advancing and communicating knowledge regarding politics. Our goal is to foster both theory driven, path-breaking research, as well as outstanding graduate and undergraduate instruction. Important markers of our progress toward these goals include the success of our undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, the productivity of colleagues' research programs, and the evaluation of the Department by peers at other highly ranked Ph.D. departments.

To achieve excellence, we emphasize two fundamental values that drive our efforts to distinguish the department from many of its peers:

- **Collaboration.** A collaborative approach to our research and teaching offers important advantages in our efforts to improve and distinguish the department. Working in teams within the department, and/or with colleagues in other disciplines and universities allows us to expand the scope and methodological sophistication of our research. Collaboration also facilitates involving graduate and undergraduate students in faculty research activities, which greatly enriches the learning experience. A collaborative approach to graduate education better prepares students to compete for positions at leading research universities; in the undergraduate curriculum collaboration exploits the inherent strengths of a research university.

- **Methodological and Analytical Sophistication.** We seek to build the methodological and analytical sophistication of the faculty to inform our research and teaching. Both graduate and undergraduate students must be conversant with appropriate analytical and methodological tools in order to understand, evaluate, and contribute to the literature and to be intelligent consumers of social-scientific research as informed citizens. We do not impose any methodological orthodoxy on faculty research or on our definition of excellence in research, but we do recognize the importance of investing in appropriate quantitative and mathematical skills in building the faculty and the curriculum, especially at the graduate level.
SUBFIELD ORGANIZATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Faculty in the department affiliate with at least one of the traditional subfields in the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Research Methods. Graduate and undergraduate curricula and course requirements reflect this sub-field orientation, and many of the fundamental questions that motivate our research, such as the impact of democratic institutions on political behavior, problems related to the representation of citizens’ political interests, and the sources of violent conflict in international politics, have their roots in these subfields.

Despite the importance of the traditional subfields, our strategy for breaking into the top tier involves capitalizing on our distinctiveness among leading PhD programs by recognizing that the traditional organization around subfields can impede the goals of collaboration and methodological sophistication discussed above. We further these values by the emphasis we place upon thematic interests that link faculty members’ research and teaching by cutting across the traditional subfield barriers. This has been especially facilitated at Davis by building the Comparative Politics subfield around broad substantive, theoretical and methodological concerns in common with those who study American Politics and International Relations. Comparative Politics faculties have traditionally been built on an area-studies model, which emphasizes geographic areas of the world with specialists in Western Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin American politics, etc. This approach typically reinforces and deepens subfield barriers because area specialists tend not to draw upon sophisticated analytical and theoretical approaches developed in other fields. The Davis Comparative faculty is schooled in the theoretical and methodological approaches that have emerged to address core questions in the discipline, rather than specializing primarily on the politics of particular regions or countries.

To capitalize on the permeability of the traditional subfields at Davis, we have emphasized thematic interests in faculty hiring and in the department’s organization that bridge the subfields and foster greater collaboration among faculty and students. Three thematic areas tie together many of the faculty’s interests:

- **Institutional Analysis.** Much of the most prominent and sophisticated work in American, Comparative, and International Relations is focused on understanding how institutions evolve in response to individual incentives, strategies and choices, and how institutions shape the performance of political and economic systems. This concern is found within “developed” democratic contexts as well as in processes of democratization and globalization that define some of the most important and dramatic political issues of our time.

  Research in this area examines many different political institutions in a variety of contexts, including institutions that aggregate preferences to achieve social choices (legislatures, electoral systems, courts), and those in which the preferences and skills of particular individuals (such as chief executives) carry great weight and are organized hierarchically. Work on these problems has taken place primarily within the traditional
areas of American and Comparative Politics. Scholars in International Relations study the role of domestic political arrangements and international institutions on the initiation, resolution, and the costs of inter- and intra-state conflict. The study of institutions is central to understanding regional and multilateral trade arrangements, international financial organizations, and questions of domestic political strategy and economic performance in a global economy.

Comparative faculty members share an interest in the generation of theoretical models and the empirical analysis of the implications of those models. These interests are also found among American Politics and International Relations scholars, and are reflected in the National Science Foundation’s Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM) program.

• **Micro-Politics and Experimental Research.** The micro-politics group focuses on the empirical and theoretical study of individual political attitudes, perceptions, and behavior, including how they affect and are affected by social, geographic, and institutional contexts. It is organized around an assumption of methodological individualism that treats the individual as the primary (though not exclusive) unit of theoretical and empirical analysis. A distinctive aspect of the Davis group is an emphasis upon laboratory experiments organized around The Omnibus Project (TOP), which consists of separate experimental modules combined administratively into cohesive multi-investigator studies. Faculty members in the micro group also conduct non- and quasi-experimental research using a variety of other techniques including sample surveys and aggregate election-return data.

These studies have involved faculty and graduate students from all subfields within the department, and include collaborations with colleagues in other departments. The boundaries between the micro-politics group and other areas of concentration in the department are easily bridged because of the prominence of micro-level theories in the study of institutions and conflict processes. These links, in turn, produce opportunities for collaborative research and teaching opportunities at all levels of the department. Graduate students have designed and carried out their own experiments, and several faculty members have introduced micro-based experimental and non-experimental research activities into the undergraduate teaching so that students undertake their own research projects. With our upcoming move to Kerr Hall, we will have space to support an enhanced experimental research facility and build a distinctive center of experimental research in political science.

• **Conflict Processes.** Conflict is a clash of values, goals, or interests that involves or has the potential to involve violence. As such, conflict is one of the key organizing concepts in political science, with clear implications for the other social sciences and for many problems outside the social sciences. The faculty in this group studies intra- and inter-state conflict and the intersection between the two. Faculty and graduate student research also focuses on violence from non-state actors, low-level disputes, the impact of war on domestic politics, and the systemic causes and consequences of conflict. A
significant aspect of our research interests concern the management and resolution of conflict as well as its origins and effects.

The Davis conflict faculty stands out among UC departments in its emphasis on quantitative techniques. Its substantive concerns include post-Cold War issues such as terrorism, regime type and war, and ethnic conflict. Its members generate and test theory and explore the policy implications of academic research. This group aspires to create an interdisciplinary center to explore the political, economic, and societal sources and consequences of conflict. The center would sponsor speakers, facilitate grant applications, house visiting scholars, and coordinate research activities within the department and with colleagues in cognate disciplines. Again, the move to Kerr Hall gives us the flexibility to support these activities.

Research on conflict processes extends beyond the political science faculty linking political science to other disciplines on campus. Historians, sociologists, psychologists, economists, and even physicists and mathematicians engage in understanding both abstract and actual conflicts among individuals, organizations, social groups, states, and international institutions. Because many of these conflicts are political, members of our department coordinate and provide intellectual leadership for scholarly activity on conflict processes at the university. Similar interdisciplinary research centers dealing with conflict processes (e.g., Center for Security and Cooperation at Stanford, the Mershon Center at Ohio State, IGCC at UCSD, Center for International Affairs at Harvard) are organized around a nucleus of political scientists.

THE CASE FOR ADDITIONAL FACULTY FTE

Our request for additional faculty positions is based upon the demand for the departmental courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, our record in hiring faculty who have enhanced the teaching and research excellence of the department, our success in improving the curriculum, and a comparative analysis of the investment required to enable us to break into the top tier of political science departments nationally.

- Undergraduate Course Demands. The total count of majors in Political Science and International Relations in the fall of 2006 was 167 percent of the count in the fall of 1997 -- 1,404 vs. 841. During the 2005-2006 academic year, Political Science graduated 356 majors and International Relations graduated 262, for a combined graduation total that was one of the very highest on the campus. Student credit hours (SCH) per ladder faculty members in Political Science was 301 in 2006-2007 as compared to 262 for the Division as a whole. Our student credit hours have declined slightly in recent years. This is a reflection of our expanded graduate program and a revised graduate curriculum that involves an increased number of core graduate seminars. These graduate program changes have resulted in sunk costs that will not increase in the years ahead, and hence we expect to see continued gains in our student credit hour production per faculty as we add new faculty.
Our expanded graduate program is crucial both to the quality of our undergraduate instruction, as well as to student credit hour production. In order to maintain high undergraduate educational standards, we are re-emphasizing undergraduate seminars in the curriculum, while offsetting the effects on student credit hour production with marginal increases in the size of our upper level undergraduate lectures. Our ability to pursue these strategies depends on growth both in the number of faculty and in the number of graduate students.

- **Graduate Program.** The graduate program has grown substantially in recent years in response to the growth in numbers and excellence of the faculty and our efforts to mount an aggressive national recruitment effort. The number of students in our program has increased about 50% since 2001. Graduate applications have increased by more than three-fold since 2001, with an equally dramatic increase in the number of out-of-state (domestic) applicants from top-flight undergraduate institutions. As a result, we have been in the unusual position of recruiting larger classes of graduate students (from an entering classes of 6-9 students to about 15 students) while at the same time being able increase the quality of students we attract to Davis (see Appendix for admissions statistics). Our aim is to continue to increase the number of graduate students in the program, although at a more modest rate, while at the same time continuing to improve the quality of the students.

Our success in training students while they are in our graduate program is evident in several ways. Our students have been unusually successful in publishing while in graduate school, both on their own or with fellow graduate students or in collaboration with faculty members. Among the accomplishments of our students-- *over the past four years and while they were enrolled in the program*:

- 26 articles in peer-reviewed journals, including 4 articles in top-tier generalist journals and a similar number in top-tier subfield journals
- 5 best paper awards from national professional associations or organized sections of those associations
- A number of national and international fellowships, including a NSF Dissertation Grant, a Guggenheim Dissertation Fellowship, a Fulbright Fellowship, a Chateaubriand Fellowship, a UC Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation Dissertation (IGCC) Fellowship, and a fellowship in the Harvard Institute for Quantitative Social Science
- 3 best dissertation awards from national professional organizations

Finally, our placement record has improved along with the improvement in the quality of the program. Since 2000, we have placed 30 students in tenure-track academic positions, out of 32 students who have graduated during that period. These placements include positions in a variety of types of university, but increasingly they have largely been at R1 universities, including a number of prestigious programs with established reputations, such as University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of California-
Irvine, and Texas A&M University, among others. (See Appendix for list of placements.)

In order to continue the growth and increasing excellence of our graduate program, we need to continue to invest resources, including through faculty recruitment and retention.

- **Record of Hiring Excellent Faculty.** As mentioned, we have hired 17 new faculty members spread across all the subfields in the department since 2000. These include 9 at the Assistant/ABD stage, 5 Associate Professors, and 3 Professors. We have been successful in hiring high quality candidates, and a clear indicator of their quality is the fact that we have recently experienced significant market pressure to retain these newly hired colleagues. In some instances we have been successful – retaining colleagues with opportunities to move to prestigious institutions – but in five instances we have lost valuable colleagues (four of whom were recent hires) to other high quality institutions—Washington University, UC San Diego, and Vanderbilt.

We are very proud of the junior faculty we have recruited – they show extraordinary promise to make substantial impacts on the discipline and to develop into outstanding classroom teachers. They have already started to make their mark and we are confident their contributions will be instrumental in propelling us into the first rank of departments nationally.

Several simple indicators of the career research accomplishments of the 13 faculty recruited since 2000 who remain on the faculty are:

- 21 books;
- 19 National Science Foundation grants;
- 73 top-tier journal publications.

In short, these new faculty augmented the highly distinguished existing faculty to produce rapid gains in overall quality. One indicator of this progress is our overall improvement in the *US News* national rankings of PhD departments: 39 in 2000; 34 in 2002; and 29 in 2005. (We are at 16 among the public universities in the 2005 ratings.)

- **Curricular Revisions.** In addition to successfully recruiting faculty and graduate students, we have undertaken top-to-bottom reforms of our curricula to foster faculty-student collaboration and increase the methodological sophistication of our students. For example, we have enhanced the methods course sequence at the graduate level and increased the number and level of required and optional graduate courses in that area. We have also instituted an undergraduate required methods course (POL 51) to supplement the required statistics course. By invigorating the honors program and instituting undergraduate seminars and research-practicum offerings, we have greatly expanded the research experience and opportunities to participate in faculty research for our undergraduates.
National Comparison with Other Departments. Size matters in determining the national rankings of Ph.D. departments. The Davis department will have 26 faculty in the 2008-9 academic year. The subfield distribution of our faculty is broadly consistent with top-ten departments, but as the outside evaluator in our most recent graduate PRC process noted, it is difficult to see how we can break into the top tier of programs nationally if we remain at our current size, which is small compared with the top ten. The average top-ten department has 45 FTE faculty. Only two top-ten departments are in the 30s: Chicago (30) and Stanford (36). Three UC campuses are in the top ten: UCSD with 42 faculty members, Berkeley with 54, and UCLA with 50. Among all the public universities in the top 20, the average size is approximately 45 faculty members. Finally, most departments in the top 20 do not experience demand for their undergraduate courses as large as ours.

