PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR RALPH HEXTER  
Offices of the Chancellor and Provost  

Dear Provost Hexter:  

Please find enclosed the 2011 Strategic Plan of the Division of Social Sciences (DSS). There are two parts to the plan: The plan itself, and an attachment, the report of the Social Sciences Advisory Council (which I handed to you in July during our monthly update meeting). The report was the basis for the plan, and hence the delay in our submission of the plan because the report was not completed until June 2011.  

In your charge letter of April 20, 2011, you asked that this transmittal letter include a summary of the strategic plan addressing the following questions. I provide my brief comments below, but also direct you to the Executive Summary and Conclusions of the attached plan.  

Sincerely,  

George R. Mangun, Ph.D.  
Dean, Division of Social Sciences  
Professor of Psychology and Neurology
Summary of the Strategic Plan/Responses to Provost’s Questions

1. What significant changes will your school/college/division see by 2020?

(i) The division will make further gains in national prominence through the activities of a new Institute for Social Sciences (see section IV. A.);
(ii) Undergraduate research will be increased to enable more students to take advantage of the unique opportunities of a research institution; and,
(iii) There will be an increase in both endowed support for education and research, and in extramural funding – the former supported by our increased investment in development, and the latter supported by the creation of both the Research Service Center (a Division grants administration team) and implementation of metrics that emphasize a more entrepreneurial role for faculty and programs.

2. What significant strengths will it continue to support and build upon?

The Division is very broad. Our current strengths are in the highly NRC ranked programs in Anthropology, Political Science, Psychology, Economics and History. We will continue to invest strongly in these areas. Increased emphasis on public policy (e.g., with UC Center Sacramento) and research and outreach (e.g., National Poverty Center) will also occur.

3. What specific strategies will your academic units employ to maintain excellence in undergraduate education? In graduate education?

In 2011-12 a new Committee on Effective Delivery of the Curriculum (CEDC) (see section III. B.) will work with all departments and programs to maximize teaching effectiveness, and make recommendations that focus on improving the student educational experience.

4. What will it stop doing in order to build to its strengths?

Under the auspices of the Institute for Social Sciences, the division will begin a comprehensive review of programs, centers, and initiatives. The goal is to terminate ineffective programs in order to divert resources to new initiatives that will permit the division to remain vibrant. At present, the Center for History, Society and Culture (CSHC) has been suspended while a review of its future is conducted.

5. How have you and the faculty distinguished between (1) weak programs that are so fundamental that they must be strengthened, and (2) weak programs that should be phased out?

As noted above in #4, comprehensive review, and a consideration of factors such as undergraduate demand versus national standing, will go into our decisions (see the discussion on pages 26-27 of the Strategic Plan, which contrast two large majors – Communication and Psychology – in light of the differing academic standing of the two units).
6. What collaboration with other schools/colleges/divisions will be necessary for yours to attain its goals?

The division has strong interdisciplinary ties to virtually the entire campus. It has key roles in the Center for Neuroscience, California Regional Primate Center, UC Center Sacramento, as well as in Graduate Groups in the natural sciences. These will continue, with an emphasis on STEM education from both our STEM fields (Psychology and Anthropology), from the perspectives of the social sciences (via Science and Technology Studies and the Center for Science and Innovation Studies). If a new business major comes to fruition, the division will actively participate with the GSM and other colleges.

7. How will your school/college/division participate in emerging, multidisciplinary foci of excellence (energy/environment, water, food, society, health to name a few general areas)?

The new Institute for Social Sciences will include this at the core of its mandate. In addition, as in the case of the National Poverty Center, the division will lead the campus in areas of the highest relevance to society. The Institute of Governmental Affairs, the new Institute for Social Science, our leadership in UCCS, all involve interdisciplinary activities, and aim to capitalize on campus strengths while providing leadership in a wide range of public policy areas.

8. Is there an emergent sub-discipline or interdisciplinary constellation that you (or we at Davis more broadly) are not yet appropriately engaged in that you believe will become essential in the next 5-10 years?

We discuss several opportunities in the Strategic Plan and related SSAC report. However, it is our position that annual calls to the faculty to compete for new initiative seed money, vetted by the Board of Directors of the new Institute for Social Sciences, will provide an on-going means of bringing forward the most innovative ideas. Therefore our intent in this plan is not to identify one or a few initiatives, but rather to build institutional means of continuously eliciting and supporting the most novel and exciting faculty ideas.

9. What opportunities does your plan offer to advance diversity at Davis and what strategies will you employ to capitalize on those opportunities?

Section VII addresses this issue. Historically, the division has had a strong commitment to advancing diversity. For example, our Economics Department has the highest percentage and number of tenured female faculty members in North America (which probably also means in the entire globe). During the past three years, we have appointed more female faculty members as departmental Chairs than in the prior decade. Lastly, we continue to engage opportunities to bring new faculty to campus through opportunities such as the Presidential Postdoc program, which last year helped us recruit a Hispanic scholar to the Division. We will continue to promote and monitor these activities.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Vision for Social Sciences (2011), the strategic plan for the Division of Social Sciences (DSS) in the College of Letters and Science, provides a framework for continuing excellence in social science academic units in research, teaching and service. The overarching goal for DSS is to ensure that all social science programs are on a trajectory to enter the top tier in the nation, providing the finest education possible to UC Davis students. The division is well positioned to accomplish this goal, having five of its seven NRC-ranked programs in the top 25 nationally for public universities – two in the top 10, two in the top 20, and one in the top 25. The plan lays out how to enhance the core academic mission to benefit society through innovative education, visionary scholarship, and bold leadership. It embraces the unprecedented challenges facing the University as the result of significant reductions in state support and the resulting reorganization of the campus budget mechanisms. In its strategic focus, the DSS plan is aligned with the campus plan, A Vision of Excellence (2010). In contrast to past divisional academic plans, the present document does not focus on specific faculty hiring objectives for individual academic units, although it does provide examples of interdisciplinary opportunities. Rather, it lays out the principles that will be used to align the division with the campus plan and goals, and for moving the division forward over the next five years during an anticipated period of growth. One core feature of the plan is the development of a new Institute for Social Sciences (IS²), an overarching hub for social sciences scholarship within the division and across campus. IS² will coordinate the development of new initiatives and the evaluation of ongoing programs, which will guide future programmatic development, enrich educational opportunities, and serve as a focus for fundraising efforts. The DSS strategic plan addresses undergraduate and graduate education, including STEM education, where the division provides significant campus leadership and holds significant responsibility. The plan also lays out the metrics that will be used to evaluate success in scholarship, education, service and administration, and importantly, also in supporting the UC Davis Principles of Community. Lastly, the plan summarizes sweeping administrative changes that have been undertaken to support the division’s academic mission, and to enhance research and educational success. A foundation of the divisional plan is the 2011 report of the Social Sciences Advisory Council (SSAC), Strengthening the Social Sciences at UC Davis: Review of Progress and Proposal for the Future, which is attached to this document.
I. Background

The Division of Social Sciences (DSS) in the College of Letters and Science has developed a strategic plan, *A Vision for Social Sciences* (2011), as part of the campus planning process initiated in 2010 by Chancellor Katehi. In line with the campus plan, *A Vision of Excellence* (2010), the divisional plan aims to propel the social sciences forward in all aspects of the academic mission. This plan was undertaken at the height of unparalleled success in the division’s academic mission over the past decade, but also in the midst of unprecedented challenges to the University of California, resulting from severe reductions in state financial support. The campus response to the opportunities and challenges at this juncture in history will likely determine the course of UC Davis for decades. DSS embraced this fact in creating a plan that will protect its core mission, stimulate innovation in scholarly and educational achievements, benefit students, staff and faculty, and translate these efforts to advance the campus and society. In the remainder of this section, the context of the plan is described in terms of the relevance, challenges, and opportunities for the social sciences at UC Davis.

A. Relevance of Social Sciences

The following critical factors highlight the relevance of the social sciences to the campus mission:

- **Social sciences are core disciplines in any top-ranked research university.** The societal issues facing our world in the twenty first century are among the world’s most pressing concerns, and therefore, students from all disciplines will require a basic understanding of social sciences’ issues and methodologies in order to maximize the impact of their contributions.

- **Social science education and research provides significant return on investment.** Although the psychological and anthropological sciences require investments similar to those in the wider life, physical and engineering sciences, much social science research and education has relatively low capital (building) and operating (utilities and maintenance) costs. As a result, for the same investments in education and research, the benefit to the campus in reputation and ranking from investing in the social sciences is potentially higher than laboratory intensive disciplines.
● **Social sciences are popular with students.** Many students come to UC Davis to major in the life, physical and engineering sciences, only to transfer to majors in the social sciences during their tenure here. These students have very often been shown to be among the most accomplished students, as indexed by SAT scores and other metrics, who are attracted to the challenges in social sciences.

● **Social sciences are critical for societal progress.** Whether one considers sustainability, health care, environmental policy, or globalization, the social sciences are essential for understanding the critical issues and for developing innovative solutions to society’s most pressing problems.

### B. Educational Challenges and Opportunities

The relevance and popularity of the social sciences are reflected in how the division has grown over the past decade. During the past decade, student demand for the social sciences has remained extremely strong. Between 2003 and 2010, the number of degrees conferred in DSS rose by over 24%, slightly outpacing the campus growth during that period. The division confers nearly 35% of all campus degrees (Fig. 1), and is home to the largest campus major, Psychology, which confers close to 10% of all UC Davis undergraduate degrees.

The ratio of undergraduate students to faculty members continues to climb, jumping recently as described below, and this is a significant challenge for the division. Another challenge is the relatively low ratio of graduate students to faculty members in the social sciences, a problem that must be addressed in order to maintain and accelerate the academic status of social science programs. Finally, the reductions in faculty numbers have exacerbated a long-standing problem that despite the size of the UC Davis campus, the departments and programs in the division of social sciences are undersized compared with peer institutions in the UC system and nationally. These three factors represent significant challenges to the national ranking and international reputation of our departments and programs because all three factors contribute to the quality of academic programs. With this in mind, the continued success of divisional academic programs (reviewed below in section II. Academic Standing of Social Sciences) is all the more noteworthy.
Although unresolved at this time, campus planning suggests that UC Davis must grow its student body by roughly 5,500 students, with a commensurate growth of approximately 300 Senate faculty members, over the next five years. This presents both a challenge and an opportunity for DSS. Based on past patterns of enrollment, and changing national factors (e.g., changes in premedical curricula), it is likely that DSS will experience another period of significant growth in majors, and in teaching of non-majors given the significant role the division plays in general education across campus. The division must compete effectively for the new faculty positions in order to accommodate student growth, mitigate the damage of recent reductions in faculty numbers due to the budget reductions, and provide for hiring in new strategic areas of scholarship and research that will be necessary to advance UC Davis’ stature in the social sciences.

![Figure 1. Degrees Awarded 2009-10](image)

**2009-10 Bachelor Degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division of Social Sciences</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Humanities, Arts &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Budget Impact and Response**

Despite the growth in faculty through 2008, recent events have seriously undermined DSS academic programs and their ability to effectively deliver undergraduate and graduate education. In the division, budget cutbacks over the past three years have led to permanent reductions of close to $5M annually –
approximately 10% of an already lean budget. In response to this remarkable circumstance, the division has:

- **Reduced Senate faculty by approximately 11%**

- **Reorganized administrative support by:**
  - Clustering services across departments, programs and centers
  - Developing divisional service centers for
    - *Human resources and payroll*
    - *IT support*
    - *Grants management*

- **Reduced funds for supplemental instruction**

Importantly, although budgetary challenges have motivated these actions, not all are considered negative. Throughout this process of reduction and reorganization, the focus has been on maintaining the quality of academic programs. In this light, the reorganization of the division’s administrative support is viewed as an opportunity to improve service to our academic programs by creating efficiencies derived from the clustering of support. For example, in the case of IT support, a centralized (divisional) IT group means that departments have backup from the entire group, and are less affected by loss of IT staff due to illness or departure. Similarly, IT support is now specialized, so that each department and program has access to the full spectrum of expertise from desktop support to systems administration.

In the case of the new grants administration group (Research Service Center), all departments at present have access to professional pre- and post-award administration, and the division has a single point of contact with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (OVCR) and the Sponsored Programs Office (SPO). For some departments, this is the first time they had direct access to grants management services, including advising faculty members and trainees on how to research grant opportunities, initiate grants, and manage awards.

Importantly, the administrative reorganization also provides divisional staff with opportunities for career development, including advancement within the division, because the increased size of the administrative units (e.g., clusters and service centers) results in higher classifications for many positions. Interestingly, this is the case even though the recent analysis by Budget and Institutional
Analysis (BIA) showed our divisional administrative structure to be the “flattest” on campus, meaning that the ration of supervisors to those supervised is low (a pattern considered positive according to efficiency criteria on campus and around the nation). A related but different result is that because the new organization has reduced the number of administrative units, increasing the size and complexity of the new units, there is now more breadth in terms of job titles, which results in more specialization in duties, and additional staff opportunity.

As the campus moves to a new incentive-based budget model, it will be essential that the division address faculty and student needs with an appropriate level of staffing and staff support, whether this occurs at the local or service center level. Historically this has been a problem for the division. Over the years, it added considerable numbers of faculty while budget cuts severely reduced the level of academic support, leaving it with by far the lowest level of support per ladder faculty FTE of any unit on campus. Adding more faculty members only exacerbated the problem. Lack of adequate support is problematic for faculty productivity, morale and ultimately retention. This is not an argument for simply increasing the numbers of staff members, but rather for increasing the investment in staff support for the academic mission, whether this requires adding staff, improving the training of the staff, upgrading the tools available to the staff to perform their duties, or in other ways of investing in support services.

With the aforementioned actions completed, the present strategic plan is forward looking, laying out the principles that will guide our advancement over the period from 2011-2016 and beyond. The plan will position the division to take advantage of the new budget model and the anticipated strategic growth in faculty, which will provide opportunities for advancement of our strongest academic programs, and the development of new high-priority academic programs that will benefit our students and propel the division to the top tier of public American universities.

D. Progress, Challenges and Opportunities in Social Sciences

The present strategic plan relies on an assessment of our past and present status, and future aims, drawing strongly from a faculty report prepared by the thirteen-member Social Sciences Advisory Council (SSAC), which was formed by the Dean of Social Sciences in 2010. The report, *Strengthening the Social Sciences at UC Davis: Review of Progress and Proposals for the Future* (2011), is attached to this document. To the extent possible, the present plan will avoid duplicating the analyses and conclusions of the SSAC report, and will
instead refer to the SSAC report as appropriate. The SSAC report made the following main points and observations (summarized from the report):

**Summary of Conclusions of the SSAC Report (2011)**

- **DSS departments play a huge role in undergraduate education**
  - Granting 35% of all undergraduate degrees on campus, and with only approximately 200 Senate faculty members, DSS is faced with high student demand. The student-faculty ratio for DSS is the highest on campus.

- **UC Davis cannot be a top-tier university without top-tier social science departments**
  - Hiring social scientists is economical in terms of salaries, space, and startup funds compared to other kinds of scientists, and therefore investing in social science can aid the campus in its goal of moving into the top tier of public national universities.

- **Extramural grants in social sciences increased 1700% in a decade**
  - Extramural awards grew from $720,525 in 2000 to $13,198,669 in 2010 in the division. This increase foreshadowed the significant rise in NRC rankings despite the small faculty size of DSS units relative to the top UCs and our peers nationally.

- **DSS departments advanced in rankings over the past decade**
  - Strategic hiring remains critical to continue to propel our departments to the top in national rankings.

- **Budget cuts threaten faculty retention and therefore excellence**
  - UCD needs to find ways to continue making excellent hires in the social sciences, and to retain our top scholars when they are courted by other universities.

- **DSS faculty are willing and eager to respond to financial and other incentives that will advance the division’s mission**
  - But to do so, the faculty members must have clear and transparent budget information at the campus and college level.
● **The Council suggests that an Institute for Social Sciences be established to advance the academic mission of the division**
  - An Institute for Social Sciences will help propel the social sciences at UC Davis into the top ranks nationally by stimulating the development of innovative, interdisciplinary initiatives within the division and across campus.