We do not aspire to compete based on building a faculty of 40-45 members. Departments of that size have difficulties we do not wish for, many of which work directly against our explicit aspirations, especially a collaborative and collegial intellectual community. However, it is clear that we cannot hope to produce the research visibility and numbers of graduate students on the PhD market sufficient to enter the top tier without significant growth in the next stage of the department’s development. It is also clear that the undergraduate teaching demands in both the Political Science and International Relations undergraduate majors warrant substantial new faculty investment.

**REQUESTED NEW FTE INVESTMENT**

Our current FTE is 31 faculty members, which includes a newly allocated position dedicated to the International Relations Program, and we expect to have at least 26 colleagues on our faculty roster in 2008-9. We hired three new faculty members during the 2007-2008 academic year, with two colleagues lost to outside offers. In addition to filling out our faculty roster to the full FTE complement of 31, we are requesting an expansion of our FTE to 35 over the longer term.

Faculty retirements are likely to occur during this period, and if we assume two faculty retirements, an increase of our active faculty roster to 31 would require that we conduct a minimum of 7 successful recruitments over the next 5 years. Assuming growth consistent with this plan, faculty recruitments to replace retiring faculty members should remain within the general subfield, subject to a careful assessment of departmental needs.

In filling new positions, we will follow several principles and strategic guidelines, listed in no particular order:

- Define positions as broadly as possible to maximize our options in a competitive market, and to take advantage of larger candidate pools in searching for colleagues whose research and teaching contribute to the Department.
• Continue to hire faculty who bring sophisticated analytical and methodological skills to bear on significant substantive problems. This means recruiting faculty members whose research interests have the potential to bridge traditional subfield boundaries by enhancing the themes of micro-political research, conflict processes, and institutional analysis.

• Add to the diversity of the faculty. The gender and ethnic diversity of the faculty adds to our excellence by enhancing faculty retention and graduate student recruitment, and by enriching the pedagogical effectiveness and intellectual environment of the department. Diversity considerations are an ongoing priority in our recruitment activities.

• Make a concerted effort to build on our strength in institutional analysis. Recruitments emphasizing institutional approaches could easily be spread across the major traditional subfields and further elevate the methodological sophistication of the faculty.

The following list identifies the major needs that must be met in the next round of recruitments. Our goal is to hire individuals who bridge the various subfields and overlapping interests within the department. The most attractive candidates, therefore, will be those who can help us meet more than one of our needs.

First tier hires. We divide our proposed hiring plan into two tiers – a first tier to bring our faculty roster up to the level of our current 31 FTE, and a second tier to bring our faculty to the proposed target of 35 FTE. As part of the first tier hiring process, we will make a special effort to hire a candidate with advanced formal modeling skills as part of one or more of the searches listed below. We adopt this strategy because our goal is to add a formal theorist whose work is substantively anchored in a particular area. If this strategy is unsuccessful, we will adjust the tier two strategy accordingly.

1. One position in American Politics, with expertise in Micro-Politics. We have pressing needs in our curriculum with respect to political psychology, public opinion, and political methodology, as well as in the Department's experimental program. The new position would ideally be filled with a scholar who specializes either in social and political cognition, or in political economy approaches to the study of individual behavior. We would also consider candidates with complementary interests in formal theory and experimental methods.

2. One position in Comparative Politics, with emphasis on political development, broadly conceived. We are particularly interested in issues of democratization, institutional design and consolidation, and political competition in developing states. Successful candidates will have strong analytic skills. While we do not wish to impose a particular geographic specialization, candidates with expertise in the politics of Latin America might be especially attractive.
3. *One position in Political Methodology*, with expertise in advanced statistical applications. The Department needs additional staffing to service undergraduate and graduate teaching needs in methods. We are particularly interested in candidates who employ one or more of the following: Bayesian statistics, time series, and measurement models.

4. *Two positions in International Relations, one of which will overlap with Comparative Politics*. We are particularly interested in scholars studying international institutions, substate actors, ethnic conflict, civil wars, the interrelations between domestic and international conflict, international political economy, and comparative political economy. At least one of these positions will be defined in a way that creates the potential to fill our needs in advanced formal modeling.

The Department's most pressing short term needs lie in Political Methodology and International Relations. *Our proposal for AY2008-09 is to recruit at least one of the two International Relations positions, as well as to finish the open recruitment in Political Methodology from AY2007-8.* If these recruitments are successful, and if no one retires in the meantime, we would achieve 28 FTE – the Department's FTE at the time of our last planning document in AY2004-05.

**Second tier hires.** These second tier hires represent an increase in our FTE from the current level of 31 to the proposed target of 35 FTE. These descriptions assume that we have succeeded in hiring a formal theorist as part of the tier one process. If we have not succeeded in that effort, we will redefine these positions to include a position dedicated to a formal theory search.

1. *One position in Political Institutions.* This position would be most likely to fall within the field of American politics, but it might alternatively fall within comparative politics. We are particularly interested in expertise within the general areas of bureaucracies, legislatures, and courts. The specifics of the position would depend on the results of the tier one hiring results, but our ongoing need for expertise in formal modeling might be met by this position.

2. *One position in Conflict Processes.* This recruitment would contribute strongly to the institutional focus of the department by adding a colleague who studies institutional constraints on conflict in the international system. Candidates at the intersection between Comparative Politics and International Relations could focus on interstate conflict, ethnic conflict, revolution and civil war, or political economy.

3. *One position in Micro-Politics.* This position would most likely be in the general area of political psychology and experimental methods. The position could be in virtually any of the traditional subfields, and the person who occupies the position would complement and extend the Department's existing strengths in experimental methods. Possible areas of expertise would include the cognitive sciences, computational models, genetics and heritability, physiological bases of political orientations, as well as formal theory.
4. One position in Political Theory. This is an area where demand for our courses is high at the undergraduate and graduate levels. An additional theory recruitment would enable us to create a nationally visible theory program in a subfield where relatively few strong programs exist. The normative theory group is well integrated with the rest of the department, and we will define this position to further this integration by linking the recruitment firmly to at least one of the cross-subfield foci. For example, the position could be linked to the institutional focus by hiring a specialist in American political thought and development, or, more broadly, in the development of the institutions of the modern state.

CONCLUSION

The Department of Political Science has made rapid and substantial progress toward its goal of building a highly ranked department with distinctive national profile that emphasizes excellence in both teaching and research. Recent hiring has brought to Davis an active, visible, and promising cohort to complement the considerable strengths of the faculty already in place. We have tied excellence in traditional subfields of political science to a departmental emphasis on integrative themes that exploit areas of common interest across the barriers that often arise between subfields. These integrative initiatives foster collaboration between students and faculty, both within and beyond the department and the campus.

An excellent example is in the emphasis on experimentation that has emerged as part of the micro-politics group in the department. This initiative has involved faculty and students in all other subfields, including conflict processes, institutional analysis, comparative politics, research methods, and political theory. Experimental methods, married to computer technology have enjoyed new prominence in political science, and the Davis department can legitimately aspire to be one of a handful of centers of excellence in the discipline.

Other initiatives to attract outside resources to supplement investments contemplated or in place are also underway, including an interdisciplinary center devoted to conflict studies. Political Science is a natural home for such a center, which would have strong interdisciplinary connections to scholars in other social sciences, the humanities, and the natural sciences. We expect to be in Kerr Hall for the 2009-2010 academic year, an opportunity we seized to advance our long-range goals. Kerr will give us the space we need to develop first-class computer and laboratory facilities for research and teaching, as well as to create an environment that supports student-faculty collaboration. We see the next five years as a critical period, and we anticipate making substantial progress toward meeting our goals.
Appendix: Statistics on Graduate Program

Graduate Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Sex (M/F)</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Undergrad GPA (avg.)</th>
<th>Undergrad GPA Range</th>
<th>Graduate GPA (avg.)</th>
<th>Avg. GRE (V/Q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18 (45%)</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.7 – 4.0</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>590 / 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>5 (28%)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.8 – 4.0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>600 / 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28 (32%)</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.7 – 4.0</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>600 / 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26 (28%)</td>
<td>13/12</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.8 – 3.9</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>640 / 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25 (26%)</td>
<td>15/10</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.7 – 4.0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>650 / 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.9 – 4.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>640 / 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>28 (21%)</td>
<td>16/12</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.0 – 3.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>640 / 730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: as of March 11, 2008, we have 7 admitted students who have already accepted our offer of admissions for Fall 2008, including 3 minority students. We expect about 14 students to enter.
Graduate Student Placements

2008

Leo Blanken  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Skyler Cranmer  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Gregory Love  
University of Mississippi  
Molly M. Melin  
Loyola University Chicago  
Jennifer Ramos  
Loyola Marymount University

2007

Olga Bogatyrenko  
SUNY, Fredonia  
Ryan Dudley  
California Maritime Academy  
Sarah Fulton  
Texas A&M University  
V. Gregg Garbesi  
United States Naval Academy  
Dana Zartner-Falstrom  
Tulane University

2006

Daniel Brunstetter  
University of California, Irvine

2005

Matthew Carlson  
University of Vermont  
Ryan Claassen  
Kent State University  
Michael Koch  
Texas A&M University  
Michael Rocca  
University of New Mexico  
Patricia Sullivan  
University of Georgia

2004

Cynthia Boaz  
SUNY, Brockport

2003

Christian Erickson  
Roosevelt University  
Tiffany Jones  
University of Dallas  
Kimberly L. Nalder  
California State University, Sacramento

2002

Bethany Barratt  
Roosevelt University  
Teena Gabrielson  
Southwestern University  
John J. Kennedy  
University of Kansas
2001

Richard Andres                School of Advanced Airpower Studies
Thomas G. Hansford           University of South Carolina
Stephen R. Routh             California State University, Stanislaus
Lisa Sharlach                University of Alabama

2000

Craig Collins                California State University, Hayward
David Damore                 University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Matthew Hoddie               Texas A&M University
Psychology: The Field and Our Department

The Field of Psychology. Psychology is fundamentally important to all modern universities. Because of its location at the intersection of the biological and social sciences and its centrality to literary and cultural studies, psychology captures the interest of more undergraduates than any other discipline. It tackles some of the longest standing and most compelling sets of intellectual and personal puzzles in philosophy and religion, including the relations among mind, brain, and body. Discoveries and conceptual developments in psychological science influence the philosophy of mind, conceptions of ethics, and the creative arts.

Our Department. For the past decade, one of our major stated goals was to become a “Top 20” Department of Psychology, and we have made remarkable progress in establishing an extremely strong national reputation as a top department. The department is now larger than ever, better known, better supported by large extramural grants, and better able to attract top doctoral students (based on more than 300 applications per year). We have acquired the best faculty members on the market, in each case competing successfully with other major universities’ offers. Despite our heavy emphasis on research excellence in the hiring process, all of our new faculty members have also proven to be very effective and popular teachers. This is important, because we are now the largest department, with the largest major, teaching the largest number of undergraduate students in the Social Sciences. Indeed, we have the largest single-department major on the entire UC Davis campus. We have greatly increased our strength by participating with faculty members from other departments in graduate groups focusing on neuroscience, human development, and animal behavior. We have added excellent faculty members from around campus to our own psychology graduate group, and several now play important roles in mentoring and supporting our doctoral students, choosing new graduate students to enter the doctoral program, and consulting with us on faculty hires and other departmental matters.

During the past several years, our hiring efforts have been especially focused on cognitive psychology and cognitive and affective neuroscience, which are exciting growth areas around the world, due in large part to recent, revolutionary developments in neuroimaging technology. The brain is no longer a mysterious and impenetrable “black box,” but instead is open to investigation while human beings and other animals perceive, think, make decisions, express wishes and emotions, and act. Our ability to attract the best young faculty members in areas related to mind and brain has been due in part to the university’s association with a well-established Primate Research Center and the newer Center for Neuroscience, the M.I.N.D. Institute (for research on developmental disorders), and the Center for Mind and Brain. We are also beneficiaries of the university’s expanded commitment to building a first-rate Imaging Center in Sacramento. Our hiring efforts have benefited from the university’s superb biology departments, medical school, and veterinary school. We have also made stellar faculty hires in social/personality, developmental, and quantitative psychology, and all areas of our department are becoming stronger with every additional hire. And we have, thankfully, been well treated by our dean when
it comes to start-up packages for young scientists. As our department becomes more methodologically and technologically sophisticated, the cost of new hires increases but so do the long-term payoffs in intellectual quality, international reputation, and extramural grant support.

The excellence of our department can be gauged by many indicators, including number and quality of publications, number and size of extramural research grants, awards granted for particular books and articles, journal editorships and editorial board memberships, and awards to individual faculty members. In recent years, these awards have included major scientific and professional distinguished contribution awards from the American Psychological Association and other professional societies to ten different faculty members and a MacArthur “genius” award to one. Two of our faculty members have won the coveted UC Davis Prize for Teaching and Research, and several have won other local and national teaching and mentoring awards. Our faculty members have served as officers, including president, of several major professional organizations, and several are serving as editor or associate editor of the field’s top journals. Several have held prestigious faculty positions at universities in other countries. We have also held major administrative roles in the university and at various research centers. Since the faculty is getting larger, better, and more productive, the number of prizes and other forms of national and international recognition can be expected to keep growing.

As we have improved our grant support and scientific productivity, we have also maintained and invigorated our commitment to excellent graduate and undergraduate education. Our curriculum is continuously being reviewed and improved so that we offer the highest quality educational opportunities to our students. The delivery of quality instruction is a constant challenge because of the large numbers of undergraduate majors (currently more than 2000), and the even larger number of students taking our classes as requirements or electives for majors in other departments. Yet our faculty continue to average well above 4.0 on the 5-point rating scales used by students to characterize the quality of instruction and courses they encounter in our department. The quality of our graduate students has steadily increased over the past several years and the time to degree has decreased. Our graduates are getting excellent jobs following graduation. The improvements in our graduate program have occurred despite severe limitations placed on us by our inability to offer competitive financial aid packages. We have been able to survive despite institutional limitations because of applicants’ genuine enthusiasm for our research endeavors, the quality of our faculty, the morale of our current students, and funding provided by our research and training grants.

We recently underwent a review of the Graduate Program in Psychology, in connection with which we developed a strategic plan that would serve as the blueprint for departmental goals during the next 5 to 7 years. The current academic plan for the Department of Psychology is for the academic years 2009 through 2014 and will draw on issues discussed in our departmental strategic plan. In the current plan, we highlight space and other needs and request the additional faculty hires needed to give us a boost into the Top 20 departments in our field.

Our plan must be considered in the context of the alterations of our faculty over the past few years. During just the past 2 or 3 years, we have been recruiting a very strong crop of new faculty members. But, we also have lost several outstanding junior faculty members (including Silvia Bunge and Jennie Beer). With the loss of at least 3 junior faculty members who were just coming into their own, we have fallen behind our expectations in terms of the number of faculty members we thought we would have at this point in time. Even more important than loss in terms
simply of numbers, the resignations of junior faculty (who recruited to other outstanding universities) represented a tremendous loss of individuals who were at the forefront of collaborations across areas of our department. As a result, we have a very strong need to complete projected hiring in our department, even as we try to consolidate emphases in our department that have been compromised by the resignations of several key faculty members.

**Cross-disciplinary focus.** The most prominent shift in programmatic emphasis within our department across the past decade is the growth of interdisciplinary approaches. With every year, we have seen increases in research involving intersections between the five areas of our department. Our five stated areas are (in alphabetical order): (a) Developmental, (b) Perception, Cognition, and Cognitive Neuroscience, (c) Psychobiology, (d) Quantitative, and (e) Social / Personality. Our department has always had rather permeable boundaries between the five content areas it covers, but the increase in cross-cutting research is notable. We currently have research applications that represent collaborations across two or more areas of the department for every area of the GPP: collaborations between psychobiology and quantitative, cognitive and developmental, social/personality and neuroscience, developmental and quantitative, etc. The cross-disciplinary focus is evident in the faculty hires we have made during the past several years. With each hire, we have sought to serve the needs of more than one subdiscipline – for example, by hiring quantitative experts whose substantive interests match those of other members of the department, or hiring neuroscientists, we have been careful to choose people whose substantive interests overlap with those of other members of the department while not being simply redundant with them. For example, we now have neuroscientists whose interests range from cognitive development in children and visual and auditory perception in adults to the hormonal bases of social and emotional bonding in various mammalian species and the neurological processes involved in shyness, emotionality, and emotion regulation.

Most importantly for our department, many of our cross-area collaborations are leading to research discoveries that are truly on the forefront of science, discoveries that only occur because of these cross-area collaborations. In this academic plan, we discuss several pressing issues that confront the department, such as the issue of space for the department as a whole. Then, we outline requests for several additional positions, each of which represents a request for a faculty member who would add strength in cross-cutting areas of research. As noted above, our five areas have always had quite permeable boundaries. With our new requests, we seek individuals who would fit the mold of collaborative researchers interested in drawing on two or more areas of psychology, supplementing our increasing focus on cross-cutting research.

**Issue #1: A New Building for the Department of Psychology**

At present, the Department of Psychology is spread among at least six locations, and four of these need to be consolidated into a single building on the UC Davis campus. The six locations are: (a) **Young Hall**, which contains the central departmental offices, houses all administrative functions, and contains office space for each departmental faculty member (although faculty members whose research space is in Locations (c) and (d) (below) must now share faculty offices in Young Hall); (b) the adjacent **Social Sciences Building**, which houses the research space of approximately 5 faculty members; (c) **The Center for Mind and Brain**, at 267 Cousteau Place, which houses the research facilities of over one-half of the faculty in the Perception, Cognition, and Cognitive Neuroscience (PCCN) area of our department; (d) **Developmental Psychology Research Space**, at 202 Cousteau Place, which contains research
offices and space for all but one of the members of the Developmental area of the department; (e) the **Center for Neuroscience** (with two faculty labs), on Research Park Drive; and (f) the **California National Primate Research Center** (with two faculty labs), at Hutchison and Road 98. Labs at these locations would not be incorporated into the new building, because they are already optimally situated.

The faculty research space at Cousteau Place is pleasant and well designed, and it is meeting the research needs of the faculty whose research offices and space are housed there. However, it is located about 2 miles (15 minutes) from Young Hall, and the physical distance makes it difficult for faculty located there and faculty located in Young Hall to interact productively and collaborate on a steady basis. Indeed, many faculty members do not come to Young Hall except when they are teaching. Many advantages of being in a graduate program or department (from attending colloquia to engaging in casual hallway conversations and participating in faculty meetings) – activities that bolster cross-area collaboration – are undermined. And, the distance between Cousteau Place and the department makes mentoring of graduate students difficult.

Thus, one very pressing need of the department is to consolidate offices and research space in a single building on campus, with the following stipulations: (a) **Consolidate space.** Consolidate faculty office and research space currently in (1) Young Hall, (2) the Social Sciences Building, (3) 267 Cousteau Place, and (4) 202 Cousteau Place into a single building on the main UC Davis campus. (b) **Leave certain labs in current locations.** Leave the research space for departmental faculty in the Center for Neuroscience and the California National Primate Research Center at their current locations, because these sites are optimal for the pursuit of the associated research activities. (c) **Ensure continued animal and other wet laboratory space.** Ensure sufficient space for the housing of animal laboratories and other wet lab requirements in the new departmental space. The Psychobiology area of our department maintains active animal laboratories and is highly visible around the country for its research. Maintaining animal and wet lab space in our department must be a major priority in planning for a move of the department to another location. (d) **Research space for all faculty members.** Ensure sufficient research laboratory space for all faculty members of the Department of Psychology. At present, some faculty members are getting by with less research space than is optimal. Sufficient research space for all departmental members would ensure optimal productivity for our department, which is already making a mark at the national and international levels.

### Issue #2: Reduction of Our Teaching Load

The teaching load for faculty members in the Department of Psychology is 4 courses per year. Our competitor universities – even within the UC system – have lower teaching loads, typically equating to 3 of our courses per year. (For example, at UC Santa Barbara – which is on the quarter system, as are we – the Department of Psychology has a load of three courses per year because it is part of the Life Sciences rather than the Social Sciences, but the psychology faculty members at UCSB do the same kinds of research that we do.) A reduction in our teaching load would increase the time and effort faculty members could place on their research and their mentoring of graduate students, and the mentoring of graduate students is one of the most important missions of our department.

The issue of lowered teaching load affects graduate student support as well. Some faculty members have decided not to pursue certain federal grants for the following reason: The grant
amounts are so low that the faculty member would have to choose between buying out of courses or funding one or more graduate students; the budget cap is not sufficient to allow them to do both. The faculty member would not have the time to do the research without buying out of courses, yet could not complete the research without the help of graduate RAs.

At present, faculty can buy out of up to 2 courses per year (or half of their teaching load) at a cost of $1/9$th of their annual salary per course (equal to one summer month per course). When they buy out of courses, the courses they forfeit are usually forced to be small graduate courses – precisely the ones that most benefit our graduate students. As a result, course buyouts harm course offerings in our graduate program, while having minimal impact on courses offered at the undergraduate level. If our teaching load were reduced to 3 courses per year, faculty members would (in all likelihood) be allowed to buy out of only a single course per year, rather than two. Because the faculty members would not have to buy out of the second course in order to reduce their actual teaching load to 2 courses per year, this would free up money in grant budgets to fund graduate RAs. Thus, the actual teaching by faculty would likely remain unchanged, but the money to fund students in the department would be increased.

**Issue #3: Most Crucial Personnel Needs: Three Critical Faculty Hires**

The Dean’s Office asked us to develop hiring plans under two scenarios, one being a slow-growth scenario and the other a more sizeable, but still modest growth. In developing our current plan, we portray these scenarios under two different headings. The heading for the current section identifies these three faculty positions as the most crucial additional hires we need to solidify our focus on cross-disciplinary collaborations. These are the faculty positions we would seek under the slow growth scenario. In a later section, we describe additional faculty positions that we regard as extremely important for our movement into the Top 20 departments in our field, and these would be additional faculty slots associated with more sizeable growth.

- **Modeling of Dynamic Systems.** Our Quantitative area emphasizes applied methods for the analysis of data resulting from experiments and correlational studies. However, the department needs an individual interested in complex systems, capturing the complexity of many questions we have in psychology. Possible areas are mathematical modeling and/or intensive longitudinal data, with a specific focus on complex systems modeling, neural networks, or nonlinear dynamical systems. In principle, any area of the department could benefit from this approach. Examples are cognitive research that uses brain imaging data with high density, psychophysiological data, research on human and animal interactions, etc. This person would buttress the Quantitative area of the department, but we seek a person who had clear and definite interests in work with researchers in other areas. Thus, the ideal candidate for this position would be a person who would buttress equally two or more areas of the department, even as certain of our faculty currently do (e.g., Ferrer – quantitative, developmental, and social/personality; Widaman – quantitative, developmental, cognitive).

- **Individual Differences in Emotion and Social Behavior.** We will seek individuals who conduct research on topics such as personality development; the cognitive/affective mechanisms underlying personality functioning; emotion, goals, and motivation; coping, adjustment, and health; and the neurobiology and/or genetics of personality. There is
growing evidence that individual differences in personality predict a wide range of important personal and societal outcomes, including occupational success, substance dependency, health problems and mortality, antisocial behavior and criminality, and the capacity to have successful and lasting romantic relationships. Consequently, research on personality processes and development is very well-funded by federal agencies and increasingly prominent in the scientific literature. Most notably, a number of high profile studies of “person-environment interactions” between genetically-based personality traits and environmental influences have been highlighted in national news and our profession. UC Davis has a long tradition as one of the top personality programs in the country but numerous retirements and resignations over the past several years threaten to undermine our status as a center for research in this area. This faculty position would strengthen our already very strong Social/Personality group, but would also develop ties to both the Psychobiology and Developmental areas.

- **Social/Affective Neuroscience.** The Department of Psychology currently has substantial and significant strength in Cognitive Neuroscience. In the broader field of Psychology, however, there has been an expansion in the area of Social/Affective Neuroscience in recent years, and the Department has lost significant expertise in this area in recent years. The growth of this area is reflected in several recent (within the past year) funding opportunities announced by the National Institutes of Health focusing on drug addiction, mental health, and the role of social and affective processes in immune function and physical health. This position might have a focus on animal model research and utilize molecular and cellular techniques to understand basic affective processes related to motivation, emotional expression, communication, affiliation, or conflict. But, such interests would likely lead to collaborative research with faculty in the department who are studying such processes at the behavioral level and by use of functional magnetic resonance imaging in humans and would bridge similar interests among faculty at the Center for Mind and Brain, the MIND Institute, the Department of Psychiatry in the School of Medicine, and the California National Primate Research Center.