II. Academic Standing of Social Sciences

The Division of Social Sciences includes nine academic departments (plus Military Science), seven undergraduate academic programs, three major research centers/institutes, and several smaller initiatives. An assessment of the scholarship in these units shows that the division has made significant strides forward over the past decade (see attached SSAC report).

A. National Stature of the Social Sciences

The social sciences at UC Davis continue to increase their national rankings and international visibility. The most recent (2010) National Research Council (NRC) rankings show that our traditionally highest ranked units continue to be ranked among the best in the nation, and previously strong departments have moved up in the rankings significantly. This was despite the relatively small size of our departments in comparison to UC Berkeley, UCLA and UCSD, and national peer institutions. The attached SSCA report provide a detailed analysis of each program, but some highlights are worth noting here, focusing on the NRC S-rankings, which are based on quantitative factors such as productivity and impact.

The NRC S-rankings show Anthropology 12\textsuperscript{th} (range 7\textsuperscript{th}-21\textsuperscript{st}) overall nationally, and 4\textsuperscript{th} among public institutions (out of 82 programs); in the UC system, the S-rankings for UC Davis Anthropology are indistinguishable from UC Berkeley, and marginally better than UCLA or UC Irvine.

Previously solid departments such as Political Science and Psychology have increased their standing dramatically in the NRC rankings to become nationally prominent. In the 2010 NRC rankings, Political science ranked 16\textsuperscript{th} (7\textsuperscript{th}-26\textsuperscript{th}) overall nationally, and 6\textsuperscript{th} among public institutions in the S-rankings (out of 105 programs). In the UC system only UCSD and UC Berkeley were ranked higher, and only marginally so in the case of Berkeley. A similar success
story is the case for Psychology, whose S-ranking placed it 29th (21st-57th) overall nationally, and 14th among public universities (out of 236 programs). In the UC system, Davis Psychology is indistinguishable from UC Berkeley in NRC S-rank, and only slightly behind UCSD and UCSB, with UCLA the clear number one (it is worth noting that UCLA’s Psychology program is almost twice the size of ours in faculty numbers, and this is also the case with most DSS departments).

The remaining departments, if ranked (Communication and Linguistics are not ranked in the 2010 NRC rankings as their graduate programs are new), performed solidly in the NRC rankings (Economics at 18th among public universities, and 3rd in UC; History at 23rd among publics, and 4th in UC, tied with UCSD), and the picture painted by the NRC rankings is mirrored in more reputation based rankings such as those in US News and World Report where Political Science and Psychology are in the top 25 nationally, and Economics, History and Sociology in the Top 35 nationally (USN&WR does not rank Anthropology departments).

In addition to these NRC and USN&WR overall rankings, it is important to also appreciate that in both subdiscipline rankings for the foregoing, or rankings performed within scholarly disciplines themselves, several areas in the social sciences are near or in the top 10 nationally, bringing distinction to UC Davis. For example, Economics was ranked 8th among public universities based on the quantitative assessments of productivity and impact in the RePEc rankings for 2011 (http://ideas.repec.org/top/top.inst.all.html), and is typically ranked in the top 5 nationally in the subdiscipline of Economic History. Similarly, Social and Personality Psychology was ranked #4 in the nation for productivity and impact in recent disciplinary rankings (2010, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin). US New and World Report placed US Colonial History at 14th in the nation overall, and Sex and Gender Sociology at 10th national overall.

As reviewed briefly here (see attached SSAC report for the comprehensive analyses), most departments significantly improved their rankings over the past decade, some dramatically. Within the UC system, overall, the UC Davis Division of Social Sciences is solidly in 4th position behind UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSD, but is also clearly pressing UCSD for 3rd. With appropriate continued investment, social sciences at UC Davis and UCSD will soon be indistinguishable in productivity, impact and reputation.
B. Variety in the Division of Social Sciences

In considering the social sciences in the division, it is essential to understand the breadth of disciplines and range of methodological approaches represented. The division includes biologists, humanists, and social scientists. Methodological approaches include experimental and analytical laboratory science, field study (around the globe), quantitative and qualitative analyses, and theoretical, statistical and mathematical modeling.

This diversity of the division is one of its strengths, but also a challenge—a challenge to ensure that policies and administrative structures serve this diversity. For example, in the RSC for grants administration, the requirements of NIH, NSF, and DOD must be supported as well as those of the Mellon Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS).

In reorganizing our administrative structure, the goal was to provide a high level of service across the range of the division’s disciplines. As well, the allocation of resources and the methods use to determine such allocations must be able to critically weigh competing programs and proposals in a manner that takes account of different values, methods, and goals. Finally, the evaluation of faculty achievement must balance the varieties in scholarship that range from multi-authored experimental science reported in journal articles to single author monographs. This last point was problematic for some social science departments in the 2010 NRC rankings where books authored in fields such as sociology were not accounted for in quantifying productivity, thereby affecting national ranking.

In sum, quantitative assessment of the division demonstrates that programmatic development and related faculty hiring have been very effective in bringing talented faculty members to UC Davis. In part, this has been accomplished through our participation in interdisciplinary initiatives on campus, as well as the development of strong programs in the division. These successes in the social sciences need to be continued and accelerated to meet the campus goal of moving UC Davis into the top five of national public universities.

III. Principles, Goals and Metrics

The present plan, as noted, does not seek to describe the future faculty recruitments by department and specialty, but rather lays out how excellence in
programmatic development will be accomplished and evaluated. Recruitment of new faculty members does not happen in a vacuum that considers only research, but includes consideration of how the teaching missions at undergraduate and graduate levels benefit, and how the activities of the faculty members contribute to the mission of the campus. As well, societal influence – how units contribute to the region, state, nation and globe – represents a core value of the land grant university. We will discuss specific issues related to education in a later section (section V. Undergraduate and Graduate Education). Here we outline the divisional aspirations and the metrics that will be used to both gauge success, and determine the allocation of resources to departments and programs. In the following we will address:

- **Program Excellence**
- **Teaching Effectiveness**
- **Campus Impact**
- **Societal Impact**
- **Diversity and Community**

### A. Program Excellence

Although it is widely agreed that national rankings alone are difficult metrics, they nonetheless strongly influence the standing of our campus nationally and internationally. Yet, it is absolutely critical that UC Davis determine the metrics by which to assess the productivity and impact of its units, because external measures are fraught with peculiarities. We need to develop quantitative rankings that consider productivity and impact of scholarship, effectiveness of training, and societal contributions; these are available both within individual disciplines and nationally as in the case of the NRC and other rankings. Over the past decade or two, the rankings of academic programs in DSS have risen steadily. Investments in key areas, and innovation in programmatic development has resulted in the expected outcome for many programs, as described in an earlier section (see also attached SAAC report). Therefore, going forward, rankings and other quantitative assessments of programmatic quality will be considered in the allocation of resources in the division. Both absolute standing, and change in rankings over time will be considered, as will programmatic planning. For smaller or younger programs, similar metrics can be applied that
consider differences in size and stage, providing quantification of whether or not the program is advancing. The following summarizes the primary metrics for program excellence:

- **Current stature as assessed by metrics including rankings**
  - Has the program been effective in investing their resources to build programmatic strength and recognition, and how is this changing over time?

- **Innovation in planning and strategic investment**
  - Does the program have specific plans for subfield excellence that can propel it forward by bringing national recognition?

- **Success in competitive extramural awards**
  - Is the program both aggressively pursuing and successful in receiving extramural grants, fellowships, and related awards appropriate for their discipline?

- **Success in training doctoral students**
  - Does the program attract the best students? How well does the program prepare doctoral students for their careers? This includes consideration of whether students obtain extramural or prestigious campus fellowships during their tenure at UC Davis, are placed in top postgraduate positions, and achieve long-term career success.

It is important to appreciate that an emphasis on excellence as determined by metrics like rankings could result in strong programs becoming stronger and weaker (smaller or younger) programs becoming weaker. This would not necessarily achieve the goal of raising the quality of all DSS academic programs because new promising programs need time and investment to develop. However, with proper care and clearly defined expectations for improvement, it will be possible to either further invest in promising programs or to identify programs that should be considered for reorganization or dissolution.

**B. Teaching Effectiveness**

The Division of Social Science has the responsibility of educating thousands of undergraduate and graduate students each year. This includes the very large number of social science majors (see Fig. 1, above), and a large
number of students whose majors are outside the social sciences, but who require General Education courses. In 2011, the DSS Committee on Effective Delivery of Curriculum (CEDC) was established by the Dean to develop a set of recommendations to improve all aspects of our teaching mission, and to establish the metrics to be used in evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The report of the committee, which is not expected until spring 2012, is not available for inclusion in this strategic plan, but will be incorporated into the strategic actions taken by the division going forward. The committee is charged with considering the following primary metrics for evaluating teaching effectiveness (as well as identifying others of relevance):

- **Efficiency in instruction**
  - How well does the program utilize its resources to provide high-quality instruction to its students?

- **Curricular development**
  - Does the program continue to evaluate and refine the curriculum to best support student needs and reflect the cutting-edge of instruction in the discipline?

- **Student credit hours by ladder rank faculty members**
  - Relative to the standards of the discipline, are the Senate faculty of the program providing (or paying for from extramural sources, such as federal grants) levels of instruction and student contact hours appropriate for a national research university?

- **Teaching awards and innovation**
  - Do the faculty and staff receive teaching awards and recognition for innovation on campus and nationally that indicate exceptional achievement in teaching?

- **Learning outcomes**
  - Has the program developed (and implemented) formal metrics of learning outcomes as, for example, reported to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and the college Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee (TPPRC)? Does the program show evidence that the learning outcomes
are being translated into successful career or postgraduate training opportunities?

C. Campus Impact

The campus strategic plan, *A Vision of Excellence* (2010), lays out competitive advantages in resources and expertise that UC Davis can leverage. Participation and leadership in interdisciplinary initiatives that draw on UC Davis' competitive advantages, is one key element. UC Davis, as a comprehensive university, has a wide variety of opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, and the division participates in many campus-wide initiatives (e.g., Center for Neuroscience; Center for Mind and Brain). The extent to which departments and programs lead and/or participate in campus-wide initiatives that leverage the social sciences will be an important metric for consideration for support. This has impact on research productivity as well as graduate and undergraduate instruction by creating novel educational and scientific opportunities.

D. Societal Impact

The issues addressed in the social sciences are among the most pressing for society. As a public, land grant institution, UC Davis has a responsibility to return to society at large the benefits of our expertise and discoveries. Members of the division provide service and outreach in their areas of expertise to the state and nation, as well as internationally. For example, the UC Center Sacramento (UCCS) is a highly salient case where the faculty of DSS are leading the effort to capitalize on the campus’ proximity to the state capitol. Another example is our leadership in supporting The History Project (http://historyproject.ucdavis.edu/), which improves K-16 education in history in the Sacramento area, as well as the statewide portion of this effort, the California History-Social Sciences Project (http://csmp.ucop.edu/chssp/), which is led from UC Davis.

Outreach and service have a significant impact on the welfare of our society and are considered part of the mission of the division, and therefore are included in consideration of the success of departments and programs during review. As we move forward with developing our programs (e.g., the new Institute for Social Sciences) it will be important to consider how to continue to help foster outreach and service.

E. Diversity and Community

The UC Davis Principles of Community are endorsed in our strategic planning, and how well programs address the need for a diverse community will
be considered an important metric in evaluation. This aspect of our divisional planning will be addressed in a later section.

IV. Opportunities in Scholarship and Research

The Division of Social Sciences has a very rich and diverse range of scholarly activities. The SSAC report (attached) reviews some potential areas for development that grow obviously out of existing strengths within the division and interdisciplinary opportunities on campus. Rather than vet these possibilities in this strategic plan, the goal here is to lay out how DSS will identify, evaluate and foster the most exciting and innovative new ideas to advance the missions of our departments and units, undergraduate and graduate programs, and outreach efforts. As a result, DSS will be positioned to create strategic opportunities in scholarship and education that maximizes the addition of new Senate FTE to the division under the anticipated growth of the campus. It is intended that all new growth FTE will reside in existing departments, but that new initiatives, identified through a competitive process, will guide that growth through the mechanisms described below.

The SSAC report recommends the development of a social science institute that would provide a focus for the activities of the division in coming years. In the following, the structure of the proposed new Institute for Social Sciences (IS²) is described.

A. The Institute for Social Sciences (IS²)

In order to identify, evaluate and foster new innovative academic areas (e.g., scholarly initiatives, programs, centers), DSS will create the Institute for Social Sciences (IS²). IS² will not have a singular scholarly focus, but will be charged with advancing all aspects of research and scholarship in the division, including the relationship between these activities and their impact on undergraduate and graduate education (Fig. 2, below). The institute should be considered an incubator of new ideas, and importantly, IS² should help provide the social sciences at UC Davis with a visible presence nationally.
IS² Objectives. The new institute will have a range of responsibilities, organized initially to include:

- **Create an international presence for UC Davis Social Sciences**
  - Following successful models such as the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, IS² will develop national and international presence through innovative programs, including cooperative activities with external partners that promote social science research in the division.

- **Stimulate division- and campus-wide collaborative research**
  - IS² will foster the development of collaborative research that enhances the divisional and campus academic missions.

- **Review and rank proposals for new initiatives**
  - The institute will provide a cohesive mechanism for reviewing and making recommendations for funding new initiatives. Successful proposals would be provided time-limited seed funding to launch their initiatives, with the expectation that these new programs would become largely self-supporting over time. Initiatives that do not flourish would be terminated following review (below).

- **Conduct reviews of existing initiatives, centers and institutes**
  - Periodic formal reviews of existing initiatives, centers and institutes will be conducted by IS² – written recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of Social Sciences. The goal here is to have a uniform, rigorous and transparent mechanism to review initiatives, including a mechanism to “sunset” them.

- **Foster graduate and undergraduate training in social science**
  - IS² will help advance the missions of undergraduate and graduate programs through programmatic and fundraising activities that benefit educational programs.

- **Inform the allocation of faculty positions**
  - In part, together with other criteria (e.g., curricular needs), the allocation of future FTE should be informed by the scholarly initiatives deemed most worthy in the review process in IS².
● Contribute to divisional fundraising and development efforts
  - The institute will provide a focus for fundraising in the social sciences.

**Structure of IS².** The new institute will have a Governing Board, consisting of six faculty members who represent the scholarly diversity of the division. The board will be appointed by the Dean of Social Sciences and/or a new Associate Dean for Research (see below) for non-overlapping 3-year terms (2 members will be rotated off/on each year). The board will nominate a chair from among the members each spring, to serve the following year. This chair will remain an *ad hoc* board member for a third year to provide continuity and assistance to the incoming chair. The board will establish and disestablish committees as necessary, including a committee on new initiatives that will receive proposals from faculty members, vet those proposals, and provide recommendations for funding priorities to the board. All funding decisions will be made by the Dean of Social Sciences and new Associate Dean for Research, to whom the IS² Governing Board is advisory.

*Figure 2.* Diagram of the planned Institute for Social Sciences (IS²). The institute will promote and foster activities in the division, as well as between the division and campus, and between the division and campus and external partners in the state, nation and globe. IS² will also help to integrate ongoing activities of other centers/institutes in the division, such as the Center for Mind and Brain (CMB), the Hemispheric Institute on the Americas (HIA), the Institute of Governmental Affairs (IGA) and the UC Center Sacramento (UCCS), and the Center for Science and Innovation Studies (CSIS), as well as other initiatives and programs supported by the division. The institute will also review proposals for new initiatives, and provide a mechanism for the formal review of all divisional academic centers/institutes, programs and initiatives (excluding degree-granting programs, which are separately reviewed).
Impact of IS$^2$. IS$^2$ is not intended as a separate, stand alone institute, but as noted, will instead have an important role in identifying the future directions of the division. Faculty members have had, and they should have, the lead in defining new faculty positions. As with the rest of campus, this role of the faculty has in past been realized by giving departments almost complete control over the disciplinary areas of new faculty hires. This has worked well to build disciplines, as DSS rankings attest, but less well to build innovative, interdisciplinary research and education programs, or to create synergies with other campus units (some notable exceptions duly acknowledged). In order to enable more synergies across the division, and between the division and other campus units, going forward, DSS will allocate a significant percentage of new FTE based on research opportunities and priorities identified as the highest priority by IS$^2$. Importantly, faculty will continue to define the priorities, and new hires will continue to be located in departments. In making such allocations, the division will be recognizing the need to preserve disciplinary strength as well. Proposals submitted to IS$^2$ will come from department-based faculty groups. Therefore, this initiative will serve to strengthen departmental programs as well as create new interdisciplinary strengths. Nothing in this plan is intended to subvert the role of the faculty, or of existing departments in the development of future academic programs. Instead, the goal is to avoid narrow planning of the sort that sometimes results from departments failing to think outside their borders.