**Issue #4: Additional Important Positions to Gain National Prominence**

As noted in a prior section, we need additional faculty hires (in addition to the preceding) if we are to move into the top echelon of departments across the country. In this section, we discuss several additional hires that might be generated under more sizeable, but still relative modest growth of our faculty across 2009 to 2014. The positions are described below in a random order; additional discussions by departmental faculty would be needed to resolve a rational ordering of requests for these positions. That is, we have taken the time to identify the types of faculty we need to take advantage of the current structure of the department. Given our cross-area collaborative structure, the ordering of requests for positions might need to be revised occasionally as the department grows and develops collaborative research arrangements.

- **Genetics of Behavior.** To date, the genomes for humans and a few other species have been published, opening up a huge set of new opportunities involving the ability to interrogate the entire genome of individuals through use of microarrays, cataloging and understanding the role of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in behavioral outcomes, and easily and cheaply quantifying gene expression through use of the
polymerase chain reaction (PCR). A few faculty members in the Department of Psychology are beginning to make use of genetic and genomic technology in their research, but the department has yet to forge a link with others on campus, such as the faculty of the new Genome and Biomedical Sciences Facility, who are expert in these areas. Recognizing the explosive growth in the areas of genetics and genomics, the department would like to search for a colleague whose principal research focus is on the genetics of social, affective, or cognitive processes, and who uses cutting edge techniques in molecular genetics, SNP analysis, microarrays, or proteomics in their research. Such an individual would be critical in establishing links between the areas within the Department of Psychology (Psychobiology, Developmental, and Social/Personality) and other programs on campus, which could include the Department of Anthropology, the Genome Center, and the Center of Excellence in Nutritional Genomics.

- **Dynamic Processes in Interpersonal Relationships.** For this position, we are seeking someone who studies psychological and structural features of interaction in interpersonal or dyadic relationships. For example, within the field, there is burgeoning interest in understanding phenomena such as the contribution of self-regulatory processes, affective processes, and cognitive framing and reasoning processes to the success of interpersonal relationships. This hire would provide links across various areas of our department, principally (but not limited to) Social/Personality and Developmental. Research on personal relationships, such as marriages, is fundamentally concerned with self, emotion, and personality. However, interpersonal processes also are a critical component of interactions among members of different groups and cultures and, thus, provide a critical level of analysis for understand stereotyping, prejudice and other minority issues. This hire also would provide a natural bridge to the department’s broader interests in self-regulation and emotion regulation, and would provide links to both the Center for Mind and Brain and the MIND Institute.

- **Memory, Cognition, and the Brain.** The Cognitive group has developed strengths in three core areas of cognition (i.e., memory, language, and attention). Each of these areas has achieved a critical mass of researchers necessary to support a vibrant research environment that ensures a strong international reputation and serves to promote funding and attract strong students. Dr. Neal Kroll was the senior member of the memory group studying memory distortion, meta-memory, mnemonic techniques, and semantic memory. His retirement leaves a significant gap in this area, in the department as a whole, and in various university organizations in which the cognitive study of memory plays a critical role (e.g., Center for Mind and Brain, the Center for Neuroscience, the Alzheimer’s Disease Center, etc). We are therefore requesting a position in this core area. This person would be a high-caliber, internationally-recognized cognitive psychologist or neuroscientist, broadly defined. Individuals studying memory or learning in normal and/or abnormal populations, using a variety of methods including behavioral, computational, electrophysiological, or neuroimaging methods would be especially encouraged to apply. Given Dr. Kroll’s interests in statistical matters, a person involved in computations models of memory and cognitive processes would also be an ideal candidate, strengthening the Cognitive group, but also forging ties with colleagues in the Quantitative area.
• **Cultural and Intergroup Effects on Information Processing.** A fundamental question for psychologists is how our perceptions, judgments, and behaviors are shaped by the presence of others. We would like to hire someone whose work examines how features of the broader social context influence how people process information and arrive at particular judgments and decisions within those contexts. We will seek individuals who conduct research on topics such as the role of group memberships on judgments of self-worth, the influence of affect on decision-making, and the effects of interracial contact on prejudice reduction. As mentioned previously, we would attempt to target this search toward individuals who study these topics in a multidisciplinary and/or multi-level fashion. For example, a person who studies interracial interactions using both traditional self-report measures and neurological measures or someone who examines both genetic and cultural bases of self-esteem would be ideal candidates. Such candidates would serve both the Social/Personality and Psychobiology areas, and might also establish collaborations with faculty in Developmental psychology.

• **Modeling Behavioral Phenomena using Semi-parametric, Nonparametric, and/or Small-sample Techniques.** Non-continuous and non-normal data are common in psychology. For example, psychological assessments often rely on ordinal rating scales with few categories. Distributions may be censored at one or both ends due to scaling choices or may depart from normality when populations are complex, such as when multiple populations have been sampled but population membership is unknown. To address these complications adequately, statistical models have become increasingly complex, relying on simultaneous estimation of measures based on different scales of measurement (e.g., combinations of continuous and categorical response data). New statistical approaches (e.g., mixture latent growth models) have been developed to handle combinations of continuous and categorical response data. An added problem in psychology is dealing with small samples. Small samples are common when data collection expenses are high (as in neuroimaging). An individual with expertise in these areas would contribute to our Quantitative, Psychobiology, and Developmental areas.

• **Development of Executive Function / Cognitive Control.** The study of higher-order executive functions has seen numerous advances over the past decade and it now represents an essential component of cognitive psychology. This position would build on the existing strengths of the PCCN group, strengths in the developmental area, as well as emerging strengths in the University in general. For example, a researcher in this area could provide a bridge to (a) the long-term memory research of Yonelinas and Ranganath; (b) the language group (Long, Traxler, Swaab and Corina); (c) attention and working memory conducted by Mangun, Luck, and Janata; and (d) to the work on perception conducted by Whitney and Post. Moreover, this person could collaborate with developmental psychologists in the department area such as Ghetti, Rivera, Oakes, Goodman, and Lagattuta, and could strengthen the imaging center and studies by Cam Carter. Thus, we are looking for a cognitive neuroscientist, broadly defined, who studies the development of executive function in any area.

• **Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience and Social Information Processing.** One (or more) additional hire(s) are needed to bring critical mass to two state-of-the-art areas of developmental psychology. Two areas of focus – developmental cognitive
neuroscience and social information-processing and reasoning – are strengths for which the developmental area is becoming known. Two additional hires in this area are necessary to bring the area to full strength. The first hire would be an individual specializing either in social representation or in social developmental neuroscience. The other would be someone specializing in emotional development, especially with applications to developmental psychopathology and children at risk, preferably one also using methods of developmental neuroscience. These faculty members would each benefit the Developmental area of the department, but would complement strengths in Cognitive Neuroscience and in Social/Personality, respectively.

**Issue #6: Evolution of Our Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula**

With the addition of several new members of the department over the past 6-8 years, we are beginning to review our curricula at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In fact, curricular offerings at the graduate level have been altered in significant ways during just the past 3-5 years, with new advanced courses in statistical analyses and new courses that cover modeling in areas of cognitive neuroscience, among other additions. However, we are undertaking a review of requirements in the course structure for the graduate program, to see whether any revisions of our curriculum (e.g., first-year core sequences in each area covered by the department) would be advantageous. We are also beginning a re-evaluation of our undergraduate course offerings, to build on the strengths of our new faculty members in the improved design of our courses of study. We remain committed to teaching and to teaching well at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. With the very heavy load of undergraduate majors, we have strong pressures in teaching at the undergraduate level, because we are determined to ensure an adequate number of high-quality courses in our graduate curriculum. Moreover, we are trying to balance the desire to offer specialty courses in faculty areas of expertise with the need to ensure that graduate students get opportunities to take required courses. To satisfy the interests of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and administration will require more faculty members in the Department of Psychology. An increase in the number of faculty members seems especially reasonable for a department that generates enormous numbers of student credit hours at the undergraduate level.

**Summary**

We still identify five areas within our department in some venues, such as the recruiting of new graduate students. However, in our research, we have become much more collaborative, with research grants being submitted that combine contributions by members of two or more of the five areas of the department. What is emerging is a department that pursues various substantive research interests, borrowing strength from faculty across various areas of the department to contribute to state-of-the-art discoveries. A new building for the department would support our cross-disciplinary focus, and a reduction in our teaching load would have minimal impact on course teaching, yet would aid our mentoring of graduate students. The faculty positions described in this plan would strengthen further our resolve to provide cutting edge research to the field and thereby attain Top 20 status among Departments of Psychology across the country. We look forward to discussing our plans for the future of our department with the Dean or any other administrators at UC Davis.
Science & Technology Studies, 5 Year Academic Plan

March 23, 2008

SUMMARY
The Science & Technology Studies (STS) Program at UC Davis launched a new major in STS in 2005, launched 5 new classes since then, recruited a new faculty member in 2007, pioneered a pan-UC graduate-faculty STS retreat last summer, maintained a high-quality colloquium and workshop series, and contributed to faculty recruitment in other departments. The STS Program is gaining international recognition for these efforts and requires a small amount of growth (2 half-FTEs) to strengthen and continue to grow its undergraduate major. In this document, I have provided a brief overview of the STS Program and its Major, a description of our resources, and a detailed outline of our priorities:

1. Continuing STS Major growth (through Revising the Major & Minor, Targeting Pre-law, Pre-health, and Pre-policy undergrads, Involving more faculty and expanding courses in STS, Exploring grants that might bring teaching postdocs to campus, and Space)
2. Expanding Graduate Training in STS and Enhancing UCDavis as Regional STS Hub
3. FTE Growth

In an appendix, I have provided our current Draft Revised Major & Minor.

OVERVIEW
Science & Technology Studies is a field designed to facilitate the analysis and synthesis of science, technology, and medicine in a way that actively creates connections between the varieties of perspectives and concerns in the humanities and the social and natural sciences. As science and technology have become explicit areas of concern in public, in government and globally, the need for and recognition of expertise in this field have grown. The examples of global warming, genetically modified foods, stem cells, evolution, genetic ancestry testing, nuclear power and biohazards, floods and levee design, internet managed social movements, and global environmental activism provide a quick sense of the complexity, creative challenge and post-disciplinary nature of the questions facing us now.

Science & Technology Studies forms a unified discipline in the same way as disciplines such as geology and plant pathology do, both represented by departments at UC Davis. Such disciplines apply a wide range of basic domains of knowledge and methodologies to a topic unified by its subject matter. In the case of the study of science, technology and medicine, the relevant methodologies are drawn from history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, literature and media studies, legal studies, and economics: in short, from the social sciences and humanities. But, as in the cases of geology, plant pathology, and other collective disciplines, the shared subject of inquiry provides a sharp focus.

STS developed during the 1970s at the intersection of "History and Philosophy of Science" and the Sociology and Anthropology of Science. At UC Davis, a History and Philosophy of Science colloquium series in the 1970s became a Committee in 1982, and in 1990 launched an official Minor in HPS. By 2005, the 11-year process of establishing a Major in Science & Technology Studies succeeded. During that time, undergraduate-degree programs in STS were successfully begun at MIT, Cornell, RPI, University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Virginia Tech. The STS major at UCDavis is the first STS major in the UC system.

The National Science Foundation has had an independent funding program mirroring this growth (currently called Science & Society, the name changes every two years; Director Joseph Dumit is now serving his third year on this panel). There are also a growing number of STS PhD
programs in the US and internationally. UCSD established one in 1990 (with $1 million seed money from NSF) and Patrick Carroll (Sociology) received his doctorate from that program. Joseph Dumit taught for 7 years in the STS program at MIT. Nationally there are a set of professional societies that span STS including the Society for the Social Studies of Science (4S) (Dumit is a member of the council), the History of Science Society (HSS) (Joan Cadden is president), the Philosophy of Science Association (PSA), the Society for Literature, Science and the Arts (SLSA), as well as a number of more specialized societies such as the International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology (ISHPSSB) (Jim Griesemer is President and Roberta Millstein is Secretary), and STS sections of other disciplinary societies, such as the Science, Knowledge & Technology section of the American Sociology Association (ASA) (Carroll is on the council).

The STS Major at UC Davis:

Students majoring in STS are expected to excel in science, humanities, and social science. The major requires students to take upper-division science classes as well as courses in the Social Sciences and HArcS Divisions of L&S. This requirement ensures that students develop a deep understanding of the scientific method and scientific practices, in addition to understanding how those practices both shape and are shaped by the wider environment.