In addition, to address campus priorities, as laid out in the campus plan, A Vision of Excellence (2010), and to foster cross-campus program development, IS$^2$ will be given the mandate to include in the evaluation of proposals, whether or not the initiative engages UCD units outside of DSS. This will be implemented by considering the extent to which proposals capitalize on campus strengths and priorities, not merely on where the faculty are located, of course. By including non-DSS faculty members on review committees charged with identifying promising directions for DSS investment, we will create a culture of thinking beyond the borders of the division to consider the greater campus mission. As a result, the social sciences at UC Davis will continue to rise not by merely emulating similar social sciences divisions/colleges in other universities, but by leveraging campus opportunities and resources to create a unique constellation of programs that will make UC Davis unique.

B. Coordinating Research in DSS: Associate Dean for Research

Research in the Division of Social Sciences is quite diverse and expansive, and despite significant growth over the past decade and a half (e.g.,
in extramural support), there remains great opportunity for expansion. With over 200 faculty members, and activities spanning the life, mathematical and social sciences, as well as humanities, DSS is a complex organization. Like CBS, CAES, COE, SOM, MPS and SVM, the division could benefit from the leadership of an experienced senior scholar who could coordinate research and graduate educational activities of the division, and oversee the administrative support structures that have been and are being developed to advance research and scholarship. With this in mind, DSS proposes to create a new position for an Associate Dean for Research, as exists in most of the aforementioned colleges/divisions. The Associate Dean for Research will have a broad portfolio that ranges from development activities (e.g., foundations, government and industry) to administrative support of research (e.g., the Research Service Center for grant administration, and research computing supported by the IT Service Center), and will include support of graduate education in the division.

C. Areas for Continued and Potential Future Investment

Although the goal of this strategic plan is to outline the principles and structures, such as IS$^2$, that will be used to guide decisions about future academic development, there are nonetheless important areas already identified for consideration that have emerged from past planning, the work of the SSAC, and other campus groups. In particular, in the case of the SSAC recommendations, the following reflect areas that represent emergent strengths in the social sciences, but that also present interdisciplinary opportunities that coalesce areas of scholarly strength in the division and across campus.

Areas for Potential Future Investment. The SSAC report (attached) identified several important opportunities that should be highlighted as IS$^2$ begins its work in 2012. These areas for consideration are discussed in great detail in the Appendices of the SACC report, and are therefore only described briefly here, with short abridged excerpts from the report. These include the following potential new initiatives:

- **Social Network Analysis**
  - *Network science is the study of the relationships and interactions among biological, physical, social, and conceptual units. The concepts, methods, and emerging models of this science span the social, biological, physical, medical, and engineering sciences, as well as the humanities. There is tremendous, but currently uncoordinated strength within the division and across the campus in network science, and much initial progress has been made that could be*
organized and advanced by pursuing this as an initiative led by the social sciences.

- **Decision-Making, Communication, and Uncertainty**
  - Uncertainty is a constant challenge to decision-making by individuals and groups. A central component to progress in effective decision-making is basic research in behavioral decision-making, including attitude formation and change, persuasion, and social influence, and the manner in which these individual-level cognitive processes interact with group-level phenomena such as social movements to drive public opinion and behavior. Decision-making is a primary research focus in many units within the division and across the campus, and is an area that is ripe for development; one example of a more targeted effort would be working with the John Muir Institute to develop “environmental decision-making”. To effectively address environmental challenges and prioritize conservation actions, our scientific understanding must be successfully integrated with the conflicting needs of parties whose economic and personal interests are often at odds. This process of conflict resolution requires disentangling complex and competing issues in very complicated biological, social, and economic environments.

- **Challenges to Human Security**
  - Rapid global political and environmental transformations pose a direct threat to human societies, and yet our ability to understand and address these challenges remains poorly developed. Human health and security are intimately tied to rapidly changing political and environmental conditions, and interact with issues such as human mobility and resettlement, human rights and social justice, military readiness and national security. Emerging economic opportunities, such as the solutions in energy efficiency and sustainability that UCD is a leader in innovating, may present solutions to many of the foregoing challenges when combined with expertise from the social sciences that permit the translation of new tools to solve social and cultural challenges.

**Areas for Continued Development and Investment.** There are several critical strengths in division that have resulted from past planning and/or investment that capitalized on campus-wide initiatives or special strengths in the division. The following are those that are identified for continued investment, and are important for the campus’ success:

- **Brain, Mind and Behavior**
  - The campus has made significant investments in developing major centers and institutes that have resulted in significant
success, and continue to provide opportunities for high-end interdisciplinary scholarship in studies of the brain, mind and behavior. Primarily via ties with Psychology and Anthropology, but increasingly with the involvement of Linguistics and Philosophy, the division has major roles in some of the campus’ leading research centers/institutes, including the following that should continue to be leveraged to the benefit of the division and campus:

− California National Primate Research Center
− Center for Neuroscience
− Center for Mind and Brain
− M.I.N.D. Institute

● Public Policy

  ▪ The Institute of Governmental Affairs (IGA) has functioned as an ORU at UC Davis for more than 20 years, and in 2010 was reorganized to provide a more broadly based program in public policy. Easily the most exciting development along these lines was the involvement of IGA and the division in helping the campus to assume the management of the UC Center at Sacramento (UCCS) on behalf of the university system. These developments provide the division and campus with a tremendous opportunity to advance public policy activities at UC Davis, where highly-ranked social science departments, such as Political Science and Economics, can advance their academic missions and societal impact.

● Science Innovation and Entrepreneurship (with School of Law)

  ▪ In 2010, the division, in partnership with the School of Law, launched the Center for Science and Innovation Studies (CSIS). CSIS investigates the processes of innovation, which are distributed across the sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and the professional schools. Through detailed case studies (both contemporary and historical), CSIS analyzes the role that training, cultural background, and cross-disciplinary mobility play in the emergence of innovation, as well as the new institutional, technical, social and legal arrangements that sustain it (e.g., intellectual property). CSIS is having a strong impact on degree programs such as that in Science and
Technology Studies (STS), and several social science majors. CSIS was developed with the support of the Chancellor and Provost, and is part of the campus' push to expand entrepreneurship at all levels. Hence, CSIS is a node in the wider campus efforts in innovation, entrepreneurship and STEM education.

- **Globalization and International Studies**
  - The Division of Social Sciences has dramatically increased its efforts in international programs of research and study. With its highly successful program in Middle East and South Asia Studies (ME/SA), the East Asian Studies (EAS) program, and a wide range of disciplinary expertise in history, sociology, anthropology, economics and related disciplines, the division is contributing strongly to the campus goals for globalization and internationalization. Importantly, these programs continue to provide international visibility that makes UC Davis a desired destination for international students and scholars.

- **Applied and Computational Linguistics**
  - The field of linguistics is rapidly evolving to become heavily interdisciplinary in its methods, models and theories. Moreover, there are increasing applications of linguistics that can solve real-world problems in society. For example, those involved in Homeland Security, or in biomedical applications to deafness, hearing loss and to communication disorders. The learning of English around the world can also be improved through new technologies, such as electronic corpora of learner English, and through collaborations with computer science. Applied linguistics (applications of linguistics to societal challenges) and computational linguistics (embracing methods from computer science, mathematics, and logic) are related areas of tremendous energy at present internationally. UC Davis linguistics is young and poised to establish an identity that capitalizes on the strengths in linguistics itself, as well as in psychology, neuroscience, philosophy and computer science.
International Economics

- Globalization is now moving forward at rapid pace, as illustrated by the recent/current world economic crisis. Understanding how global economic factors influence all aspects of society must necessarily rise in importance. UC Davis is strongly represented in the field of international economics, and is poised to develop a leading international program to understand how trade, investment, migration, immigration, currency regulation and other factors influence the global economy. The development of a center dedicated to international economics should be explored and should be a target for development efforts.

In sum, the Division of Social Sciences has numerous exciting opportunities for advancing its academic mission. The foregoing represents some of these, but many more exist, and will emerge as annual calls for new initiatives are released. The goal of this plan is to lay out how we will identify, evaluate and foster new innovative academic initiatives that will propel the Division of Social Sciences forward, building on the excellent foundation that has been laid over the past two decades. With the establishment of IS\(^2\), the mechanisms for vetting new initiatives and reviewing (and “sun setting”) existing ones will be in place. The administrative reorganization implemented in 2010 will provide strong support for existing and new initiatives. As a result, DSS will be positioned to be the most competitive for, and to make the most strategic possible uses of, new Senate FTE that are available as part of the anticipated campus growth, and the division’s strategic investments. One challenge, however, will be to develop the funding streams to support the most creative and promising proposals that will be identified and reviewed by the IS\(^2\). To this end, the new campus budget model holds the promise for ensuring that, together with development and other fundraising (e.g., extramural grants), these goals can be realized.

V. Undergraduate and Graduate Education

The Division of Social Sciences is responsible for undergraduate instruction for thousands of majors, and for virtually all undergraduates on campus through our offerings that support General Education requirements. As measured by degrees awarded, DSS has 8 of the 20 largest majors (including Psychology which is the largest on campus), awarding as a division a total of 2,215 degrees in 2009-10, or approximately 35% of all undergraduate degrees at
UC Davis (see Fig. 1). By any measure, the role of DSS in undergraduate education is immense. The allocation of Senate FTE to the division, however, has lagged behind growing enrollments, and the result of this is, of course, an unfavorable student-to-faculty ratio. This fact presents a significant challenge to the social sciences going forward, and was clearly identified as a significant concern in 2008-09 by the Undergraduate Council of the Academic Senate in their comments on the 2008 DSS academic plan. It is critical for the college and campus to work with the division to address this issue, which was exacerbated by the campus’ response to the budget crisis, which resulted in a loss of approximately 25 Senate faculty members (11% of the total DSS FTE, and therefore an even higher percentage of the filled FTE).

DSS also participates in numerous graduate programs, including those in social sciences departments, and several interdisciplinary graduate groups. Approximately 500 graduate students are supervised by faculty in the division. The ratio of graduate students to faculty members is lower than at highly-ranked peer institutions, and this needs to be corrected. The principal barrier to increasing graduate student by numbers is the ability to develop support for graduate stipends and tuition. The new budget model may create an opportunity to accomplish this because the large and increasing numbers of undergraduate students taught in the division requires increasing teaching assistance from graduate students, providing a source of graduate student support.

As noted earlier in section III. Principles, Goals and Metrics, part B. Teaching Effectiveness, the DSS faculty Committee on Effective Delivery of Curriculum (CEDC) was established by the Dean in 2011 to develop recommendations to improve all aspects of our teaching mission. The committee will develop metrics to be used in evaluations of teaching effectiveness in the division, in order to improve efficiency and quality of undergraduate education, and to address serious threats to the quality of undergraduate education, such as high student-to-faculty ratios, that have been identified by the Undergraduate Council, SSAC report (attached) and noted in this document. The CEDC will consider the following issues and metrics in their analyses: Efficiency in instruction, Curricular development, Student credit hours by ladder rank faculty members, Teaching awards and innovation, and Learning outcomes.

The CEDC report will not be complete until spring 2012, and therefore, the present section of the strategic plan will be brief with respect to detailed analyses and recommendations. The final recommendations of the CEDC, will however,
be vetted in the college, supplied to the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council for review and comment, and incorporated into the future actions taken in the division. The remainder of this section will address some issues and opportunities that face the division.

A. Undergraduate Education

In the following, challenges and opportunities for undergraduate education in the division are described. In general, since the last academic plan, the division, working with the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, has made significant progress in development and implementing formal metrics for Student Learning Outcomes and program assessment plans. The table below summarizes the status of the 14 DSS majors as of June 2011.

The Dean’s Office, in conjunction with Undergraduate Education and Advising in the college, the Vice Provost’s office, and the DSS department chairs and program directors, is working to complete all of the requirements and implement the assessment plans. The results will be reported to WASC for the ten-year WASC capacity report, to be submitted in fall 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Status of WASC</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PROG REVIEW CLUSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan drafted</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc–Organizational Studies</td>
<td>SLOs &amp; Assmt plan in progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>SLOs to be posted to web, Assmt plan in progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan in progress</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>SLOs to be posted to web, Assmt plan in progress</td>
<td>Cluster 3 – reviewed Spring 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>SLOs posted to web, Assmt plan in progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol Sci – Public Service</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Cluster 4 – began AY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee (TTPRC) reports for five programs – Economics, Political Science, International Relations, Psychology and Sociology – were completed in 2010-11. These have been reviewed by the dean and forwarded to the college Executive Committee.
**Challenges in Undergraduate Instruction.** There are several challenges and opportunities within the division regarding undergraduate education. Challenges stem largely from the presence of some very large majors. There are three impacted majors in the division: Communication, International Relations, and Psychology. Three additional majors qualify for impacted status (Economics, Political Science, and Sociology), but have not yet taken action to be declared as such. The impacted and potentially impacted majors present obvious challenges in terms of resource allocation, and even more importantly for strategic planning.

It is essential to understand the nature of the pressures on DSS. Whereas the Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS) has responsibility to provide introductory education of high demand in lower division subjects like chemistry and mathematics (DSS does also, in many courses), the demand in DSS is dramatic for upper division courses. By way of illustration, of the 22 Letters and Science courses that have “hotspot” status so far for fall 2011, (double digit wait list, or a wait list of more than 10% of total enrollment cap), 8 are upper division classes in Communication, 3 are upper division classes in Psychology, and 3 are upper division classes in Sociology). The “hotspot” list changes rapidly, but clearly these majors face challenges that must be addressed by careful long-term planning, in addition to short-term emergency measures. The CEDC will address these issues in its report. There are multiple concerns, but principal among them is that students may have difficulty completing their course of study within 4 years.
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**Figure 3.** Time to bachelor’s degree from High School. At the time the present plan was finalized, the statistics for 2010-11 were not yet available, but initial evidence suggest this trend has not reversed.
Hotspots and anecdotal reports would tend to suggest that this concern represents a grave threat. However, in contrast to the expressed concerns, the analysis through 2010 (Fig. 3, above) indicates that time-to-degree has not lengthened over the past five years in DSS, but has instead dipped slightly from 12.20 quarters in 2005-06 to 11.96 quarters in 2009-10 (the campus average is higher at 12.32, but the trend is the same direction).

Although in the right direction, the downward shift in time-to-degree is small, and these statistics will have to be monitored carefully, and thoroughly analyzed. The trend may reflect less what decisions the division and campus are making to improve time-to-degree, and more the economic reality that as tuition increases, students may themselves assume greater responsibility to finish their degree in a timely fashion.

From first principles, undergraduate choice of major cannot alone determine the allocation of Senate FTE in a comprehensive research university. Therefore, in the division, a balance is struck between the competing needs of instruction, and the scholarly missions and best educational practices of the disciplines within the social sciences. Although these needs do not compete in terms of importance—both must be factored into strategic resource allocation—they do compete in terms of resource allocation. Examples of how the division currently makes these decisions can be illustrated by considering two large majors, Communication and Psychology. These examples will demonstrate how the dual needs to provide effective instruction to large numbers of undergraduate students, and to advance the academic standing of departments and the division as a whole, determine resource allocation. (NOTE: The following examples should be considered only together with the information in section III. Principles, Goals and Metrics, above, which lays out in more detail how division resource allocation is organized and will be developed in future).