Since science is an increasingly pervasive component of every aspect of our lives and world, the introduction of such a major into a university curriculum is extremely timely. At a practical level, we believe that this major should be an excellent option for students considering careers in law or business which will deal extensively with science; careers in teaching; careers in science journalism and technical writing; and, very generally, careers in the health care professions. The major will also provide an ideal foundation for students going on to various graduate programs that specialize in science issues. More generally, the STS major should provide one natural locus for expected increased undergraduate enrollment in the Social Sciences Division, and we believe that our methodology course, STS 20: "Methods in Science, Technology, and Medicine Studies," provides a good general introduction to the social sciences. The advanced methods course, STS 175: “Laboratory Studies Lab,” teaches students hands-on archival and ethnographic approaches to studying scientists and engineers in their laboratories, emphasizing STS's strengths in relating micro-practices to meso- and macro-scale social phenomena. The current STS Major uses the concept of “modules” to allow students to concentrate their attention on the areas of science and technology that interest them most, and it provides them with the flexibility to tailor the curriculum towards the career paths they envision (in our revision we have deepened this specialization).

STS has also been very successful in getting courses approved for cross-listing. This is, however, only a partial solution to the primary problem we face of being able to offer enough classes to cover an adequate curriculum. Considering that our program has only two half-time faculty and two other faculty with official permission (via MOUs) to teach STS classes, this problem has become increasingly evident ever since we launched the major and now imagine scaling it up. Cross-listing topical classes now enables faculty to serve their home departments while also providing STS with a fuller course roster. Cross-listing also increases awareness about these STS classes across campus. But it is only a partial solution because the cross-listing system is hampered by the long time required for approval of any course changes, and it does not fully address the curricular flexibility that a program like STS needs when its faculty come from so many different disciplines.

In 2005-06, STS had one major, a transfer student. In 2006-07 it had two majors, again both transfer students. Now in 2007-08, STS has gained ten new majors, including one freshman and three sophomores. This 500% growth may not seem like much when based on only two majors, but it is an indication that we are hitting the ground running and are confident of significant growth. Many other students have explored declaring the major, but, despite its flexibility, they were hindered by the difficulty of fitting the STS classes into their schedules. Such limited
growth is to be expected of a “major that no one has heard of,” and which is “hard to explain to parents,” as some of these students have put it. Transfer students who have taken the time to read the catalog were the first to recognize that STS fit their vision of their future. Now several students are seeking out advisors in STS, either because they have taken one of the lower-division classes and became intrigued, or because they have heard of STS from friends or from TAs who are graduate students working on STS topics.

In Fall 2007, a group of students set about creating an undergraduate STS Club, which was officially approved in Winter 2008 with Dumit as faculty sponsor. The club has been meeting bi-weekly with 9-15 students attending. Its activities have included fieldtrips to labs on campus, such as the KeckCAVES immersive visualization labs, and to the “Bodies Revealed” exhibition in Sacramento. In the latter case, the students followed up their visit with a discussion of article written about the Bodies exhibits (authored by Hsuan Hsu, who will join the UCDavis English department in Fall 2008). They plan on showing science-themed films in the future, again to be followed by scholarly discussion. The STS Club has already attracted additional students to STS classes.

RESOURCES

Top Faculty:
UCDavis is seen nationally and internationally as one of the most vibrant STS programs. UCDavis STS Faculty come from across campus and currently include the departments of History, Philosophy, Sociology, Anthropology, American Studies, English, Environmental Science & Policy. Members of the Program Committee have also been drawn from Economics, Statistics, and Mathematics. One of the things that we are implementing this year is “Associated Faculty” who are committed to helping advise students in STS and attend STS events. This will help with the ten-member limit of the Program Committee.

As noted above, UCDavis faculty are serving in key leadership positions in almost all of the STS professional societies. We have also celebrated a number of awards including the Outstanding Mentor Award, Consortium for Women and Research (Cadden), and the Rachel Carson prize for best book from the Society for Social Studies of Science (Dumit). Our interdisciplinary productivity includes over 22 national grants over the past 5 years, 4 monographs, 7 edited books, 2 book series editors, 2 journal editors, and over 85 articles. Two large-scale pending NSF grants also include identified STS cores: Responding to Rapid Environmental Change (REACH): From Genes to Ecosystems, Science to Society (IGERT); and the Center for Environmental Impacts of Nanotechnology ($25M center grant).

Recruiting Magnet:
In the past three years, UCDavis successfully searched for and recruited two faculty members, each of whom had competing offers from three other top programs. Dumit chose to come to UCDavis over USC (Anthropology), UCSD (Communication and STS), and McGill (Social Studies of Medicine); Timothy Choy chose to come to UCDavis over UCI (Anthropology), Ohio State (Comparative Studies), and Simon Fraser (Sociology and Anthropology). STS has also played a role in recruiting faculty in English (Colin Milburn in 2005, and Hsuan Hsu and Nathan Brown in 2008), History (Daniel Stolzenberg), Philosophy (Millstein).

Colloquium Series & Reading Group:
The STS program has hosted and co-sponsored over 30 talks over the past three years. Highlights have included filling lecture halls for talks by Donna Haraway and Kim Stanley Robinson, and a highly successful "Beyond the Book" conference on Digital Humanities.

In Spring 2008, STS put together a talk by Mario Biagioli (History of Science, Harvard) on the science studies of law. Desiring to increase the cross-campus appeal of STS, we engaged the Law School, which was happy to host the talk in their King Hall lecture theater, and also to
provide a reception following the event. Biagioli’s visit is also being co-sponsored by the DHI, English, Cultural Studies, History, and the CHSC.

STS has also run a series of “Food for Thought” meetings for three years now, using a unique format involving faculty, postdocs, and graduate students (and pizza). The format involves a featured scholar, either from UCDavis or another university, pre-circulating a paper, which is read and discussed by all those attending. For the first 45 minutes of discussion, the featured scholar remains silent; this phase of the meeting is then followed by 45 minutes of collective discussion. The scholar gets to hear his or her work discussed, and, by not talking, enables the conversation to become truly multi-directional, thus improving on the standard seminar mode of two-way dialogue. It is a remarkably successful format, and it has included professors, postdocs, and graduate students from Berkeley, Stanford, UCSC, UCSF, UCI, MIT, Duke, and Harvard.

**STS Regional Hub:**
Over the past three years, STS in the Northern California region has really taken off as a network. Faculty from the UCs received a UC Humanities Institute Grant to start a “California STS Network,” which is devoted to sharing speakers, events, and expertise. UC Berkeley hosted the website the first two years, and UCDavis will take it over in 2008. Santa Clara, the home of a Center for STS (with $20M endowment), hosted an STS Directors Retreat, and UCSF hosted two regional meetings of STS faculty to better understand our different campuses and the status of STS at each one.

UCDavis also began an STSnet Website in 2006 that served as a repository for over one hundred STS syllabi, collected by a graduate student from STS faculty in California. The website also had a calendar for coordinating events, graduate student groups, and the course schedules from many campuses so that grad students and faculty could see the incredible richness of STS expertise in the state. The website is currently offline for server migration, but it will be up again by the end of spring quarter.

In the summer of 2007, graduate students and faculty at UCDavis designed a three-day “Experimental Retreat” for California STS scholars. It was supported by UCDavis STS and hosted at the Marin Headlands. It was quite successfully attended by thirty-nine graduate students and six faculty from UCB, UCDavis, UCLA, UCSD, UCSF, UCSC, and Stanford. The retreat featured discussions of PhD prospectuses, workshops on writing, pedagogy and methodology in STS, job placement strategies, and topical hikes. Currently, a committee is working to expand this retreat into a week-long summer school for STS.

**Graduate Student Critical Mass:**
Graduate students come to STS because they find that their interests in researching and writing about science and technology are often shared more with graduate students in other disciplines than with their disciplinary colleagues. With initial funding from the CHSC and STS, a graduate student STS Research Cluster was formed in 2005, and it continues today with funding from STS. The Cluster members run the Food for Thought series, and they participate in reading groups and the STS Network. Graduate students are vibrant representatives of our program at international and national meeting and a great asset disseminating STS in their departments and beyond.

Two graduate students in the STS Research Cluster are also serving in leadership positions in the Society for Social Studies of Science. Michelle Stewart is the Chair of the Student Section, and Chris Kortright is a paid student co-editor of Technoscience, the 4S website.
FIVE-YEAR PLAN PRIORITIES & CHALLENGES

Continuing STS Major growth:
Our first priority is increasing the number of STS Majors. As noted above, this has been hampered by the relative invisibility of STS on campus, as well as the difficulty we have in stabilizing the courses being taught with so few faculty. We are addressing this priority through a set of initiatives, including: (1) revising the STS major and minor; (2) targeting pre-law, pre-health, and pre-policy undergrads; (3) involving more faculty and expanding course offerings in STS; and (4) exploring grants that might bring teaching postdocs to campus.

1. Revising the Major & Minor:
The current STS Major was finalized back in 1998 and has become severely outdated. We have only begun to fully assess it this year through surveying the experience of undergraduate majors. Dumit has been advising these majors and conducting exit interviews with those who explore the major but do not continue, usually due to too-few course offerings. In almost every case, exceptions have had to be granted to the existing major requirements because module courses in other disciplines no longer exist and because new courses have been added in both STS and elsewhere.

The STS program committee has spent this year revising the major requirements, including revisiting the two-module structure. It has concluded that a more focused “one module” approach will provide a better grounding for students seeking jobs or graduate school. A single module also means that undergraduates will take more courses in the same discipline, increasing their contact with individual professors who can then better advise them and potentially guide a thesis (a longer research paper and crucial experience for graduate school applications).

We are revising the current HPS Minor to create an STS Minor in its place, again updating the courses required to mirror our current offerings. We have provide draft revisions of the major and minor in an appendix.

2. Targeting Pre-law, Pre-health, and Pre-policy undergrads
Having surveyed other STS Major programs across the country in the past two years and met with STS Directors and Advisors regarding recruitment growth strategies, we have concluded that the greatest potential and also possible risk lies with recruiting students who are interested in professional training after graduating. STS is an ideal major for law students, medical other health students, and for those interested in policy. In each case, it provides substantive exposure to a wide range of disciplinary ways of thinking, and an intense focus on a particular area of science or technology, which in turn provides a focus for legal, medical or policy attention in the future. The very thing that led to the formation of STS major, the increasingly visible role of science & technology in the world, makes expertise in it valuable to law schools, medical schools and policy schools, as well as business and other professional schools.

In addition, meeting with the Pre-Health Advisor on campus, for instance, revealed that the STS Major is well-designed for the pre-health student, where the biology and other science classes needed are part of the major, and the social, historical and philosophical foundation prepare the student for both taking the entry exams and for dealing with the complex world of medicine. This fit is not coincidental, of course, it was built into the major by design. Already lists of STS courses are forwarded to the pre-health list. What we will do in the future and in concert with the new major requirements, is produce a rubric for each group of pre-professional students, helping them to see how an STS major will efficiently help them meet the requirements for their future professional school.

The risk associated with this approach is too-rapid growth. Programs that have specifically targeted pre-professional students, even at smaller schools like Harvard and Cornell, have run
into the problem of becoming one of the biggest majors on campus, but not having the class sizes nor the faculty to properly advise them or meet their scheduling needs. Scaling STS at UC Davis with only two half-time faculty will require careful planning so we do end up imposing too much on program committee members and affiliated faculty who already have to teach large service courses in their own disciplines.

3. Involving more faculty and expanding courses in STS

Growing the majors in STS requires more faculty, both as proponents and as teachers. As noted above, STS has been successful in getting courses cross-listed (Colin Milburn, for instance, has cross-listed both a new Writing Science course, and a Science Fiction course). Identifying two or three courses in a wide variety of majors is a strategy we will be pursuing over the next five years. This requires identifying faculty and courses, and finding a fit that is appropriate both to the discipline and to STS. It also requires both paperwork and lengthy approval time, and additional ongoing staff time coordinating the cross-listed courses.

STS’s role in recruiting new faculty to campus also contributes to this growth, as faculty can negotiate in their contract (through a Memorandum of Understanding) that they are free to teach a course outside of their discipline each year and this can be dedicated to STS. In general, this is a win-win strategy for the campus in retaining some of the brightest interdisciplinary scholars on the market who are attracted to by this freedom.

4. Exploring grants that might bring teaching postdocs to campus

Another method of adding courses that can attract majors, and of increasing the liveliness of the scholarly environment in general, is to bring postdocs to UC Davis for one or two year to both research and teach. STS scholars often need a postdoc before successfully seeking a job, and so in the next five years we will continue to look for opportunities to apply for funds that will bring this resource to campus.