Communication is the third largest DSS major, and because core course requirements in majors such as Engineering must be served by the department, as well due to its popularity, it teaches many students across campus. Communication is, nonetheless, our smallest department, with only 9 Senate faculty members at present, and is unranked in US News & World Report or the 2010 NRC rankings (owing to it only developing a doctoral program this past year). A department that is rebuilding, with a new, dynamic externally-recruited chair, young faculty, and newly approved Ph.D. program, Communication is being remade to be a modern, highly interdisciplinary department for the rapidly
evolving “communication age” in which we live. They are, however, inundated with students and have had to respond to the teaching demands while also acting to improve the major. An impacted major, they have recently taken important steps to advance the curriculum by adding increased quantitative requirements, and these actions should help both control the size of the major, and improve the quality of student education. While this is positive, it comes at a time when DSS has been negatively impacted by reductions in FTE to meet large budget reductions handed to the division. As a result, despite the divisional desire to advance Communication, it is not slated for growth at present, and while taking positive actions in their program, the tools available to address their impacted major are limited. In part, this is because while all DSS programs need to be supported as appropriate, the division must make strategic decisions that positively influence the overall academic quality of the division.

The second example comes from Psychology, the largest major at UC Davis, graduating an impressive 10% of all degrees on campus, and a department currently of 37.5 FTE. The major is popular and impacted, but well organized under new leadership. It has also experienced impressive success over the past decade in national rankings. As described in an earlier section, Psychology has leaped in the rankings from around 40th to 23rd in the nation (of 239 programs) and in the 2010 NRC S-rankings, is indistinguishable from UC Berkeley for productivity and impact – UC Berkeley is often the number one program in the nation in reputational rankings. Psychology has a high teaching load, and has been strategic in partnering with campus interdisciplinary initiatives to advance its mission. In strategic planning, Psychology must receive resources to meet its teaching mission, and to continue to excel in scholarship and advance its rapidly growing national standing, which has a major impact on the reputation of the division and campus.

The take-home message that comes from the foregoing examples is that large majors (all in the top 20 on campus) like Psychology (largest major on campus), as well as others like Economics (2nd largest major in the division), Political Science (4th largest major in the division), History (7th largest major in the division) and Anthropology (8th largest major in the division) that have gained national distinction and are also challenged by significant undergraduate teaching responsibilities, will necessarily continue to be high in priority for resource allocation. Again, it is important to emphasize that the metrics laid out in earlier in section III. Principles, Goals and Metrics, together with the
recommendations of the Committee on Effective Delivery of Curriculum (CEDC) will guide divisional decision making.

A separate but related issue is that of small enrollment programs. This issue will be addressed by the CEDC, but a few points are worth noting. First, several smaller programs in the division (East Asian Studies, Middle East and South Asia Studies, and Science and Technology Studies) are rather new majors. As a result, enrollments and numbers of majors are small. Yet, as the programs reflect important directions for the campus (e.g., internationalization and STEM education) as identified in the campus vision document, these programs are deemed important areas of investment. Indeed, each of these majors is growing in a consistent fashion. Because resources for these programs do not require separate FTEs (with the exception of STS where 1.5 FTE reside in DSS), and do not have separate staff (each is served by our clustered administrative services and divisional service centers), the marginal cost invested in their development is deemed a sound investment to keep the social sciences at the cutting edge of national education and scholarship.

Finally, the large numbers of students majoring and being taught in the division also means that significant investments must be made in supplemental instruction. These funds, which are now in the divisional budget, and in future will come from divisional resources under the proposed new campus budget model, are necessary in order to help (i) balance the competing needs that determine resource allocation (e.g., FTE), and (ii) help to maintain reasonable student-to-faculty ratios which benefit students and faculty. Planning related to the issue of supplemental instruction (especially by lecturers), is within the domain of the CEDC, and a longer term structure for the role of supplemental instructional resources must necessarily await the CEDC report, and the implementation of the new campus budget model. It is noteworthy here, however, that supplemental instructional funds have been reduced by budget cuts, and departments in the division are working diligently, as will CEDC, to effectively deliver a high quality curriculum given these budget constraints.

**Opportunities for Undergraduate Instruction.** The social sciences are critical for addressing a wide range of societal challenges. Preparing students for a rapidly changing national and global set of priorities will require continual evolution of course offerings and majors. Several areas are in periods of dynamic change at present. The following are some areas in which the division is currently or plans to advance undergraduate education.
Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics (STEM): The national need to advance STEM education is now well understood, and is the focus of state and national efforts in K-12 and university education. STEM methods and approaches are not limited to the life, physical, and engineering sciences, but extend also to the social sciences in virtually all core disciplines. Modern social sciences include rigorous quantitative approaches (e.g., statistical analyses, mathematical modeling) and experimental research, with many techniques increasingly utilizing tools from the engineering, life, and physical sciences (e.g., brain imaging, genetic analysis, physiological measurement, etc.). The clear trajectory in the social sciences is to become increasingly quantitative and analytic in methodology.

The division has several departments/programs that can contribute to STEM education (outside the STEM fields in the division, which is addressed below). One example comes from the other end of the divisional spectrum – Philosophy, a humanistic discipline. Advancing STEM education includes, as the 2011 NRC report “A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas” notes, the practices important for STEM include: (i) “Engaging in argument from evidence”, and (ii) “Obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information”. These goals are served in Philosophy by the focus of the department on the philosophy of science, and its offerings in courses such as: Critical Reasoning (PHI 5), Introduction to Symbolic Logic (PHI 12), Introduction to Philosophy of Science (PHI 30), and Understanding Scientific Change (PHI 31), as well as upper division courses that extend these topics.

As curricula continue to be refined in the social sciences, quantitative approaches are increasingly fundamental to advancing knowledge in core disciplines, and therefore critical to the training we provide our students. The CEDC will consider this in its analysis and report.

In addition, however, to the involvement of STEM methods in social science scholarship, there is the inverse opportunity – to investigate STEM methods and approaches from the perspective of their impact on society. That is, students in STEM disciplines (e.g., engineers) benefit from an understanding of the cultural, behavioral, political, economical, and societal frameworks within which STEM disciplines function. In DSS, the Science and Technology Studies Program (STS), provides this kind of interdisciplinary scholarship and training to undergraduate (and graduate) students. The newly created Center for Science and Innovation Studies (CSIS) is part of a strengthening of this program, and
brings significant new energy to the growing major (as noted later, the changes in undergraduate premedical curricula will also lead to opportunities in STS and associated departmental programs in DSS).

In addition, however, to STEM methods and approaches across the social sciences, and the ways in which the social sciences can contribute to understanding STEM education, two disciplines in DSS are themselves STEM fields despite the common misperception to the contrary – UC Davis should not make this error. Both Anthropology and Psychology are STEM fields, and should be included in campus planning regarding STEM education. Why are Anthropology and Psychology STEM fields at UC Davis?

In Anthropology (the most highly ranked department in DSS), the evolutionary anthropology division of the department (12 Senate faculty members) conducts research on archaeology, human ecology, molecular anthropology, paleoanthropology, biogeography, conservation biology, and the socio-ecology of primates. The methods applied in these subdisciplines are those from the core of the life sciences, from genetic analyses to analytic methods including spectroscopy and related tools. Take for example the Obsidian Laboratory, which analyses samples of materials related to prehistoric human activities. The lab contains a new polarizing microscope outfitted with a micrometer, and a portable X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) spectrometer that allows scientists in the department to measure hydration diffusion bands in artifacts which help convert those measurements to age estimates.

Similarly, at UC Davis, the Psychology department (also highly nationally ranked) is a science department. At UC Davis, “psychology” means “experimental psychology” (because clinical psychology degrees are not offered), or as more commonly use across the nation, “psychological science”, which includes a strong neuroscience component. All areas of psychology utilize quantitative experimental approaches, many relying on physiological measures, computational and mathematical modeling and related approaches. Faculty members in Psychology are core members of the Center for Neuroscience, the Center for Mind and Brain, and the California Regional Primate Center. Psychology and Anthropology are two departments that represent core STEM disciplines and can contribute strongly to campus efforts in STEM education.

Undergraduate Research and Internships: A key advantage of the research university is to provide students not only with course work, but also
viable laboratory experience in active faculty research labs, and in internship in
business, government and professional settings. DSS provides invaluable
experiences to hundreds of undergraduate students in research labs and
internships. Nonetheless, many students still graduate without the benefit of such
an experience. In future, the division will consider how to expand such
opportunities for students through incentives to faculty members, and support for
internship programs.

Social Sciences in Premedical Preparation: Significant changes are taking
place in premedical preparation in the US. These changes will impact how UC
Davis must prepare students, and this will increasingly involve the social
sciences. In 2009, a report of a combined committee of the American Association
of Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI)
recommended a shift away from specific course requirements, and towards an
emphasis on core competencies. For example, rather than requiring a specific
mathematics course like calculus, the requirement would recommend developing
a quantitative competency that might come from training in an appropriate level
of mathematics or statistics.

In a separate report, the AAMC committee (MR5), charged with the 5th
review of the Medical College Admission Test (MCAT), provides a specific set of
recommendations for the revised MCAT. The AAMC oversees the MCAT. The
MR5 committee released preliminary recommendations in April, 2011. The new
recommendations are expected to be approved (with some minor changes) by
the AAMC Board of Directors in February, 2012. If approved, the recommended
changes will be introduced in the 2015 MCAT examination.

Following the MR5 recommendations, the MCAT test would be
reorganized into four new sections:

- Molecular, cellular and organismal properties of living systems
- Physical, chemical and biochemical properties of living systems
- Behavioral and social science principles
- Critical analysis and reasoning skills

This newly-revised MCAT will contribute to educational changes in the
premedical undergraduate curriculum, potentially necessitating the addition or
modification of courses in the social sciences to meet these demands.
A new DSS faculty committee is being charged with evaluating how departments and programs in the social sciences should respond. The committee – the Social Sciences and Medicine Workgroup (SSMW) – will work with premedical advising, the college of biological science, the School of Medicine and others to provide recommendations for how the social sciences should respond. A few ready examples of topics represented in the division that will be useful for the social science portion of the curricular changes in premedical education include coursework in:

- Medical Anthropology
- Health Psychology
- Medical Ethics (Philosophy)
- Medical Sociology
- History of Medicine
- Health Economics
- Health Policy (Political Science)
- Communication in Health Sciences

The recommendations of the SSMW, developed over the coming academic year, will be provided to the CDEC for consideration and incorporation into their broader report. As well, these changes in premedical education may well influence students’ choices of major, and programs like Science and Technology Studies, which is a popular premed major at Harvard, might see increased enrollment pressure and growth majors. It will be important to be proactive in preparing for the coming changes.

**Business Administration.** Over the past year, the campus has been exploring the possibility of establishing an undergraduate business major. Together with the CAES and the GSM, DSS has been an active participant in these discussions. Should such a major be developed, DSS would naturally have a significant role in training in economics that would be required for such a major, and in the General Education requirements that business students would require. No further discussion is required here given the early stage of discussions regarding a possible major, except to note that campus growth that included business students would provide an opportunity for new FTE to join economics, and perhaps related areas of interest such as organizational psychology where
our division does not have expertise, but where there would be significant need in supporting the major.

**Internationalization – ME/SA, EAS and IR:** Increasing internationalization in all aspects of society requires that higher education lead the way in developing programs that focus on the special societal intersections of nations, cultures and peoples. The global economy, increased mobility, the clash of philosophies and religions are all of daily consequence to citizens. DSS plays a key position in instruction in the political, economic, cultural and behavioral factors that influence modern societies. DSS will continue to invest in the development of majors such as Middle East and South Asia studies, East Asian Studies, and International Relations. In doing so, the division will continue to develop leading scholarship in international studies. This will further augment our outreach programs to foreign undergraduate and graduate students. As well, the activities of our faculty members around the globe carry the UC Davis brand, further bolstering efforts to make the campus an attractive destination for scholarly visits and exchanges.

**B. Graduate Education**

The division’s departments manage doctoral programs in the several core disciplines, and the faculty members of the division participate in several graduate groups. Approximately 500 doctoral students are currently enrolled in the following DSS doctoral programs, which are primarily departmentally-based programs (although some, like Psychology, are open to faculty members outside the department):

- Anthropology
- Communication
- Economics
- History
- Philosophy
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology
In addition, DSS faculty members supervise students in the following graduate groups:

- Animal Behavior
- Ecology
- Human Development
- International Agricultural Development
- Linguistics
- Neuroscience
- Nutrition
- Population Biology
- Religious Studies

Graduate training in the division remains very strong, as evidenced by the recent rankings of DSS programs by the NRC, and reputational rankings such as US New and World Report (see section II. Academic Standing of Social Sciences).

Given the success in graduate education in the division, further investment is warranted, but is also challenged by the ability to support (current and) additional student numbers. In some programs, there has been very strong success in raising extramural funds for student support, primarily from individual investigator grants supporting students as research assistants (e.g., NIH and NSF), but also from training grants. However, these sources of support are not uniformly available to doctoral students in all social science disciplines. Therefore, although as noted there has been a remarkable 1,700 percent increase in extramural funds brought into the division over the course of the last decade, the vast majority of these funds support students in Psychology where NIH funding is available. This is not to belie the successes in NSF and other funding obtained in other disciplines, which have also grown over the past decade, but the total support in dollars is necessarily greatest from NIH sources. More aggressive pursuit of funds in the form of training grants, and private and foundation support will be required to increase support for doctoral students, enabling growth in student numbers to be more in line with those in the leading social sciences programs in the nation. Indeed, this is one metric that correlates with national ranking and reputation.
The creation of the divisional Research Service Center is intended to assist faculty in obtaining extramural funding. Development efforts, however, are equally important. Investments in development professionals have been made in the division and college, and there have been some notable successes (e.g., a $500K grant for graduate student support from the Bilinski Foundation, with HArCS; a new $250K endowment for the Center for Mind and Brain in support for research involving graduate students; and several others). A much greater amount of endowment funds will have to be raised to attract and support the best graduate students to UC Davis. This is particularly true when considering foreign graduate students. Foreign graduate students studying for the Ph.D., are a tremendous resource for the campus, but also bring along significant cost, as these students typically do not pay or come with fellowship funding, and they have to pay (or rather the department or investigator has to pay) high tuition for the duration of their training. If the campus hopes to increase foreign graduate students, then in addition to fundraising in the division or departments, some remedy for this situation must be sought.

Graduate Groups. Although most graduate programs in DSS are department based, as noted, faculty in social sciences are active in several strong graduate groups. Despite department-based doctoral training being the norm in DSS, there are also hybrid department-group programs (i.e., Psychology, which opened its borders to faculty mentors outside the department in 2000), and some new graduate programs arising from DSS leadership have moved directly to the graduate group model (i.e., Linguistics). It is therefore important for the division to have role in graduate group education, which benefits our faculty, and doctoral students at UC Davis.

A long-standing difficulty with graduate group support at UC Davis is the fact that whereas department-based programs enjoy the direct financial support of the Dean of Social Sciences (e.g., through both supplemental instructional finding and development efforts), graduate groups do not necessarily benefit similarly (reporting instead to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who supports the programs, and who appoints the graduate group chairs). DSS has taken steps to improve the support of the division for graduate groups. This year, the division revised its instructional workload policy to include course releases for DSS faculty members who are appointed graduate group chairs. This was an important step because it is possible that a faculty member whose own work is directly related to a graduate group, may be asked to take on duties that do not directly benefit their home department. Department chairs are reticent to provide
course releases to faculty members so that they can assume duties that may have little benefit to the department. It is important for these “costs” to be socialized and therefore the DSS Dean’s Office will provide the support. This policy was applied this year to support the appointment of an Anthropology professor as chair of the Linguistics Graduate Group.

Self-Supporting Graduate Programs. Revenue to support doctoral education can also come from self-supporting (i.e., revenue generating) masters programs. The division currently has one program, the Masters in Teaching History, and is investigating the following, in line with campus planning:

- Masters in Public Policy/Public Administration
- Masters in Psychology
- Masters in Finance (with GSM)

The target audiences for these programs vary from professional teachers seeking advanced training and career opportunity, to working professionals in the public and private sectors. The division will adhere closely to the guidelines by the campus Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs in developing any such programs, follow all procedures of the Senate, and will carefully evaluate any proposal for both market analysis and fiscal stability.

VI. Resources, Development and Fundraising

The new campus budget model should, over time, provide a more stable and appropriate budgetary foundation for DSS. The significant undergraduate teaching duty of the division will be the greatest source of revenue under the new model. This is because in comparison to other units on campus, the total extramural revenue from return of indirect costs from grants will be modest for most units within the division. Similarly, although revenue from self-supporting programs might augment individual units in the division, these funds are unlikely to be a significant source of income – in part because the teaching load in the division is already high (four courses per year), which leaves little room to increase teaching to create new teaching programs (Note: There are models under which the foregoing might be considered conservative thinking, but to a first approximation, it is not a bad assumption). Therefore, additional resources
to strengthen the foundations of the division and advance the academic mission will have to come largely from fundraising and development efforts.

A. Development and Fundraising

UC Davis has lagged far behind its peers in its investment in development, with the result being the predicted small rate of philanthropic giving to the campus. To provide some perspective for this problem, there are approximately 35,000 alumni of the Division of Social Sciences. A development professional can be expected to maintain an active portfolio of only 150 or so donors/prospective donors. In 2008, the division had a single dedicated development officer, a number far below peer institutions like UCSD. The history of development investment is even more surprising.

In 2002, there was a single senior development professional serving all three divisions of the College of Letters and Science, its 66,000 alumni, and thousands of students and friends. In 2003, the college began to assemble a larger development team, including three development officers (one for each division), four development professionals, and a support staff; all headed by an assistant dean (a development officer). This was still modest in size compared to peer institutions. In 2009, with the present dean’s appointment, DSS added another senior development professional, bringing the total number to two for the division. With the assistance of the Provost, the college was able to add another development professional in 2011, including additional support staff.

These critical infrastructure increases were essential to put the college on a course to match our competition around the state and nation, and begin to close the significant gap between the divisions and similarly sized university units in development and fundraising.

In concert with this, the role of the dean was modified to allow a larger percentage of time to be dedicated to development. This was accomplished with the recruitment of a new associate dean in 2009 who assumed responsibility for academic personnel and supplemental instruction in the division, working closely with the dean. This freed time that could be allocated by the dean to development and strategic planning. There is a long time horizon for investments in development to yield increased revenue, owing to the delay between first contact with potential donors and their first significant gift. Nonetheless, the progress over the past two years in terms of contact hours between development officers and the dean and alumni and friends of the campus, has increased sharply. Despite the economic downturn of the world economic crisis of 2008,
which led to a one year dip in donations, the division is now back to its pre-2008 annual figures for philanthropic support, raising $2.5M (total sources) for the second year in a row. The division is on target to achieve the divisional goals for the campus’ $1B Campaign for UC Davis.

Strategic planning for divisional development efforts in the coming years will include exploiting areas where there has been little prior effort. These include:

- Developing Industry Partners
- Cultivating Foundation Relations
- Enhancing Alumni Connections to the Division

Among the many goals for the division, one must be to dramatically increase fundraising. As is already the case with peers at UC Berkeley, UCLA and other major national universities, it must become a high priority for the division to develop endowments to enable new initiatives, enhance the opportunities and resources available to the leading programs, support undergraduate and graduate education, and attract and retain the most productive faculty.

B. Facilities

In order to draw attention to a major, long-term problem in facilities for DSS, this document will not provide an exhaustive analysis of space and facilities in the division. Instead, the effort here will be to highlight a significant shortcoming in campus planning.

Two of the highest ranked laboratory-based programs, who together account for approximately 13% of all undergraduate degrees on campus each year, and have contributed the most to the 1,700% increase in extramural funding over the past decade -- Psychology and Anthropology -- occupy arguably the worst physical space on campus -- Young Hall.

Built in 1940, Young Hall is inadequate to house the needs of these departments. Over the past several years, growth in Psychology and Anthropology has been met by investing in 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 in East Davis); in addition, three additional faculty members are located in the Center for Neuroscience in South Davis. Anthropology received additional space on Pena Drive, also in East Davis. The long-term goal of the campus must be to relocate its academic units back on campus but, to date, campus planning has not made adequate progress toward such a “repatriation”.

VII. Diversity

The Division of Social Sciences is fully committed to the UC Davis *Principles of Community*. The division seeks in policy and implementation to create a safe, inclusive, respectful and diverse environment for students, staff and faculty. The division embraces diversity from all perspectives, and seeks to develop a community that provides opportunity for all.

| TABLE 2: L&S Social Sciences Five Year Hiring History: 2006 - 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Work Force | Recruit | Total | Recruit | Total |
| | Availability | Applicants | Interviewed | Hired | Hired |
| Applied | 4,779 | Women | 45.0% | 31.2% | 44.5% | 40.6% | 37.7% |
| | People of Color | 15.8% | 18.3% | 17.6% | 20.3% | 20.3% |
| Interviewed | 272 | POC less Asian | 10.5% | 5.7% | 6.3% | 4.7% | 5.8% |
| Recruited | 64 | African American | 5.2% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.6% | 1.4% |
| Hires | 69 | Hispanic | 4.8% | 3.7% | 4.0% | 3.1% | 4.3% |
| | Asian American | 5.4% | 12.6% | 11.4% | 15.6% | 14.5% |
| Total Hires | 69 | Native American | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Over the past several years, DSS has worked diligently to increase diversity among faculty. Although the record is generally positive (Table 2), there remains room for increasing diversity. In the case of gender, the division performs well: For example, the Department of Economics has the highest percentage of women tenured faculty members of any economics department in North America. But in other areas, such as our success in recruiting people of color, the record is less impressive in the division, and must be a priority.

To increase diversity and strengthen the division, the dean will create a Committee on Diversity and Community (CDC). This committee will advise the
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dean’s office on how to create an environment that is more conducive to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, student body, and staff.

VIII. Conclusions

The Division of Social Sciences at UC Davis has excelled in scholarship over the past decade, providing outstanding educational opportunities to students and advancing the campus mission. As the campus grows, and the new budget model is implemented, the division must aggressively pursue innovative opportunities designed to propel its programs forward to the top tier of public universities. The division will execute a strategic plan that will:

- Create a new Institute for Social Sciences to lead the division forward in interdisciplinary scholarship
- Invest in faculty to enhance our strongest programs
- Provide incentives for progress in developing programs
- Improve the efficiency and quality of undergraduate instruction
- Advance graduate education and support for students
- Provide superior administrative support to academic programs
- Invest in staff development and increase efficiency
- Accelerate and expand development and fundraising
- Enhance diversity and opportunity for students, staff and faculty

These efforts will be undertaken in the spirit of protecting and advancing the historic mission of the University of California in teaching, research and service to society. As stated in the campus plan, A Vision of Excellence (2010):

“The mission of UC Davis, as a comprehensive research university, is the generation, advancement, dissemination and application of knowledge to advancing the human condition throughout our communities and around the world.”

The Division of Social Sciences in the College of Letters and Science is committed to creatively and energetically pursuing these campus goals with continued rigor and innovation, and with an abiding commitment to our students.

~Fiat Lux~
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Part I. Executive Summary

At the request of Dean George R. Mangun, the Social Sciences Advisory Council, comprising faculty members from departments in the Division of Social Sciences, met biweekly from October 2010 through May 2011 and prepared this report, which explains how the various departments have fared since 1998, when the last such report was written, until today. The report contains a description and assessment of each department (in Section V) and a number of proposals for the Division as a whole. The following are our main conclusions:

• Thirty-five percent of undergraduate degrees at UC Davis are granted to majors in the social sciences, which means that DSS departments play a huge role in undergraduate education. The student to ladder faculty ratio in the social sciences, 21.74 (and rising because of a reduction in the number of lecturers), is almost twice as high as the ratio in Engineering, 11.71, and 50% higher than the ratio in HArCS, 14.51. UC Davis simply cannot be a top-tier university without top-tier social science departments, and hiring social scientists is economical in terms of salaries, space, and startup funds compared to other kinds of scientists in other parts of the university.

• Extramural grant awards to social science faculty, per year, increased from $720,525 in 2000 to $13,198,669 in 2010. (DSS faculty members also collaborated with many faculty and centers outside of DSS on other large grants.) More and larger grants could be obtained by social scientists if they collaborated across disciplines and were rewarded for working harder across disciplinary boundaries.

• Many DSS departments improved markedly over the past decade (or in the case of Anthropology, which has long been excellent, remained prominent), and this was generally attributable to astute faculty hires across career levels. Some of the hiring was facilitated by the creation of the Center for Mind and Brain and by the use of adjacent facilities at Cousteau Place for other new faculty laboratories. Despite the improvements, most UCD social science departments still do not rank #1 in the NRC ratings of UC campuses. That position is still typically held by Berkeley or UCLA. Strategic hiring is still necessary to bring our departments closer to the top in national rankings.

• Although some outstanding faculty hires were accomplished in the past 10 years, many faculty members, including some of the newly hired ones as well as some excellent old ones, were lost to other top-ranked universities. As budget cuts increasingly weaken UCD, the problem of retention is likely to become very serious for the social sciences. UCD needs to find ways to continue making excellent hires in the social sciences, and to retain our top scholars when they are courted by other universities.

• DSS faculty members are eager to respond rationally to financial and other incentives, but to do so they must have clear and transparent budget figures. They need to know, for example, whether finding ways to teach more students will pay off in division and departmental budgets, or whether it is more rational to spend less time on teaching and more time on grant
acquisition. This judgment depends on knowing how dollars flow into DSS and how they are spent, something that has never been clear to the faculty.

• Given that new hiring will have to be very selective for the foreseeable future, it is important to hire scholars who both add to UCD’s reputation and result in the acquisition of large grants, including interdisciplinary grants. The Council discussed ways to prioritize ideas for new interdisciplinary centers within DSS, and it suggests that a Social Sciences Institute be established, staffed by select faculty members, and provided with a reasonable budget. The Institute would encourage new center proposals, carefully vet such proposals, provide modest but truly useful funding for perhaps two years to one or two nascent centers, and then sunset centers that did not move rapidly toward successfully supporting themselves with extramural funds. Creating such centers within DSS would help to attract the attention and collaboration of social scientists housed in other parts of the University. This set of ideas is spelled out in more detail in Section II, pp. 7-8.

Part II. Background of This Report

In the fall quarter of 2010, Dean Mangun asked the Social Sciences Advisory Council to prepare a report on the present state and future prospects of the Division of Social Sciences (DSS) at UC Davis. The council, which included representatives from all departments in the DSS, met biweekly from October 2010 through May 2011.

The Council was asked to evaluate what happened in DSS departments since the 1998 Report of the Provost’s Advisory Council for the Social Sciences (PACSS), which was appointed by then-Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Robert D. Grey. (Their report is sometimes referred to as the Lindert Report – Professor Peter Lindert being the chair of the PACSS in 1998.) The goals of the PACSS were (1) to advance the research productivity and renown of the UC Davis campus, particularly in the social sciences; (2) to develop stronger teaching programs, leading to more productive careers for both undergraduates and graduates in the social sciences; and (3) to attract better students to UC Davis. In 1998, according to the PACSS, the social sciences at UC Davis were suffering from underinvestment and relatively small size compared with the top UC campuses and other reasonable comparison institutions across the United States.

The specific goals of the present report are: (1) to assess the current state of the division and its individual departments relative to their status in 1998, using both narrative assessments and quantitative rankings such as those published by the National Research Council (NRC) and U.S. News and World Report; (2) to suggest ways to continue improving the DSS in both the research and teaching domains during a period of budgetary constraints; (3) to propose strategies to increase interdisciplinary cooperation within the DSS and between members of DSS and other units on campus, especially with major campus initiatives proposed by Chancellor Linda Katehi.

The Lindert Report included several recommendations: (1) to increase the emphasis on quantitative methods in the social sciences; (2) to provide the social sciences with their “own enhanced set of computer support services”; (3) to create “a new interdisciplinary General Education offering in Social Science”; and (4) to create “a new undergraduate major [and perhaps a new Division] in business-related fields.” The report also called for developing areas of faculty strength in eight areas: Government and the Economy; Environmental, Resource, and
Several of the recommendations were successfully implemented. Since 1998, there has been an increased emphasis on quantitative methods in the social sciences, mostly due to new faculty hires rather than to new central facilities (although new facilities were provided initially, and they contributed to the increased emphasis on quantitative methods). No new interdisciplinary General Education offering in the social sciences was created, but the number of undergraduate students, both majors and nonmajors, taking social science courses increased dramatically, due both to both enrollment growth overall at UC Davis and to growing student interest in the social sciences (35% of all undergraduate degrees at UC Davis are now awarded to DSS majors).

Various components of an undergraduate business major were created, but moving further forward toward this goal now will involve the School of Management. What was proposed as a “Center for Mind Sciences” in the 1998 Lindert Report did in fact materialize, in the form of the Center for Mind and Brain, which resulted in several excellent new hires in various disciplines related to the mind sciences. Also, an interdisciplinary Hemispheric Institute of the Americas has been established. Some of the other emphases in the 1998 report were taken into account when new faculty members were hired in various DSS departments, but most of those initiatives did not develop into new centers or programs.

Comparing where we were in 1998 with where we are today – based on our own evaluations, recent NRC rankings, the *U.S. News* rankings, and other field-specific rankings – we see that many DSS departments have improved in the rankings despite a huge increase in undergraduate majors and nonmajors, with some consequent increases in student-to-faculty ratios. For example, the rank of our Anthropology Department (in the top 10 or 15 in the country according to the NRC S-rankings) is now indistinguishable from those at Berkeley, UCLA, and UC-Irvine (the other UC campuses are ranked much lower). The Department of Economics is ranked third among UC campuses, after only Berkeley and UC San Diego. The Department of Political Science, which has risen in the rankings faster than any other UC campus over the past decade, is ranked higher than all of them except Berkeley and UC San Diego. The Department of Psychology, which also rose markedly in the rankings over the past decade, has an S-ranking very similar to those of Berkeley and UC San Diego but lower than those of UCLA (a huge department) and UC Santa Barbara. The Department of Sociology, which had a graduate program producing too few PhDs to be ranked by the NRC in 1995, today – despite a comparatively low faculty growth rate – has an NRC ranking 5th among UC campuses, and fourth in publications when books are taken into account. The Department of Philosophy shows many signs of high quality, but it has lost almost as many faculty over the last decade as it has hired, making its reputation in the rankings difficult to interpret. In general, what stands out across the DSS departments is the overall improvement in stature in recent years. Some of the other departments and programs (e.g., Communication, Linguistics, Science and Technology Studies) did not have large enough graduate programs to get them included in the 2009 NRC rankings, so trends for those departments are difficult to assess.

These overall advances are now threatened by budgetary belt-tightening, retirements, and loss of faculty to other universities. As in 1998, departmental rankings nationwide are correlated with faculty size, higher faculty salaries, and lower teaching loads, and the DSS at UC Davis is
suffering on all of those dimensions. Thus, if we do not adopt effective counter-measures and energetically support new initiatives, we are likely to slip in the rankings over the next decade, along with the actual quality and size of our faculty. We also note that a few departments did not improve in the rankings since 1998, and steps need to be taken to facilitate the development of these departments.

Detailed departmental summary reports are provided later in this report, in alphabetical order by department (see Section V). Each includes comparisons with other institutions. These departmental reports suggest where future faculty hires could consolidate gains or overcome deficits. Beyond these departmental improvements, we need to increase interdisciplinary cooperation within the DSS, link the social sciences with other major campus initiatives, seek new and larger research grants, and accomplish new efficiencies in teaching.