Already STS faculty at UC Davis have been involved large scale IGERT and Center grants that if successful will directly benefit STS. The NSF has a number of cross-training and post-doctoral grants that need to be initiated by the host institution.

One limiting factor with this approach is space.

5. Space

At the moment STS literally has no space besides the two offices occupied by Dumit and Choy. The lack of even a dedicated small meeting room means that the STS library has nowhere to go (it currently takes up half of Choy’s office) and that when we do hire lecturers as we have this year, we must let them use our offices at the same time that we use them (Dumit used his office in the afternoon this winter so that Crawford could use it in the mornings with occasional overlap). A full-time postdoc would need their own space.

6. Evaluation:

We will evaluate the success of this priority primarily through the number of majors that STS attracts. We will also measure the increasing STS class sizes, and the number of additional STS courses we are able to offer.

Expanding Graduate Training in STS and Enhancing UC Davis as Regional STS Hub:

A second priority is maintaining the vibrancy of the scholarly activity around STS at UC Davis. The success of the graduate STS Research Cluster has led to many discussions over the extent to which a more formal structure for STS graduate work should be put into place. As noted above, this pressure is being felt on many UC campuses, none of which have the faculty to support a full-time PhD program.
The UC system has a mechanism for just this problem however. The Designated Emphasis system allows for the creation of a sub-degree of sorts that spans a number of disciplines. We are therefore setting up an exploratory committee to investigate the feasibility and design of a DE in STS for UC Davis. If deemed desirable, we anticipate this being applied for as early as next year to be approved by the following year.

Drawing on the UC STS Network, and the wonderful critical mass of STS scholars across especially the Northern UC campuses, we are also exploring coordinating this DE with other campuses so that graduate students can take advantage of the UC-wide expertise and be even more prepared for the job market. The STS Summer School discussed above is a potential site for increasing the unity of the DE's across campuses.

STS is also experimenting with a year-long graduate seminar next year in which a series of three quarter-long courses are linked by an STS thematic, and graduate students can take all three in order to become conversant in a variety of disciplinary approaches to STS. This course will also be a possible model for some of the required courses of a future DE.

In 2008, STS at UC Davis will take over the UC STS Network currently at Berkeley and outlined above. We will combine this with the STSnet website that we previously set up, and use this as one way of continuing to keep STS faculty and graduate students in communication with each other.

**Evaluation:**
The establishment of a DE in STS will in itself be a measure of success, as will the number of students eventually choosing to declare this Designated Emphasis. Another set of measures will be the increased links across campuses in graduate and faculty visits, coordinated talks, and continued use of the STS Network.

**FTE Growth:**
2 additional FTE (shared).

STS is establishing itself as a presence on campus, within the UC system, and nationally. It is also becoming internationally recognized. Our greatest strength is the variety of committed faculty who first came together to design the major and fight for its establishment, and now the faculty who continue to dedicate precious time to expand it into a vibrant major. Nonetheless, the current model has only succeeded by employing a generous number of lecturers over the past three years (2 in 2005-6, 4 in 2006-7, 1 in 2007-8), in which we did not even offer the required STS 190 honors seminar. The total number of STS courses we are able to cover each year is (2 each by Carroll, Choy, and Dumit; and 1 each by Milburn, Griesemer, and as of 2008-9, by Caren Kaplan). Nor do we have any flexibility should a faculty member take a sabbatical or leave of absence (a problem compounded by negotiating with host departments).

In addition, despite the stellar faculty we do have, we still lack basic coverage of key courses such as STS 150: "Science & Gender," and the Seminar, as well as a number of other courses that were dropped from the catalog or are basic components of STS, such as courses on medicine and society, medical technology, environmental science, engineering studies, etc.

Two more 50% STS faculty with joint-appointments in other disciplines would establish the program solidly and provide a platform on which to grow the undergraduate majors into a force on campus. The additional four courses this would provide each year would both cover the remaining required courses, and allow us to teach the types of courses, like "Biology and Society" and "Science & Gender" that draw students into the major and provide non-majors with STS experience.
APPENDIX: DRAFT REVISED MAJOR AND MINOR

Science & Technology Studies

The Major Program

The Science and Technology Studies (STS) major is designed to facilitate the analysis and synthesis of science, technology, and medicine in a way that actively creates connections between the varieties of perspectives and concerns in the humanities and the sciences. The STS major takes science, technology, medicine, and their social, political, economic, and cultural contexts as its objects of study. As such, the STS major draws on the research programs of faculty in a wide range of departments, including American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, English, Environmental Science and Policy, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Science and Technology Studies, and Sociology. Students in STS pursue a broader understanding of science than is available within traditional science majors and is also suitable for students in the social sciences interested in interpreting science, technology and medicine as part of society and culture.

The Program. Graduation with a degree in Science and Technology Studies requires completion of introductory courses in the social sciences and humanities, in the natural sciences, and introductory, laboratory and seminar courses in STS. Upper division work includes 24 units in STS and related courses, an STS Lab course, an STS Seminar, and 12 units of science electives. The STS and related units must include at least 8 units of STS and at least 16 units from a single area of concentration. The areas of concentration are: I. Social and Cultural Studies of Science and Technology; II. Ethics, Values, and Science Policy; III. History and Philosophy of Science; IV. Medicine, Society, and Culture; V, Media Technologies and Information Society. Courses in the areas of concentration require careful selection to make the best use of the STS major. Twelve units of science electives (plus prerequisites) are also required, providing depth, concentration and field work opportunities in the sciences. Prerequisites for courses in the sciences can be extensive and require substantial advance planning for timely completion. Students are encouraged to take advantage of faculty and staff advising to plan their course of study.

Careers in STS. The STS major will create an opportunity to analyze science and allied practices from historical, philosophical, sociological, political, anthropological, and cultural perspectives. There are a growing number of PhD programs in STS at such schools as Cornell, MIT, RPI, Univ. Wisconsin, and UCSD. STS also prepares students for careers that must address the broader social, cultural and political ramifications of science, technology and medicine such as law, journalism, public policy, economics, government, and science education. Careers that students of STS from many universities nationwide have pursued, in addition to research and teaching careers in STS, include employment in: systems engineering, Web site design, science museums, non-profit health organizations, government service, libraries, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, nursing, teaching, public health administration, media companies, management consultant practice, and the Peace Corps.

A.B. Major Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Science and Technology Studies 1 | 4 |
| Science and Technology Studies 20 | 4 |
Eight units selected from American Studies 1A, 5; Environmental Studies 1; Humanities 3; Nature and Culture 1; Philosophy 30, 31, 32; Science and Society 1, 2, 3, 5

**Depth Subject Matter**

Depth Subject Matter: 44-46
Twenty-four units from one of the following areas of concentration, at least sixteen of which must be from one area and at least eight units must be upper-division STS: 24

(I) **Social and Cultural Studies of Science and Technology**: American Studies 101G, 158; Community and Regional Development 118, 162; History 139A, 139B; Nature and Culture 100, 180; Science and Technology Studies 32, 109, 130A, 131, 150, 164, 173, 180; Sociology 150, 176

- African and African-American Studies 165: Inequalities in Science
- American Studies 101G: Environmental Justice
- American Studies 158: Technology and the American Body
- Applied Behavioral Science 118: Technology and Society
- Applied Behavioral Science 162: People, Work, and Technology
- History 139A: Medieval and Renaissance Medicine
- History 139B: Medicine, Society, and Culture in Modern Europe
- History 172: U.S. Environmental History
- Science and Technology Studies 130A: History of Nature and Natural History
- Science and Technology Studies 131: Darwin
- Science and Technology Studies 150: Gender and Science
- Nature and Culture 100: The Culture of Nature
- Nature and Culture 180: Field Work in Nature and Culture
- Science and Technology Studies 32: Drugs, Science & Culture
- Science and Technology Studies 109: Introduction to Scientific Visualization
- Science and Technology Studies 164: Writing Science
- Science and Technology Studies 173: Science Fiction
- Science and Technology Studies 180: Special Topics
- Sociology 160: Environment and Society
- Sociology 176: Sociology of Knowledge

(II) **Ethics, Values, and Science Policy**: Agricultural and Resource Economics 120, 147; Environmental Science and Policy 165; History 185B; Nature and Culture 120; Philosophy 115, 116; Physics 137, 160; Plant Pathology 140; Political Science 171, 175; Science and Technology Studies 120, 150, 180; Veterinary Medicine 170

- Agricultural Economics 120: Agricultural Policy
- Agricultural Economics 147: Resource and Environmental Policy Analysis
- Engineering 190: Professional Responsibilities of Engineers
- Environmental Studies 165: Science, Experts, and Public Policy
- History 185B: History of Technology in America
- Nature and Culture 120: Environmental Ethics
- Plant Pathology 140: Agricultural Biotechnology, Ethics and Public Policy
- Philosophy 115: Problems in Normative Ethics
- Philosophy 116: Ethical Theories
- Physics 137: Science and Technology of Nuclear Arms Effects & Controls
- Physics 160: Environmental Physics and Society
- Political Science 171: The Politics of Energy
- Political Science 175: Science, Technology and Policy
- Science and Technology Studies 120: Religion, Science & Magic
- Science and Technology Studies 150: Gender & Science
- Science and Technology Studies 180: Special Topics
- Veterinary Medicine 170: Ethics of Animal Use
(III) **History and Philosophy of Science**: History 135A, 135B, 136, 185A, 185B; Philosophy 104, 108, 109; Science and Technology Studies 120, 130A, 130B, 131, 164

- History 135A: History of Science to the 18th Century
- History 135B: History of Science, 18th to 20th Centuries
- History 136: Scientific Revolution
- History 185A: History of Science in America
- History 185B: History of Technology in America
- Philosophy 104: Introduction to Philosophy of Science
- Philosophy 107: Philosophy of the Physical Sciences
- Philosophy 108: Philosophy of the Biological Sciences
- Philosophy 109: Philosophy of the Social Sciences
- Science and Technology Studies 120: Religion, Science & Magic
- Science and Technology Studies 130A: History of Nature and Natural History
- Science and Technology Studies 130B: History of Modern Biology
- Science and Technology Studies 131: Darwin
- Science and Technology Studies 164: Writing Science

(IV) **Medicine, Society, and Culture**: American Studies 101G; Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine 101, 160; History 139A, 139B; Psychology 160; Science and Technology Studies 32, 109; Sociology 154

- American Studies 101G: Environmental Justice
- Communication 165: Media and Health
- Community Health 101: Perspectives on Community Health
- Community Health 160: Health Education
- History 139A: Medieval and Renaissance Medicine
- History 139B: Medicine, Society, and Culture in Modern Europe
- Psychology 160: Health Psychology
- Science and Technology Studies 32: Drugs, Science & Culture
- Science and Technology Studies 109: Introduction to Scientific Visualization
- Sociology 154: Sociology of Health Care

(V) **Media Technologies and Information Society**: American Studies/Technocultural Studies 158; Communication 140, 165, 170, 172; History 185B; Computer Science Engineering 120; Computer Science 188; Science & Technology Studies 109, 163, 164, 173; Sociology 175; Technocultural Studies 113, 150, 151, 152, 154, 159.

- American Studies/Technocultural Studies 158: Technology and the Modern American Body
- Communication 140: The Media Industry
- Communication 165: Media and Health
- Communication 170: Communication, Technology, and Society
- Communication 172: Computer-Mediated Communication
- History 185B: History of Technology in America
- Computer Science Engineering 120: Introduction to the Theory of Computation
- Computer Science 188: Ethics and the Information Age
- Science and Technology Studies 109: Visualization in Science: A Critical Introduction
- Science and Technology Studies 163: History of Communication Technologies
- Science and Technology Studies 164: Writing Science
- Science and Technology Studies 173: Science Fiction
- Sociology 175: Mass Communication
- Technocultural Studies 113: Community Networks
- Technocultural Studies 150: Introduction to Theories of the Technoculture
- Technocultural Studies 151: Topics in Virtuality
• Technocultural Studies 152: New Trends in Technocultural Arts
• Technocultural Studies 154: Outsider Machines
• Technocultural Studies 159: Media Subcultures

Science and Technology Studies 175 (Lab)  4
Science and Technology Studies 190, or 190HA-HB  4-6

**Science Electives**: Select twelve units, at least eight of which must be from upper division courses, from the Approved Science Electives list below. (Unit totals will vary with required prerequisites.)  12-32

Note: Students are strongly advised to choose science elective courses in consultation with faculty advisors. Some courses in some areas may require prerequisites too extensive to be used for the STS major.

Approved Science Electives. Courses may be drawn from any of the following approved subject areas:

- Aeronautical Science and Engineering; Animal Genetics; Animal Science; Anthropology; Applied Behavioral Sciences; Applied Biological Systems Technology; Atmospheric Science; Avian Sciences; Biological Chemistry; Biological Sciences; Cell Biology and Human Anatomy; Chemistry; Engineering; Engineering: Applied Science; Engineering: Biological Systems; Engineering: Chemical; Engineering: Civil and Environmental; Engineering: Computer Science; Engineering: Electrical and Computer; Engineering: Mechanical; Entomology; Environmental and Resource Sciences; Environmental Horticulture; Environmental Science and Policy; Environmental Toxicology; Evolution and Ecology; Exercise Science; Fiber and Polymer Science; Food Science and Technology; Geology; Material Science and Engineering; Medical Microbiology; Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology; Microbiology; Molecular and Cellular Biology; Nematology; Neurobiology, Physiology, and Behavior; Nutrition; Pathology; Microbiology, and Immunology; Physics; Plant Biology; Plant Pathology; Population Health and Reproduction; Psychology; Soil Science; Wildlife, Fish, and Conservation Biology.

Total Units for the Major  60-82

Major Adviser. J. Dumit

**Minor Program Requirements**:
The interdisciplinary minor in the history and philosophy of science invites students to examine historical and contemporary problems in a variety of scientific disciplines, and to explore concepts and procedures basic to science and how they have evolved. The minor is sponsored by the Program in Science and Technology Studies.

**UNITS**
Science and Technology Studies  20
Twenty upper division units from the courses listed below. STS 20 may be substitute for four of the upper division units. At least eight of the units must be upper division STS courses.
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Introduction to the UCD Sociology Department

The core goal of the sociology department for the next five years is to strengthen key research and teaching areas by hiring new faculty. These new hires will allow us to maintain excellence in several research areas and help us to offset some losses of senior faculty through retirement. At the same time, we plan to deepen collaboration and synergy among our existing faculty by strengthening research networks among our faculty and with faculty in other programs on campus.

The Department of Sociology has a baseline FTE of 26.75 (24.75 current faculty plus two positions for which we hope to recruit in Fall 2008). We teach a large number of students, with nearly 8,000 students taking our undergraduate lecture classes and seminars in academic year 2006-07. Measuring by degrees conferred, we were the fifth largest of the social science majors in 2006-07; we have the third largest graduate program in the social science division (with about 70 active students in Fall 2007 we are just behind the largest, economics, and the second largest, psychology, programs).

To support our instructional offerings of (on average) 100 undergraduate classes each year, we hire a considerable number of lecturers (an average of 14 per year in the last five years) and a very large number of Teaching Assistants (an average of 109 per year in the last five years). Since our last Academic Plan was written (2004) we have hired Lecturers to teach around 45% of our undergraduate classes each year.

Sociology majors are a diverse group. While African American/Black students comprise 3% of UCD undergraduate students, they comprise 8.2% of sociology majors. While Hispanic students comprise 12% of UCD undergrads, they comprise 21% of sociology majors. Thirty-six percent of UCD undergraduates are white/Caucasian; this population comprises 26% of sociology majors. And Asian/Asian American students comprise 41% of UCD undergrads as a whole, while they comprise 36% of sociology majors.

Our Discipline

Sociology takes all social life as its province and thus is extremely broad in scope. Sociologists focus on macro-level, global institutions such as the state and the corporation; micro-level interactions and group processes such as interpersonal relationships and informal work groups; and meso-level phenomenon such as career structures or high school graduation rates. The American Sociological Association lists 44 different substantive sections to which members can belong. Within these fields, sociologists deploy a diversity of methodological and epistemological approaches that include the use of quantitative, qualitative, and historical and historical comparative methods.
Not only is our subject matter diverse; our ranks are diverse compared to other fields, including other social science fields, as well. During the period 2000-2004, sociology had the highest percentage of African American Ph.D. recipients of any social science discipline (9.1% of sociology doctorates were earned by African Americans during that period, compared to the next highest percentage of African American Ph.D. recipients in a social science discipline, political science, at 7.4%). Hispanic/Latina/o graduate students earned 6.6% of sociology doctorates, a lower percentage than found in economics (8.6%) but notably more than the field with the third highest percentage of doctorates to Hispanic/Latina/o students: psychology, at 5.7%. Women were awarded 60% of sociology doctorate degrees in 2004, compared to 69% of psychology, 38% of political science, and 30% of economics doctorate recipients.ii

It would be safe to say that the majority – maybe even a large majority -- of sociologists study pressing contemporary trends that create unequal opportunities and outcomes for individuals, groups, and nations. Indeed, this is the hallmark of sociology and something that gives our discipline unique relevance in the academy, in government, in the media, and in the eyes of the public. Many sociologists study social problems that require the kind of deeper understanding that sociological research can provide. Sociology, as a field, seeks to place the experience of individuals in a larger frame. This involves understanding when and how individual troubles come to be identified as social problems and how society responds or fails to respond to those problems.

Moreover, the concern to understand stratification and contribute to social change is a mission reflected in the ten largest sections of the American Sociological Association, which have a major concentration of sociologists who study stratification and inequality. Sex and Gender; Organizations, Occupations and Work; Medical; Race, Gender and Class; Racial and Ethnic Minorities; Social Movements; Political Sociology; and Family (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 in size, respectivelyiii) are well known for being areas in which sociologists orient their research toward the study of institutions, group processes, and micro-level interactions that create and reproduce inequality in many forms. Importantly, many women and scholars of color conduct research in these subfields and they are more highly represented here than in other subfields in our discipline.

*Our Department*

This two-prong mission is central to our departmental identity. While UCD sociology faculty focus on different empirical phenomena (family, work, labor markets, organizations, racial politics and identity, urban development, immigration, collective mobilization, television talk shows, state policy, violence, law, political action, medicine, poverty, to name a few), the majority of us are interested in these phenomena for what light they can shed on enduring social problems, on stratification, on power relations, and social change in the contemporary world. Our emphasis on stratification extends from research on bullies in the schoolyard to the impact of corporations on communities.

Our shared interests are demonstrated in Figure 1, which represents a condensed model of UCD sociology faculty research.iv It captures the fields that are linked by their focus on
stratification and social change; the size of the nodes reflects the number of faculty working in that subfield, while the width of the links represents the number of faculty working in both areas. Every active faculty member does research that falls into at least one of these seven core fields. This amount of intellectual overlap is a remarkable achievement given that there are at least ten other sociological subfields where we have significant concentrations of strength, and individual faculty members with expertise in still other areas of sociological investigation (see Appendix II). Figure 1 shows the powerful departmental core that has emerged over the years as a result of careful planning and successful recruitment. While our research agendas span the empirical reaches of the discipline as a whole, the department nonetheless maintains a few core areas of concentration, evidenced by the larger nodes.

Figure 1: Core Strengths of the Department, condensed

There are many ways in which our research connects to our understanding of stratification, inequality, and how to soften its inequitable effects in contemporary society. Illustrative questions with which our faculty are concerned include: Under what conditions might members of different ethnic groups mobilize and work together to improve the conditions of their lives? How might communications between doctors and clients of different cultures be improved, to the advantage of the latter? Why do so few women chose or stay in science careers, one of the more professionally lucrative career tracks available? Is it possible to improve the conditions of work and employment for the nation’s most vulnerable temporary workers? Why do youth decide to engage in criminal activities and why do offenders violate the conditions of their parole? Why did the United States develop a different model for abortion policy than other leading industrialized nations, and what are the consequences of this for contemporary abortion practices in the U.S.? What are the sources and consequences of emotional inequality in intimate relationships? Comparing historical cases, what can we learn about creating more affordable housing for the poor? What are the barriers to higher education for black and white youth?
In addition to publishing scholarly books and articles on these topics, some of us write up our research for consumption in non-scholarly venues such as field-specific and/or popular magazines, technical reports, and web sites and a few of us are directly involved in policy making and various forms of public sociology. Our faculty receive requests to speak to the media on pressing contemporary topics as varied as immigration and reproductive rights, temporary employment and higher education, environmental catastrophe, and the behavior and motivation of members of contemporary cults. We have provided expert testimony at a U.S. Congressional Briefing, on “60 Minutes,” ABC News with Peter Jennings, the News Hour with Jim Lehrer, and on BBC Radio. Colleagues have been quoted in articles related to their expertise in the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Boston Globe, Chronicle of Higher Education, Sacramento Bee, and USA Today.

As measured by research grants, our faculty has been notably successful. As sole Principle Investigators, sociology faculty members have been awarded approximately 1.5 million dollars in the last five years. As co-PIs (with UCD as well as external colleagues) sociology faculty have been awarded approximately 2.2 million dollars in the last five years. Totaling about 3.7 million dollars, many of our grants have come from the nation’s most prestigious funding agencies, including the National Science Foundation, Ford Foundation, William T. Grant Foundation, Spencer Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, and the National Institute of Justice (see Appendix III).

Above and beyond high-quality, socially relevant research, we have maintained a commitment to preserving the same tripartite methodological foundation that characterizes the best sociology departments around the nation. For many years, our academic plans have explicitly stated that we want to maintain excellence in quantitative, qualitative, and historical and historical comparative methodology and we have mostly succeeded in doing so. (In the wake of John Walton’s and Jack Goldstone’s departures several years back, we have had less luck in rebuilding our historical comparative wing, principally because we offered a great many positions in this area to senior faculty whom, ultimately, could not be recruited to UC Davis.) Our methodological pluralism has enabled us to attract sociologists who use a variety of methodological approaches (including mixed methodological research strategies) as well as to attract strong graduate students who wish to come to Davis precisely because they will be able to develop expertise in two or more techniques.

Our Vision and Resources Required to Achieve It

The sociology faculty believe that at this particular historical moment, we are well positioned to capitalize on these strengths and advantages in the discipline as well as to capitalize on other major currents in our university community and the state of California as a whole. Whether we remain stable or experience modest growth, we envision strengthening who we are and what we offer along these lines.
I. REMAINING AT STEADY STATE:

First and foremost, we have defined our 2008-09 recruitment plans for next year in such a way as to align with and expand existing departmental strengths, connect to larger disciplinary priorities, and advance our reputation as a department that excels in the areas of stratification and social change. To reach our 26.75 FTE we hope to conduct two faculty searches next year. Both of our searches should yield sizable pools of exciting candidates who do research that will fit into this broader commitment. We have defined one of our positions as quantitative social demography, with preference for a sociologist/demographer who studies immigration, family, labor markets, race and ethnicity, or aging. We have defined the other as macro-sociology, with preference for a sociologist who studies globalization, economic sociology, social movements, or political sociology. The way the latter position is defined opens the doors to a large and vibrant applicant pool, invites sociologists who do either qualitative or historical research (or both), and increases the chances that we might recruit someone who studies international development, political resistance, state building and racial or ethnic inequality, and so forth. Both of these positions open the door to candidates whose research pivots around the concern with stratification and social change, and should generate a pool of candidates who are fairly diverse.

Second, we will continue to prioritize and augment resources for our relatively new Power and Inequality Workshop Series, keeping it bubbling on the front burner of our department’s collective life. The Power and Inequality Workshop was initiated two years ago by energetic junior faculty who desired to bring faculty and graduate students together to share work and create intellectual synergies. The workshop series features research that is relevant to our general emphasis on stratification and social change. Using a format in which one person (either faculty or graduate student) circulates a paper (a book chapter, an article-in-progress, a dissertation chapter, and so forth) and two other people comment on it, the PI Workshop has been a continual source of new ideas, collegiality, and improvement of scholarship. It encompasses topics ranging from trends in immigration, to changes in gender and family attitudes in China, historical developments in the U.S. national innovation system, to how temporary employment became widespread in the U.S. Meeting every two-three weeks, this event consistently serves as a source of lively intellectual engagement. Many departments take these collective moments for granted; for sociology, this is a welcome innovation.

Third, we would like to strengthen our affiliation with units and groups outside our department, again, in order to advance and strengthen our identity as a department that offers excellent scholarship and training in our core areas and to access intellectual and budgetary resources (for both faculty and graduate students) outside our department. Formalizing our mission as described above brings us into closer alignment with:

A. The Economy, Justice, and Society Program. EJS is an interdisciplinary program that brings together faculty from economics, political science, and sociology and focuses on social, cultural and political influences on the economic success of individuals and
groups. A number of sociology faculty already are active participants in EJS; we hope to make sociology even more relevant to that program.