Council members agree that the quality of our social science departments depends, primarily, on the quality, volume, and visibility of published research by faculty members and graduate students. Conducting such research often requires extramural funding, large investments of faculty time, and high-quality, ambitious graduate students who are adequately funded. Council members agree that much of the desired research will be done within disciplinary frameworks, which means that the individual departments need to maintain strengths, hire optimally, and publish in top disciplinary journals and produce major, influential books. There cannot be extensive and strong interdisciplinary research without strong foundations in the disciplines. As far as we can see into the future, there is no likelihood that disciplines and disciplinary majors and degrees will disappear.

That said, the DSS does need to foster strategic interdisciplinary research collaborations and grants, both within the DSS and in partnership with other units on campus. Such collaborations are already occurring: a few are discussed below and in the appendices. However, new interdisciplinary units have not generally been headquartered in the DSS. Although we welcome social scientists’ participation in wide-ranging initiatives around campus, there is a danger – without central initiatives headquartered in the DSS – of diffusing the social sciences rather than highlighting potential synergies and intellectual centers of gravity within the DSS.

The following section outlines goals and proposals that emerged from our discussions. They are described only briefly here. If there is administrative interest in pursuing them, Council members would be happy to follow up with more detailed plans. Some of the ideas for new centers are fleshed out in the appendices to this report.

**Part II. Goals and Proposals**

- **Faculty hiring.** In general, faculty hires since the 1998 Lindert Report have been excellent, and departments that have made astute hires, in significant numbers, have risen in the national rankings. As current faculty members retire or leave the university (which is happening as we write), it is imperative that only top-quality candidates be hired, and not only at the entry level. In some cases, especially where a department has a long history of internal conflict, the hiring process may benefit from input from other departments (e.g., by appointing nonvoting recruitment committee members from other departments) and from the Dean. Every hire
should be clearly aimed at making its department better, more coherent, and more significant in its national and international impact. Faculty hires are the University’s most important investment. Where possible, they should contribute to efforts to create more interdisciplinary cooperation and creative collaboration. A few DSS departments have been hampered by factionalism and conflict, which interfere with optimal hiring and decrease faculty morale. This seems to be one cause of some departments’ failure to improve in the national rankings since 1998. Departments and sub-departmental programs that contribute to the quality and reputation of the university and the DSS should be rewarded, and ones that do not contribute should be reoriented, restructured, and more closely monitored.

- **Budget transparency and clear incentives.** At the university level, the goal now purportedly to allow members of the faculty to see where all of their resources come from and how they are being used. As the university moves toward more transparent and more incentive-based budgeting – a major goal of the new administration – the DSS Dean needs to make clear to all department chairs and faculty members how various components of their costs and resources are determined. Units in the DSS have not generally known, for example, the extent to which their budgets are based on student credit hours, how much is based on grant overhead, and how much is based on development efforts. Departments have therefore not been able to determine whether their budgets would increase if they taught more; if they advertised and expanded summer course offerings; if they obtained larger grants; or if they gave more public talks that increased the likelihood that potential donors would hear about what they are doing.

In the past two years, undergraduate tuition has increased by 40%, but DSS budgets have not increased by a corresponding amount. The DSS is doing an enormous amount of the university’s undergraduate teaching and shepherding of undergraduate majors, and if departments and individual faculty members are to play a serious role in incentive-based budgeting, we need to understand better which of our efforts will result in enhanced funding. The faculty, which is already overworked and underpaid by national standards, cannot sensibly distribute its workload without knowing which activities will result in increased resources and compensation.

- **Increased teaching efficiency.** If faculty members are to be involved in efforts to collaborate across disciplines, seek large interdisciplinary grants, and play a role in large campus initiatives to attract grants and private donations, while also bearing high teaching loads, the Administration needs to invest in larger lecture halls and modern online-course technology. In general, DSS faculty have been resourceful and cooperative in handling large enrollments, but many DSS courses are continually over-subscribed, slowing students in their efforts to graduate in four years. Many faculty members are willing to teach large course sections if the space and graduate student TA support are provided. Some would be willing to explore the development of online courses, or course components, but they would need release time to explore best-practice examples elsewhere and acquire necessary technological skills.

- **Formation and review of new interdisciplinary centers.** Given that resources will be scarce for the foreseeable future, it is crucial that DSS find a way to “do more with less” (or at least with less than is reasonably desired). One way to do this is to foster the development of interdisciplinary efforts that enhance the University’s reputation and attract large-scale extramural funding. The Council found that many DSS faculty members are currently
involved in centers and graduate groups outside the DSS, even though there would be great value in having such centers headquartered within the DSS. In the past there has not been institutional support for locating several centers within the DSS, as is perhaps indicated by the failure of the 1998 Lindert Report to generate centers under most of the headings it proposed. (The Center for Mind and Brain is a notable exception, but the Administration had already committed itself to creating such a center when the Lindert Report was written.) The Council also found that center proposals have emerged recently, but there is no established way to vet ideas for centers within the DSS, and there is generally little financial support for such efforts.

We therefore propose that the DSS create an overarching Social Sciences Institute, consisting of representatives from DSS departments, which – in cooperation with the Dean – will encourage center or ‘interdisciplinary exploration’ proposals, decide each year or every two years which are the most promising proposals, and provide seed funding for them to be pursued for, say, two years. The funds would provide for outside speakers or consultants, graduate student support, and perhaps some teaching release for a faculty coordinator. Centers or center initiatives that made impressive progress toward acquiring extramural support and held the promise of becoming self-supporting within a few years would be continued, presumably with reduced – and eventually no – DSS funding. Centers or initiatives that did not make impressive progress toward self-support would be terminated after a year or two, based on evaluations by the Institute faculty and the Dean.

Some of the functions of this proposed Institute were served in the past by the Institute for Governmental Affairs (IGA). It seems possible that the IGA could be merged into the new structure, either as a center or as the foundation of the institute. Although the IGA has been beneficial during its existence, it has been focused on Governmental Affairs (as its name indicates) rather than serving the broader mission of fostering further intellectual and funding efforts across the social sciences. What we are proposing here is a DSS-wide institute responsible for encouraging self-funded interdisciplinary efforts.

- **Themes for possible new centers.** The council learned that one proposal for a Working Group on Environment and Human Security has recently come before the Dean, that a proposal for a Center for Environmental Decision-Making, initiated by the John Muir Institute of the Environment but involving several social scientists, has also been discussed with the Dean, and that two additional themes appeared in these proposals and in the work of many faculty members in the DSS: “networks” and “decision making.” There is, for example, already a faculty group engaged in video-conferencing with other campuses on the issue of networks. Details concerning these four initiatives are provided in Appendices A through D. These are excellent examples of issues that could be pursued more visibly and effectively, and perhaps with greater financial success, if they were actively encouraged and supported by the DSS. It is very likely that other excellent proposals would come forth if DSS departments heard that such proposals are welcomed within the proposed institute-and-center structure.

The Council suggests piloting the Institute and Centers idea with the networks group that is already partially formed and actively engaged in collaboration and communication with other entities on campus and beyond the campus. If the procedures were pilot-tested with this
initiative, we would be likely to enjoy an initial success and learn more about what organizational structures and procedures might be successful with subsequent ventures.

Part III. Conclusion of the Opening Sections
The social science departments at UC Davis have generally grown and improved in national rankings since 1998. This is partly a result of intelligent investment in new faculty, including ones at different points in their academic careers, and in programs such as the Center for Mind and Brain (CMB) and the Hemispheric Institute for the Americas, both of which were outlined in the Lindert Report. The social science departments became more quantitatively oriented, as recommended, and several became larger, although still not nearly as large in most cases as higher ranked departments at some other UC campuses. The CMB is proof that vibrant interdisciplinary research centers can be formed within the DSS. In departments that were not hindered by internal conflict or major faculty departures to other universities, intellectual quality, grant acquisition, and scholarly productivity increased over a 10-year period despite massively increased undergraduate enrollments and shrinking budgets. It is worth noting that nothing was accomplished for free: Excellent faculty hires required competitive salaries and, in some cases, substantial start-up investments. DSS faculty members have worked extremely hard to maintain high research productivity, high teaching ratings, and involvement in many campus centers and graduate groups, despite receiving salaries lower than they would receive at most universities of comparable stature.

We are now facing severely restricted budgets, but we are also soon to benefit from a new transparent and incentive-based budgeting system. People, departments, and divisions that generate high-quality research and large infusions of grant support, and those that aim their teaching efforts in directions that increase enrollments and attract better students, should thus reap a large share of the benefits, which over time will affect salaries, working conditions, and faculty, student, and staff morale. The specific financial contributions to the DSS of grants, donations, and student tuition will become more evident, and units that are making the greatest contributions will be rewarded for them.

In that environment, it makes sense for the DSS to organize itself more appropriately to apply for large interdisciplinary grants, create new research centers that acquire extramural funding, and generate novel research programs and projects that contribute to the solution of national and global problems. It also makes sense to explore new teaching methods and technologies and build larger classrooms and lecture halls in an effort to improve our efficiency as educators.

There are many areas of intellectual energy and excellence in the DSS. They need to be nurtured, interconnected, expanded, and publicized. Future faculty hires should be scrutinized carefully to assure that they improve their departments, help to reduce conflict where it exists, and contribute more broadly to the development of a strong, collaboration-oriented Division of Social Sciences. No department should be allowed to hire in ways that continue internal conflicts or add little to the University’s visibility and stature. Our Council discussions confirmed that there will be enormous energy and enthusiasm for these goals among the faculty when their collaborative efforts are encouraged by the Administration.
Part III. Department-by-Department Review of Progress Since 1998

Department of Anthropology

This section provides an overview of the progress made by the Department of Anthropology since the Lindert Commission Report in 1998, along with challenges and opportunities in the coming years. It demonstrates the remarkable breadth of scholarship within the department, the unusual harmony in a discipline often plagued by being split across the biological sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. Although we cannot place too much faith in the NRC rankings, it is very clear that by almost any metric UC Davis Anthropology is an outstanding department for its size, and has improved since the previous NRC rankings in 1995, from 15th to 12th place. (Anthropology does not figure as a discipline in the US News and World Report rankings.)

Department Overview

The Department of Anthropology has intermediate-sized graduate and undergraduate programs, as compared to other departments in DSS. Using the 1998 Lindert Report as a baseline, in the current academic year the department has 260 undergraduate majors (compared with 126 in 1996-97) and 67 graduate students (39 in 1996-97). Eighty seven bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Anthropology in 2009-2010, and 41 in 1996-1997. Ladder faculty now number 24 (15.5 in 1998). As shown in Figure 1, the number of ladder faculty members has increased by 55% since 1998, the number of undergraduate majors has increased by 90%, and the number of graduate students by 72%. Clearly, the faculty is bearing the weight of a massive increase in the size of the program.

Figure 1. Growth in student numbers

Anthropology at UC Davis has breadth, combined with depth in focused areas of research. It ranks among the top anthropology departments in this country, and in several areas it is the program of choice for ambitious students. Reflecting increased interdisciplinarity within all the social sciences, its strength lies not only within the department, but very importantly in the extensive collaborative connections with other graduate research groups, including a formal network of faculty in other departments. These graduate groups and graduate emphases include Animal Behavior, Cultural Studies, Ecology, Genetics, Linguistics, Native American Studies, and Population Biology (and the newly developing graduate groups in Race, Ethnicity, and Comparative Religious Studies), as well as broad-ranging choices for Designated Emphases at the doctoral level, such as Critical Theory, Feminist Theory, International Nutrition, Social Theory, and Comparative History.

Unlike many anthropology departments paralyzed by tensions between faculty who identify either with the social sciences or the humanities, the UC Davis department is organized into two distinct but related wings. The wing structure, which materialized between 2000 and 2002, ensures a balanced and collaborative spirit within the department.

The Evolutionary Wing (E-Wing, 11 ladder faculty members) maintains a broad interdisciplinary research focus on human and non-human primate culture, biology, and genetics, both past and present, and adopts a scientific approach. It is our common interest in evolutionary theory, in particular, that focuses our research on the human and non-human primate experience as a dynamic process extending over time and space. Topics as widely ranging as cultural diversity and social learning, social hierarchy, human and nonhuman dispersals and migrations, conservation biology, origins of agriculture, foraging and social exchange, morphological variation, and geographic variations in nonhuman primate and ancient DNA are among the interests of many of our faculty members, and are tackled using a broad range of modeling processes that address evolutionary change. In our quest to understand variation, we work in field sites across five continents.

The Sociocultural Wing (S-Wing, 13 ladder faculty members) gives 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. S-Wing faculty are interested in understanding global processes as well as specifically local engagements that may or may not acquire universal traction, employing a much shorter analytical time frame than their E-Wing colleagues. 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 themes 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.

The research emphasis in the sociocultural wing has shifted since 1998 as a result of turning away from the traditional subfields (kinship, economics, politics, etc.) and hiring in the areas of identity politics and globalization. Similarly in the evolutionary wing, faculty are increasingly integrated through a common focus on evolutionary theory. Anthropology received no direct benefits from recommendations of the Lindert Report. They have grown substantially in FTE, although not at the rate of growth in the number of majors. Graduate student numbers have
remained steady, although training has shifted to a focus on PhD rather than PhD and Masters students.

**Overall Ranking Information**

The NRC 2010 rankings were based on data from 2006, with some measures averaged from 2000-2006. According to these data, UC Davis had 27.3 allocated faculty (Number of Allocated Faculty, 2006), of which 16% were Assistant Professors and 70% were Tenured Professors. According to the NRC records, there were 64 graduate students enrolled in Fall 2005 with an annual first-year enrollment of 12.6 per year (2002-2006)\(^2\); of these students, 13% were supported with RAships and 56% with TAships; 100% of first-year students receive full support.

The UC Davis Anthropology ranking was:

1. **12**\(^{th}\) (7-21) on the S-ranking (out of 81 ranked programs, see Figure 2). Considering only the public PhD granting institutions, UC Davis ranks 4\(^{th}\) (out 56 ranked programs);
2. **21**\(^{st}\) (14-41) on the R-ranking (out of 81 ranked programs). Considering again only the public institutions, UC Davis ranks 13\(^{th}\) (out of 56 ranked programs).
3. It is notable how much better Davis does on the S-rankings than on the highly subjective, reputation-based R rankings, which presumably reflect either halo effects from the overall prominence of these institutions or outdated impressions of their Anthropology departments.

**Figure 2. The position of UC Davis in S-Rankings for 81 Anthropology Departments/Programs based on NRC 2010 data, with high ranking public institutions and UC Davis denoted with arrows and an ellipse, respectively (figure courtesy of Bruce Winterhalder)**

\(^2\) NRC size measures are markedly higher than those generated by the university.
Details of UCD Rankings

Key variables that contribute to this high NRC ranking are shown in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Key variables contributing to and undercutting UCD anthropology rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>Percent with academic plans</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Publications per faculty</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Average number of publications</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>Average GRE scores</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These values indicate that UC Davis does very well in inspiring students to proceed with academia mentoring, in publications, and in attracting high GRE-scoringly ranked students. The department scores lower than its mid-point rank in awards to faculty and median time to degree (not shown in Table 1). A number of recent awards, both financial and honorary, might render the situation somewhat different than that measured in 2006.

Comparison with Other UCs

1. The S-Ranking range for Davis (7-21) is indistinguishable from that of Berkeley, UCLA, and UC-Irvine; all the other UC campuses are far behind in S ranking (Table 2).
2. On the R-Ranking, UC Davis lags behind Berkeley, UCLA, UCSB, and UC-Irvine.
3. UC Davis has moved up considerably since the 1995 (R-based) NRC ranking, performing as well as the campuses with a high reputational ranking.
4. On Overall Research Activity, UC Davis ranks together with UC Berkeley, but on Overall Student Support and Outcomes, and on Overall Diversity, it lies behind UC Irvine, UC Riverside, and (marginally) UCSB (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of Overall R and S ranks with other UC campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>US News 2009 Overall Rank</th>
<th>NRC 1995 Overall Rank</th>
<th>Overall R Rank</th>
<th>Overall S Rank</th>
<th>Overall Research Activity Rank</th>
<th>Overall Student Support and Outcomes Rank</th>
<th>Overall Diversity Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>14-35</td>
<td>17-44</td>
<td>15-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14-41</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>13-27</td>
<td>13-41</td>
<td>54-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>8-21</td>
<td>17-41</td>
<td>25-56</td>
<td>38-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>9-35</td>
<td>8-26</td>
<td>23-48</td>
<td>9-51</td>
<td>10-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47-65</td>
<td>35-65</td>
<td>41-65</td>
<td>9-41</td>
<td>9-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-54</td>
<td>32-59</td>
<td>22-49</td>
<td>30-56</td>
<td>62-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>19-47</td>
<td>31-55</td>
<td>39-59</td>
<td>27-53</td>
<td>12-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison with Other Universities

The top anthropology departments are disproportionately private (see again Figure 2). The peer group of public universities is shown below. Using the S-Rankings (Table 3) UCD Anthropology’s prime contenders are Penn State, UC Berkeley, University of Michigan, UCLA, SUNY Stony Brook, and University of Arizona.

Table 3. S-Ranking (midpoint): Universities above and 10 below Davis, considering publics only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Allocated faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BINGHAMTON</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF OREGON</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Associated with UC Davis Anthropology’s Success

(1) Departments clearly have to be large to ensure high R-rankings; S-rankings are less clearly associated with size, but UC Davis clearly uses its FTE very efficiently (Figure 3), especially given NRC’s overestimate of the department’s size.

Figure 3. Size and rank for 56 public institutions
Two of the 3 departments that exceed UC Davis Anthropology in S-rank are considerably larger (Michigan and UC Berkeley). Penn State is small. Its high S-rank may stem from specializing in strong biological and archaeological science, thereby obtaining a high rate of journal publications. Penn State collectively insists on a strong scientific orientation in all hires; they also frequently hire at Associate level, minimizing risk in recruitment.

Other indicators of UC Davis’ rank amongst 56 public institutions are shown in Table 4. UC Davis Anthropology faculty members do very well in the volume and citation rates of their publications, in attracting students with high GREs and professed academic plans, and in generally supporting their students well; they do less well on attracting international students. Anthropology faculty members underperform in obtaining awards and grants (although we believe this has changed recently with 2 Guggenheims, one AAAS Fellow, 2 Chancellor’s Fellows, 1 Distinguished Public Service Award, several book awards, and a Dean’s innovation Award), on time to degree (problem with overseas research), and overall departmental diversity.

Table 4. UC Davis’s rank among 56 public institutions for selected indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>Percent with academic plans</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Publications per faculty</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Research activity (overall)</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>Average number publications</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Average GRE scores</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Student support (overall)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>Percent international students</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>Awards per allocated faculty</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>Diversity (overall)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment, Challenges, and Opportunities for the Future

The UCD Anthropology Department ranked 15th in the nation according to the last National Research Council’s ranking in 1995 (1992 data). Now the department has edged up to 12th. The NRC ranking was
based primarily on reputational effects. It is important to note that our performance has improved (albeit slightly) even though between the two rating periods we lost two National Academicians to retirement. This suggests a greater improvement than shown in the rankings. Aggressive hiring across both wings of very promising young faculty is in part responsible for this rise. Longer term faculty members also retain high productivity. In addition, the hiring of a biostatistician staff person (Mark Grote) away from Evolution and Ecology, together with a general emphasis on rigorous up-to-date quantitative methods in the E-Wing, has boosted enormously the quality of publications and the extent of collaboration; and it should be noted that Mark spends considerable time consulting with students and faculty from other departments as well. Finally, tensions between scientific and humanistic approaches to the study of humanity have been diffused, an important improvement.

Strategies for enhancing Anthropology’s ranking further might include:
1. Recruiting students with skill sets and high scores
2. For faculty hiring, identify areas of growth and expansion in the field as a whole rather than building on current strengths in the department
3. Continue to emphasize (at least in E-Wing) quantitative skills/training
4. Improve computer support, software training, etc. (for graduates and faculty)
5. Identify synergies between applied research and key theoretical issues within anthropology
6. Hire faculty with good communication skills, ability to write and present issues of anthropological significance in popular venues, etc., to boost R-rankings.
Department of Communication

This section provides an overview of the progress made by the Department of Communication since the Lindert Report in 1998. Emphasis is given to the department’s new vision statement, which provides a blueprint for the future, and the positive impact we anticipate from the recent approval of our doctoral program.

Department Overview

The Department of Communication was largely ignored in the 1998 Lindert report. This is understandable. At the time the report was being prepared, the Department was making the transition from being a hybrid social science/humanities program named “Rhetoric and Communication” to a strictly social science department, “Communication.” This shift in focus was the result of the decision to restructure the College of Letters and Sciences into Divisions. Five rhetoricians were relocated to various units in the humanities. The remaining faculty consisted to two individuals who focused on social interaction research, two health communication researchers, and one Lecturer SOE. Two of the four social science ladder faculty in the Department in 1998 were recent hires and unlikely to have been known to the members of Professor Lindert’s committee.

Year 1998 to the present. The 1990s were tough times for the Department. We were in survival mode, waiting for things to get better. Our situation improved dramatically when Steve Sheffrin took over as Dean. Dean Sheffrin was impressed with the enormous number of student credit hours we were generating and openly described us as a profit center for the division. He also realized that students on the Davis campus and nationwide had a strong interest in communication and felt that this demand needed to be respected. Our faculty doubled in size under Dean Sheffrin, the Masters program reopened, and the imposition of impacted major requirements led to a dramatic reduction in the size of our major. Most important, Dean Sheffrin strongly supported our proposal to establish a doctoral program in Communication.

Although the campus has faced dire financial consequences during Dean Mangun’s term, he has also been a strong supporter of the program. He advocated for our doctoral program, which was formally approved in 2009. Our first class of doctoral students will enter the program Fall Quarter 2011. The Dean also allowed us to hire an outside Chair to guide the department. We successfully recruited a seasoned administrator with a strong record of scholarship.

Areas of emphasis. Currently, faculty interests fall into two broad categories: social interaction and mediated communication. Examples of social interaction research represented on the current faculty include language and gender, physician-patient communication, communication and social support, social networks, and strategic communication and goal detection in interpersonal relationships. The faculty are also pursuing media-related studies in such areas as processing of media messages, healthcare product marketing, transnational communications, media and politics, and television violence. Given our small size, we have chosen to focus on quantitative behavioral science approaches to research. The faculty use experimental and survey methods, content analysis techniques, and network analysis.
Organizing the department under these two themes made good sense a decade ago. It makes less sense today. First, social interaction is increasingly mediated. Face-to-face interaction is here to stay, but we are increasingly interacting with each other in technologically mediated ways. Second, the distinction between social interaction and mediated communication no longer serves as a useful basis for classifying the faculty, their research, or even the classes we teach. For example, patients can receive social support from family and friends “in real life,” but also through online support groups. Workgroups interact in the workplace and in cyberspace. Studies of the effects of entertainment media on the behaviors of children cannot be understood without giving due consideration to parental mediation of such messages. A number of years ago we could talk about our “social interaction faculty” and “media faculty.” That is no longer the case. The majority of faculty are engaged in research programs that encompass both domains.

Numerical summaries. As of the Fall Quarter 2010, the Department of Communication major counts are as follows: Unduplicated Count (535), Duplicated Count (604), First Major Count (534). Based on the Duplicated Count value and Fall 2010 data, a comparison with other programs in the Division reveals that Communication ranks sixth in the Division (Table 1). In 2009, 4.02% of students graduating from UC Davis graduated with a major in Communication.

Despite being one of the larger programs in the Division, we have the fewest number of instructional FTE, as reported in Table 2. The Department has essentially been asked to deliver a very large major with relatively few faculty. The inevitable consequences of large student demand and a small faculty is a high student-faculty ratio. Our SFR of 49.1 is the worst in the Division, as shown in Table 3.

At the graduate level, we currently have 12 Masters students in residence. In the past few years, we have placed graduates of the Masters program in exceptional doctoral programs at such universities as Cornell, Stanford, Minnesota, Yonsei, and UC Davis. Over the next few years we
will be admitting only graduate students who wish to pursue doctoral studies; students seeking a terminal Masters degree will be encouraged to go elsewhere.

**NRC Ranking**

The Department was not ranked in the most recent NRC studies because we did not have a doctoral program during the review period.

We wish to note that our entire faculty graduated from programs with a S-rank in the top 20, five from programs with a rank of 1. The R-ranks of the programs from which our faculty come were all in the top 12. There were 83 Communication doctoral programs listed in the NRC report. Thus, the Communication faculty comes from only the top rated programs in the field. We anticipate that this will be the case with future hires.

**Comparison with Other UCs**

There are three doctoral programs in Communication in the UC system – the programs at Davis, Santa Barbara and San Diego. UCSB is ranked in the top ten programs nationwide. With 20 faculty members, the UCSB program has been able to develop strength in multiple areas, including mass communication, language and social interaction, and organizational communication. Our new focus on ICT complements nicely the emphases at UCSB. The UCSD program is very unusual, in that its faculty emphasize cultural and critical studies of the humanities. It thus does not offer a point of comparison for our program.

**Challenges and Opportunities for the Future**

**Challenges.** We have faced significant challenges since the Lindert report came out. First, we have had difficulty meeting student demand for our courses. Our undergraduate enrollments continue to be more than our small department can manage. Becoming an impacted major helped to reduce our major count a few years ago by about 500 students; we once had more than one thousand majors. We have also imposed and enforced an internal grading norm that has significantly lowered grades in our upper division classes, but this move did not affect demand for our courses. If anything, our increased rigor increased our attractiveness to undergraduates. We have added an additional requirement to become a major (ECS-115 – Introduction to Computers or PHI12 – Symbolic Logic). Also, we have also begun to institute and enforce course prerequisites to allow for cumulative learning. Doing so is unlikely to reduce demand for the major, but it will make it more difficult for students from other majors to take our courses.

Second, the absence of a doctoral program made it difficult to recruit outstanding research faculty in recent years. The individuals to whom offers have been extended have often accepted competing offers from universities with doctoral programs. Most recently, we lost recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Student-Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
battles to the University of Wisconsin, Ohio State University, and the University of Texas at Austin. In most years we have had to take a chance on freshly minted PhDs because faculty with more established records and post-doctoral research experience have been recruited to doctorate-granting institutions. We have also lost ladder faculty to the University of Iowa and Ohio State University, and nearly lost faculty to Wisconsin and Texas. Without a doctoral program it has also been difficult to attract established scholars from competing programs. For example, one of the nation’s leading media theorists considered but then rejected an offer to join our faculty, in part because his university has a doctoral program and we did not. Over the years, other scholars told us that they would love to come to Davis, but not if it meant giving up the opportunity to work with doctoral students.

Third, the absence of a doctoral program has made it difficult to recruit many of the best applicants to our graduate program. In recent years we lost potential recruits to exceptional universities that were able to offer admission directly into their doctoral programs. For example, in 2010 several students accepted into our graduate program declined our offers of support, choosing instead to pursue their studies at Stanford, Harvard, Columbia, Wisconsin, Syracuse and Indiana.

**Opportunities.** The current budget crisis notwithstanding, we are excited about the future of the Department. First, with the approval of the doctoral program we believe that faculty recruitment will be much more successful in the future. For example, we have been approached by several outstanding scholars, some of whom have significant extramural funding, about joining our faculty. These individuals work at highly regarded doctoral programs and would never have considered joining our faculty before the doctoral program was approved.

Second, our new doctoral program should help us to recruit students who prefer direct entry into doctoral studies and those who have earned a graduate degree at another institution. Several outstanding doctoral students have accepted our offers of admission and funding for the fall 2011 quarter.

Third, and most important, the Department has formulated a more circumscribed vision for its future that takes advantage of our location and campus strengths. Over the past two quarters, the Department Chair, at the request of the Dean, deliberated with the faculty to produce a vision statement that identifies *Information and Communication Technology (ICT)* as our area of emphasis. Technology is fundamentally changing how people and groups communicate and how information is disseminated throughout society. Examples include the everyday role that the Internet plays in all aspects of our lives, the emergence of social media and online communities, the development of virtual reality technologies, and media convergence. Advances in communication technologies are having profound effects on the conduct of interpersonal relationships, the workplace, healthcare delivery, and political life. Our proximity to the Silicon
Valley makes a focus on ICT very appealing; partnerships with high tech companies could be cultivated.³

Such a vision also dovetails nicely with the growing interest on the Davis campus in Information Science, Network Science, Decision Sciences, Telemedicine and Health Informatics. We note further that the first and sixth ranked doctoral program in Communication (Stanford and Cornell) have achieved high NRC rankings by focusing on ICT.

³ The International Communication Association has a division of Information Systems. The division describes its interests as follows:

“Information Systems is concerned with information, language and cognitive systems. Its central goal is promoting the development of general theories of complex systems and quantitative methodologies for communication research in a variety of domains. This focus brings together people with a wide range of interests and specialties. Member interests include: studies of information flows, the human interface with communication technology, and life in an information society: cognition, including information processing of direct and mediated communication and the construction of cognitive models; artificial intelligence applications in language, logic, and reasoning; modeling and study of interaction systems. Members have pioneered analytical techniques in areas of network analysis, information theory, structural modeling, interaction analysis, content analysis and linguistic data processing systems. Issues in the philosophy of science, cybernetic epistemology, theory and ethics are regular concerns as well.” (source: http://www.icahdq.org/divisions/index.html#DIVISION1)
1. THE ECONOMICS RANKINGS IN GENERAL

The rankings done in each field are based on different weightings of “outcome” variables. In total, some twenty outcome measures were used to determine the rankings: research (4 measures); student outcome (5 measures); diversity (4 measures); other (7 measures, mostly student).

Within economics, the S-rankings are obtained from four key variables (three research) in the following decreasing order of importance:

(i) publications per faculty member (Ave No. of Publications, 2000-2006, per Allocated Faculty, 2006)

(ii) citations per publication (Average Citations per Publication)

(iii) average GRE per student (Average GRE Scores, 2004-2006)

(iv) percentage of faculty with grants (Percent of Faculty with Grants, 2006)

By comparison, the R-rankings for economics place no weight on publications per faculty member, greatest weight on average GRE of students, and also weight on number of PhD’s graduated. So the S-Rankings emphasize research measures, and the R-rankings place more emphasis on graduate program – student GREs and number of graduate students.

2. THE U.C. DAVIS RANKING

The rankings were based on 2006, with some measures averaged from 2000-2006. Davis had 28.6 allocated faculty (Number of Allocated Faculty, 2006), 34 faculty (Total Faculty, 2006), 15% assistant professor, and 79% tenured professor, There were 91 graduate students enrolled, 46% TA’s, 13% RA’s, 24 first year,

The Davis Economics ranking was:

(1) 29-44 on the S-ranking, or 26-41 if adjusted for Harvard and Stanford having multiple high-ranked programs.

(2) 31-44 (adjusted 28-41) on research

(3) Consistent with more recent 2009 U.S. News and World Report ranking of 34.

(4) There are no obvious relative weaknesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-Ranking</th>
<th>R-Ranking</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Stud outcome</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>US News 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>29-44</td>
<td>30-56</td>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>51-89</td>
<td>42-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted*</td>
<td>26-41</td>
<td>27-53</td>
<td>28-41</td>
<td>48-86</td>
<td>39-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Harvard had 3 highly-rated economics programs and Stanford had 2 highly-rated. The “adjusted” rankings subtract 3 from those in the report.
For the key variables listed earlier, Davis’s rank was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rank out of 117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>publications per faculty member</td>
<td>0.7946</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>citations per publication</td>
<td>0.9111</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>grants per faculty member</td>
<td>0.3948</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>average GRE scores</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>average number of Ph.D.s awarded</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No overall range was given for the other categories (seven measures, mostly student criteria).

We conclude that the Davis department does very well in publications per faculty, but not as well on the other criteria, particularly citations per faculty. This may reflect having a relatively young faculty, since it takes time for citations to emerge.