B. The John Muir Institute, currently headed by Professor Deb Niemeier of the Civil Engineering Department. The Muir Institute offers several specialized tracks for faculty and graduate students, featuring colloquia, research projects, and funding. In particular, sociology could make fruitful links with Muir’s Environmental Justice Project, the Environmental Benefits and Burdens Related to Race, Class, and Gender, and Environments and Communities.

C. The Biological Invasions IGERT, with which several sociology faculty have been affiliated and with which several other social science faculty are affiliated as well. This IGERT program is dedicated to the study of biological invasions but emphasizes that sociological, economic, and legal dimensions are crucial to the understanding of biological invasions. This IGERT provides opportunities for faculty to build intellectual networks; it also offers graduate fellowships for students conducting research in the area.

D. Linkages with the UCD Medical School may also prove to be fruitful to those of us (five faculty) working in the area of stratification and medicine, whether we study how health care is inequitably delivered in doctor-patient interactions or how health care outcomes are unequally available to different groups in American society. Some of our colleagues are already collaborating with members of the med school, capitalizing on available research funding. We have had many graduate students conduct dissertation research in the field of medical sociology; the Medical School and even the new Nursing School could be a welcome source of resources for them.

E. Some faculty are interested in building greater connections to people and units in the State Capitol. Such connections might enable access to important data, research settings, and opportunities to share our research findings with policy makers. One or two of our faculty members already are well networked into state agencies and others of us are brainstorming about ways to do research that would be relevant to the Capitol community.

II. WERE WE ABLE TO GROW BY ABOUT SEVEN PERCENT OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS:

We would be looking at reaching a total of 28.75 faculty (our current 26.75 FTE plus the more or less two faculty that would be allowed with seven percent growth). Given that a small number of current faculty will retire within three years, we should actually hire somewhere between two and six new faculty to reach and maintain 28.75 FTE. Within these parameters, we identified the following areas for potential recruitment efforts. These areas should help us develop a pool of applicants who are diverse with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity. But more importantly, they should help us develop a strong pool of applicants who, no matter what their gender, race and ethnicity, would be conducting the type of research that would support the larger mission outlined in this plan.
Areas in which we hope to hire, in addition to recruiting in demography and macro-sociology in 2008-09:

A. **Race/ethnicity.** This might include sociologists who study the family, work, labor markets, education, social movements, globalization, gender relations, state formation and policy, urban, micro-sociology and identity formation, medical, and other areas in which the study of race and ethnicity is a central focus.

B. **Poverty.** Sociologists who work in this area would meet our commitment to intensify our excellence in the study of stratification and inequality, not to mention our commitment to the study of race/ethnicity/class, and gender. This will be a pressing area in which to recruit because we have a Social Services track in our undergraduate program and two senior scholars (Block and Joffe) who teach and do relevant research in this area are likely to retire soon.

C. **Criminology/ law and society.** This will be a pressing area in which to recruit given that our undergraduate Law and Society track is a crucial part of our curriculum and that a senior scholar (Cohen) who teaches and does research in this area is likely to retire soon. As is the case with people who study poverty, many areas of research in criminology and law lend themselves to our core concerns.

D. **Globalization** (perhaps with specialization in Latin America and Africa; we have an excellent cluster of Asia scholars).

E. **Environmental justice and inequality.** This a growing field, with both superb quantitative scholars (such as Allan Schnaiberg at Northwestern University) and superb field researchers who examine the impact of environmental policies and decisions on communities of color, poor communities (such as David Pellow at UC San Diego). A recruitment in this area could enable cross-fertilization between the sociology department, the John Muir Institute, and the IGERT Program.

**Space:**

It goes without saying that in order to grow we will require additional space. At this moment, we don’t have a single office to give a new faculty member. We aren’t recruiting this year so it’s not an issue; however, as we have emphasized in previous academic plans, we are always short of space and desperately need it.

The issue is larger than just faculty offices, however. At this point in time, we have virtually no room to grow for faculty who would like to have more space to conveniently house their research assistants or their secure computer facilities. With faculty winning external grants more than ever, they must hire Graduate Research Assistants; more are using confidential data sources as well. We have accommodated some modest needs thus far by rededicating a small common room to a secure computer facility but at present, we have no other rooms to use for this purpose.
The belief that sociologists (or social science faculty, for that matter) only need their own individual offices is predicated on an outdated research model. To an increasing degree, in order for us to be competitive in recruiting exciting and productive new faculty, we need start-up space, where faculty can work with groups and which house students who are working on computers with various kinds of data. For this reason, our quest for new and more space will continue unabated.

**Multiple Outcomes**

By taking these steps we will move closer to being a distinguished sociology department that will be recognized as such by our colleagues at peer institutions.

A. By moving further in the direction of improving our strengths in the areas of stratification, inequality, and social change, we should be able to strengthen our ability to recruit outstanding faculty of color. Having a critical mass of scholars who teach and do research in this area would give us a competitive recruitment edge, serving both our own and the university’s goals to achieve a diversified, excellent faculty. Rather than speaking abstractly of our desire to “diversify,” we believe that creating a more diverse faculty will become reality if we strive to orient our program toward the emphases described above. Doing so will materially link our recruitment efforts to the fields in which we specialize and hope to expand.

B. More successful recruitment of diverse faculty will help us better mentor our students: as the figures presented at the outset of this plan demonstrate, we teach in a major that hosts a disproportionate share of students of color, relative to the population of students of color on the campus as a whole. We strongly feel that in order to meaningfully serve the college-population of the state of California, which is incredibly and richly diverse, we should strive to build a faculty that looks more like this population. Whether through teaching or research, women and faculty of color have a unique ability to reach out and speak to students of color and we hope to build our capacity to offer this to students. A more diverse faculty would allow us to recruit a more diverse set of graduate students, as well.

C. Formalizing these commitments will also enhance the quality of our undergraduate program. Not only can we build a more diverse faculty; we can effectively support the many classes we offer in the areas of diversity, multiculturalism, and stratification, quite a few of which we now must staff with lecturers. Moreover, with the addition of new faculty, we will be able to reduce our dependence on Lecturers, which is fundamentally an issue about quality. While we have many excellent Lecturers, there is no doubt in our mind that it is superior for our undergraduate majors to be able to work with ladder-rank faculty. They have active and ongoing research agendas which serve as a model to students; they are around on a consistent, comparatively long-term basis; they can develop long-term professional relationships with undergraduates and can mentor and write letters of recommendation for graduate training.
D. By building and formalizing our commitments to an identity as a program with a strong center of scholars who work on research related to inequality and social problems, we should be better able to **generate the kinds of research synergies that are the mark of distinguished departments and programs**. Stated emphasis on these scholarly areas means that we self-consciously strive to improve and grow, and search for opportunities to create alliances with other programs and units.

E. Continuing to maintain methodological pluralism, **we improve our ability to recruit excellent graduate students**. Students apply to our program because we can train them in and encourage them to take multiple methodologies, and because the areas of expertise represented by our faculty reflect some of the most important areas and issues in the discipline today.

**Summary**

Among other things, we are excited about the fact that our future plans are in sync with recent commitments of the University of California to achieve excellence by diversifying university faculty, staff, and students. The official Diversity Statement adopted by the Academic Senate of the University of California states that, "the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity" in its research and creative activity (see [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/diversity.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/diversity.html)). The Sociology Department can play an important role in helping the University fulfill this promise.

The faculty agree that the department will thrive if we are given the resources that we have discussed in this plan.

Prepared by Vicki Smith
Professor and Chair, Sociology
Appendix I: The Planning Process

In preparation for faculty discussion of a new five-year academic plan the chair first closely reviewed plans that had been written in 1995, 1999, and 2004.

Second, the chair wrote a history of departmental recruitment efforts undertaken between 2000 and 2007. This document outlines how 2000-2007 recruitment efforts succeeded in meeting recruitment goals and building our program in ways that had been specified in the previous plans, and also highlights the substantive areas in which the department has not met the goals of the plans. The document also evaluates losses (instructional and research) the department has suffered due to retirements and other faculty departures.

Third, the chair compiled a “Programmatic Map of the Sociology Department” which lays out the substantive clusters of teaching and research that are primary in the department (three large clusters, three moderately sized clusters, and three small clusters). The programmatic map identifies all the classes which would be grouped within each cluster, and the faculty who typically teach all its courses. It also includes the names of faculty who do research on topics in the cluster, even if they don’t usually teach the classes. Our three largest clusters – multiculturalism, stratification and inequality; organizations/economy and society; and migration/globalization/international studies – have the largest number of classes and the largest number of faculty whose research falls in the area.

Fourth, the chair assembled a ten-page handout including a variety of facts and figures about the sociology department: information about the gender, race, and ethnicity of UC Davis students and sociology majors; the ranking of the sociology department with respect to size of undergraduate majors and most popular undergraduate major; data on sociology faculty/student credit hours; the size of our graduate program relative to other social science programs; and our use of lecturers and teaching assistants. The history of recruitment, the programmatic map, and background information were circulated to faculty prior to meeting.

Fifth, the sociology faculty met on February 8, 2008, for an initial discussion of the new plan, basing its discussion on all the materials listed above. The chair used comments from that discussion as a basis for writing a draft of the plan. We discussed plans for a five-year period of no growth, and for a period of modest growth of 5-7%, as requested. The faculty then met on February 29, 2008, to discuss the draft and finalize the details of the plan. Faculty continued to provide input on this document, up until the time of submission.
Appendix II

The Network of UCD Sociology Faculty Research Areas: Detailed Breakdown

![Network Diagram of UCD Sociology Faculty Research Areas]
Appendix III

Grants for scholarly research that UCD sociology faculty have obtained as solo Principle Investigators, covering various points within the last five years (alphabetical):

Beamish, Tom: $186,000, National Science Foundation; 2006
Block, Fred: $200,000, Ford Foundation; 2007
Carroll, Patrick: $160,000, National Science Foundation; 2007
Grattet, Ryken: $16,000 California Department of Corrections; 2005
Grodsky, Eric: $55,000, National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation; 2005
Lo, Ming-cheng: $75,000, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; 2006-2008
Okamoto, Dina: $5,500, American Sociological Association/National Science Foundation, 2007
$350,000, William T. Grant Foundation, 2007
$165,835, Russell Sage Foundation, 2007
Paterniti, Deborah: $167,400, California Breast Cancer Research Program; 2006
Shauman, Kim: $96, 600, National Science Foundation; 2002-2004
Smith, Vicki: $28,500, Spencer Foundation; 2006
U, Eddy: US $55,000 Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation; 2007

Total ~$1.5 million

Grants for scholarly research that UCD sociology faculty have obtained with other Principle Investigators, covering various points within the last five years (alphabetical):

Deeb-Sossa, Natalia: $39,900, Programa de investigacion de migracion y salud; 2007
$2,000, Chicana/Latina Research Center; 2007
Felmlee, Diane: $722,000, National Science Foundation; 2006-2009
Grattet, Ryken: $284,000, National Institute of Justice; 2005
$53,900, National Science Foundation; 2005
$88,000, U.S. Department of Education; 2004
$17,500, American Institutes for Research; 2004
McCarthy, Bill: $300,000 Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Institute for Mental Health, Neuroscience and Addictions; 2003-2006
Shauman, Kim: $200,000, National Science Foundation; 2002-2004

Total ~$2.2 million

Total of two categories = $3.7 million
Endnotes

i Data on UCD majors are taken from facts.ucdavis.edu; data on sociology majors were compiled by the sociology Undergraduate Advisers.

ii http://asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/research_and_stats/profession_trend_data/doctorate/recipients_by_race/ethnicity_in_selected_disciplines_19852004;
http://asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/research_and_stats/profession_trend_data/doctorate_degrees_awarded_to_women_in_selected_disciplines_since_2000

iii http://asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/sections/sections_membership_counts

iv Research interests were gathered from individual faculty web pages and the image was created using the Netdraw component of UCINET social network software.

v Sociology regularly offers the following undergraduate classes in these areas: Immigration and Opportunity; Intercultural Relations in Multicultural Societies (a two-quarter class); Interracial Interpersonal Dynamics; Sociology of Black Experience in America; Race Relations; Sociology of Gender; Sociology of Racial Ethnic Families; African American Society and Culture 1790-1990; Social Stratification; Sociology of Violence and Inequality; Sociology of the Jewish Experience; Social Stratification in China; we also offer, at the graduate level, Ethnic/Race Relations, Gender, Culture, and Local/Global Transformation, and Gender, Race, and Work.