3. **COMPARISON TO OTHER UC CAMPUSES**

(1) Davis is ranked a clear third on the S-ranking (and a clear fourth on the R-ranking).

(2) In particular Davis ranks higher than UCLA on the S-ranking (29-44 versus 40-60).

(3) UCLA moves up a lot with the R-ranking. This is most likely due to UCLA graduating 22 PhDs per year (4th highest). UCLA lags Davis in research (31-44 versus 43-60) and in student outcomes (51-89).

(4) Santa Cruz was surprisingly highly ranked on the S-ranking, though not the R-ranking.

The following table ranks programs by their **S-ranking**. The last column is the 2009 US News & World Report Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-Ranking</th>
<th>R-Ranking</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Stud outcomes</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>US News 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Berkeley</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>48-85</td>
<td>94-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Diego</td>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>15-28</td>
<td>14-22</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>85-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Davis</strong></td>
<td><strong>29-44</strong></td>
<td><strong>30-56</strong></td>
<td><strong>31-44</strong></td>
<td><strong>51-89</strong></td>
<td><strong>42-80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Santa Cruz</td>
<td>33-65</td>
<td>56-84</td>
<td>42-73</td>
<td>9-44</td>
<td>15-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Los Angeles</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>43-60</td>
<td>70-97</td>
<td>37-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Irvine</td>
<td>49-76</td>
<td>54-81</td>
<td>40-63</td>
<td>88-107</td>
<td>75-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Riverside</td>
<td>52-75</td>
<td>55-86</td>
<td>68-91</td>
<td>18-47</td>
<td>10-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Santa Barb</td>
<td>48-67</td>
<td>41-74</td>
<td>52-70</td>
<td>55-94</td>
<td>112-115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **COMPARISON TO OTHER UNIVERSITIES**

(1) The top economics programs are disproportionately private: 16 of top 20 (S-ranking); 15 of 20 (R-ranking).

(2) In the S-ranking, Davis is 18th among publics (R-ranking Davis is 12th among publics).

(3) The peer group of 10 universities above and below Davis is as follows:
### S-Ranking (mid-point): Universities 10 above and 10 below Davis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>BOSTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>BOSTON COLLEGE</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>TEXAS A &amp; M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK GRAD. CENTER</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAVIS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT BLOOMINGTON</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>HARVARD UNIVERSITY (Political Economy and Govt.)</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - COLUMBIA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH CAMPUS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R-Ranking (mid-point): Universities 10 above and 10 below Davis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>DUKE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>CORNELL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-ANN ARBOR</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>BOSTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>AUBURN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH CAMPUS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAVIS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>PURDUE UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>PENN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IOWA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. COMPARISON TO OTHER UCD SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS

The following table orders programs in UCD social sciences in alphabetical order. The comparison is difficult as there are different numbers of programs in each discipline (especially Psychology).

*Economics ranks in the middle of the social science departments from the NRC report.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>S-Ranking</th>
<th>R-Ranking</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Stud outcome</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>US News 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (82)</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>14-41</td>
<td>13-27</td>
<td>13-41</td>
<td>54-71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (117)</td>
<td>29-44</td>
<td>30-56</td>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>51-89</td>
<td>42-80</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (137)</td>
<td>40-68</td>
<td>29-50</td>
<td>54-86</td>
<td>26-75</td>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (90)</td>
<td>53-76</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>63-79</td>
<td>23-70</td>
<td>83-88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science (105)</td>
<td>7-26</td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>6-23</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>88-100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (236)</td>
<td>21-57</td>
<td>24-67</td>
<td>21-63</td>
<td>84-174</td>
<td>126-188</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology (118)</td>
<td>48-77</td>
<td>29-60</td>
<td>55-81</td>
<td>34-75</td>
<td>56-87</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. COMPARISON TO 1995

Compared to 1995:
(1) Davis Economics has moved up in both faculty ranking (formerly ranked at 38) and graduate program ranking (formerly ranked at 50).
(2) Davis Economics has become more competitive with UCLA (and is better than UCLA on the S-ranking, though not the R-ranking)

In 1995, the Davis Economics faculty ranking:
(1) was 38 versus UCB (7), UCLA (12), UCSD (16), UCSB (49), UCR (71)
(2) and 38 versus UCD Anthropology (15), History (35), Political Science (46), Psych (47)

In 1995, the Davis Economics graduate program ranking:
(1) was 50 versus UCB (7), UCSD (12), UCLA (16), UCSB (47), UCR (80)
(2) And 50 versus Anthropology (18.5), History (41.5), Political Science (40), Psych (48).

7. OVERALL SUMMARY

The best news from the NRC ranking – and something to be trumpeted – is that Davis scored higher than UCLA and is a clear 3rd among UC campuses in the S-ranking (though a 4th in the R-ranking), after Berkeley and San Diego. Furthermore, in the S-ranking Davis is “one step” below San Diego, i.e. Davis is ranked 29-44, whereas San Diego is ranked 19-25 (and UCLA is 40-60). So by surpassing UCLA in this ranking and closing the gap with San Diego, we have improved significantly from the 1995 NRC ranking, where Davis lagged considerably behind UCLA and San Diego. That improvement appears to be due quantitatively to the increase in
publications per faculty, which weight heavily in the S-ranking (but not the R-ranking). In terms of future improvement, an increase in citations can be expected to pull us up in the ranking markedly, since in that criterion we lagged behind our publications per faculty member.
Department of History

The Department of History scores well in awards to individual faculty members. In the past fifteen years, several have won leading national book awards, including the Pulitzer Prize (Taylor), Bancroft Prize (Taylor), Beveridge Prize (Taylor and Warren), Marsh Prize (D. Davis), and National Jewish Book Award (Biale).

Department faculty also perform well in securing prestigious research fellowships. In the past two years three professors have secured Guggenheim fellowships (Warren, Biale, and Davis), and two have won ACLS fellowships (El Shakry and Kudlick).

The department also has a strong commitment to, and good reputation for, undergraduate teaching. Two current members have won the UC Davis Prize for Scholarship and Teaching (Biale and Taylor) and five others have been honored by the Academic Senate (Olmsted, Rauchway, Saler, Spyridakis, and Chuck Walker).

The department faculty are often targeted for recruitment by other universities, but in most cases we are able to retain people thanks to competitive counter-offers from the dean’s office. In the past year, we have retained El Shakry, Kelman, and Resendez and have suffered no losses.

The history department has decreased considerably from retirements/attrition over the course of the past three years. In 2008 the history department had 41 faculty (including joint appointments); we are now at 33, with one new hire who will join us in the fall of 2012, raising the ranks to 34. This shrinkage comes after a prolonged period of growth, 1994-2008, which increased the faculty from 24 to 41 (including joint appointments). That 24 was artificially low thanks to a wave of retirements owing to the fabled VERIP program, which had reduced the department’s faculty from a previous high of 32. In other words, after two periods of contraction wrapped around one period of growth, the history department is currently about 10% larger in faculty than it was in 1993. The growth in the department has primarily come in the study of the Islamic world including central Asia, a geographic swath previously under-represented.

The recent retirements largely depleted the mature full professors in the department, leaving an age profile that skews toward late assistant professors, associate professors, and early full professors. Since the early 1990s, we have had gender balance, and occasionally a slightly greater number of female faculty. This is markedly better than most history departments in the United States.

The graduate program annually admits between 11 (in 2008) and 20 students (in 2010) and sustains an aggregate of about 100 at any given time (currently at 104). Almost all are funded for their first five years, primarily as teaching assistants, who are essential for sustaining a curriculum of large lecture courses at the lower division, particularly given the emphasis placed on analytical writing, the evaluation of which is especially labor intensive for the instructors. During the past fifteen years, most of our completed doctoral students have secured tenure-track jobs at a mix of institutions from community colleges to research universities (including Brown, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the College of William and Mary).
In terms of Student Credit Hours per FTE, the six-year average for ladder faculty in the History Department is 824, which ranks third in the division (after Communications and Political Science). The trend line in the number of majors is less promising; it has declined from 503 in 2004 to 398 in 2011.

National Ranking Information

In the 1995 NRC rankings (based on data from 1993), the UCD history program was ranked #35 among all U.S. universities and #19 among U.S. public universities.

The 2009 NRC rankings are complicated by the fact that they do not provide a single ranking value, but instead provide a confidence interval for the ranking (giving 5th and 95th percentiles). Moreover, the 2009 NRC rankings weight the different values in two ways, one that reflects expert judgments about the importance of different variables in assessing scholarship (called S Rankings) and one that reflects reputation (called R Rankings). The reputation-based R rankings are strongly influenced by past scholarship and university-wide halo effects, so the S rankings are a more valid measure of current scholarship. It should also be stressed that the NRC ranking methodology is questionable for book-oriented disciplines such as history.

The UCD history program had an S ranking between 40 and 68 and an R ranking between 29 and 50. To provide a simple linear ranking, the midpoint of these confidence intervals was computed for all full-scale U.S. history programs and the programs were ranked by this measure. For the S ranking, the UCD history program was ranked #46 among all U.S. universities and #23 among public universities. For the S ranking, the UCD history program was ranked #31 among all U.S. universities and #16 among public universities. For these rankings, the UCD history program had 30.5 allocated faculty, 31 total faculty, 16% assistant professors, and 81% tenured professors.

The 2009 U.S. News rankings placed the UCD history program at #28 among all universities and #15 among public universities.

Comparison with Other UCs

Among UC history programs, UC-Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSB are the top three programs according to the 2009 NRC rankings. UC-Davis and UCSD are comparably ranked after these top three, followed by UC-Irvine, UC-Riverside, and then UCSC. The following table ranks UC history programs by their S-ranking and includes 2009 US News rankings and the 1995 NRC rankings.

---

4 This excludes programs that focus on a narrow subarea of history, such as history of science. 122 programs remained after these narrow programs were eliminated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>US News 2009 Overall Rank</th>
<th>NRC 1995 Overall Rank</th>
<th>Overall R Rank</th>
<th>Overall S Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC-Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>14-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19-38</td>
<td>6-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>20-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24-44</td>
<td>36-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29-50</td>
<td>40-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Irvine</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39-67</td>
<td>41-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Riverside</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61-91</td>
<td>62-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100-130</td>
<td>80-119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background
Although Linguistics has had a long presence at UC Davis—launched as an interdepartmental program in the 1960s—it did not attain separate department status until 1999. As an interdepartmental program, it offered both a bachelor’s and a master’s degree in linguistics administered by a graduate group. Following attainment of departmental status, the then chair (Timm) encouraged and led the faculty in both the department and wider graduate group in coming up with a Ph.D. proposal that would distinguish UCD in some of its areas of specializations from other UC linguistics doctoral programs. This proposal was completed and submitted by June 2002, and systemwide approval for the new program was granted in Fall 2003. Our first cohort of doctoral students entered in 2004. As a result of this relative newness to the doctoral-granting scene, Linguistics did not figure in either of the most recent NRC rankings.

Linguistics as a discipline has not historically drawn the huge undergraduate major populations typical of some of the other traditional social sciences such as psychology, communication, political science, sociology, etc. Nonetheless, the major has consistently attracted a respectable number of undergraduates—30-45 between 1995 and 2002—and has shown an upsurge in growth since then—up to 87 in Fall 2010.5 With 10 ladder faculty at present, our department is about average size for Linguistics when viewed nationally. This represents almost a three-fold increase over the past decade, and is not out of line with numbers found at other comparable institutions with linguistics programs. We think this steady growth over recent years reflects, in part, the effects of globalization and new interactional technologies bringing with them (among other things) a greater awareness of language differences and an attendant interest in learning more about these differences. In part, too, the number of majors has been growing due to the diversification of our curriculum—with new options to study (for example) bi- and multilingualism, global literacies, second language acquisition and development, and neurolinguistics.

Faculty and Graduate Student Numbers
Regarding growth in faculty and in the graduate program since the time of the Lindert Report in 1998, there has been an increase of 20% (from 8 to 10)6 in ladder faculty. Since the establishment of the Ph.D. program in 2004 graduate student enrollment has shifted from solely master’s (at the time of the Lindert Report) to a majority of doctoral students: in Fall 2010, we had 16 PhD and 13 Master’s students enrolled (and an seven PhD students advanced to candidacy). The Graduate Group in Linguistics currently numbers 34 faculty: 10 from Linguistics and 24 additional faculty from a variety of departments in the social sciences, humanities, the school of education, and the university writing program. The Linguistics Graduate Group has a Chair separate from the Department Chair, though the two consult regularly on Graduate Group matters (and the Department Chair sits on the Group’s Executive Committee).

5 From http://budget.ucdavis.edu/data-reports/enrollment-reports.

6 The department added five new faculty between 1999 and 2007, but one died (unfortunately in the prime of his career) and two others retired during that interval, leaving a net total of 10.
Areas of Emphasis
Faculty research currently falls within several broad domains: structural/theoretical/comparative linguistics; psycho- and neurolinguistics; second language acquisition and development (SLAD); sociolinguistics & bi/multilingualism; and discourse analysis & literacies. Our Ph.D. students specialize in an area within one of these broader areas, while M.A. students are trained to teach English to speakers of another language (TESOL) while providing them with a strong background in theoretical and structural linguistics. While the aforementioned areas of research were present to a greater or lesser extent in 1998, several of them have been strengthened considerably with the addition of new faculty from 1999 through 2007 in the areas of SLAD (Ramanathan, Menard-Warwick), sociolinguistics (Bayley), theoretical/comparative (Hawkins), and neurolinguistics (Corina). The M.A. program, though directed by a ladder faculty member (Menard-Warwick), is mainly taught by two lecturers with special expertise in TESOL.

Linguistics and the NRC Rankings
As noted, UCD Linguistics has not been included in recent NRC rankings since its doctoral program was not launched until 2004, producing its first Ph.D.s in 2008-2009. However, knowing that we will be included in the next ranking round, we followed with interest the 2010 report on rankings. Professors Farrell and Aranovich took a particularly close look at the latter for linguistics as a discipline and extrapolated from these to make some inferences about how UC Davis Linguistics might have stacked up. (The bulk of their report is reproduced below under the heading, “Supplementary Discussion of the NRC Rankings with Respect to Linguistics.”)
Here are some of their main conclusions:

We estimate that the UCD Davis linguistics program would not fare well in the R-based rankings…and that is as it should be for a public, land grant university. On the other hand, because of the weight placed on such things as faculty publication records, interdisciplinarity, and student support and outcomes, we estimate that the UC Davis linguistics program would fare quite well in the survey-based (S) rankings, overall, and would do better than other UC linguistics programs with the exception of the UCLA program in applied linguistics and the joint SDSU-UCSD program in language and communication disorders. Precisely because of our program’s focus on applications of linguistics, including second language acquisition and language and mind/brain, we are less like the traditional theoretically oriented linguistics programs and more like the clear winners in the S-based rankings, i.e., the linguistics program in cognitive science at Johns Hopkins and the applied program at UCLA.

Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities
UCD Linguistics is strongly interdisciplinary and has a marked emphasis on empirical, experimental, socially oriented approaches to the study of language, supported by strong foundations in structural linguistic analysis and language typology. We have been building strength in these areas in the decade plus since the Lindert Report with strategic faculty hires, and we have, since 2004, been attracting talented doctoral students who are now finding academic positions that require the sort of training they have received here. Undergraduate majors continue to grow, and our lower-division general education classes serve large numbers of undergrads every quarter and in summer sessions. Several of our more recently hired faculty are working in areas that provide excellent grant opportunities, and they have been landing some
significant awards, sufficient to provide GSR support for a number of our graduate students.\footnote{Specifically, largish—for the social sciences—awards have gone to David Corina (neurolinguistics, American Sign Language), Jack Hawkins (language typology, computational linguistics) and Bob Bayley (quantitative socio- and educational linguistics).} In all these regards, Linguistics is in a much stronger position than it was in 1998. Maintaining this excellence over the next decade will be challenging as some faculty move into retirement in the absence of expertise redundancy within our moderate-sized department, though this effect is mitigated to some extent by participation in graduate education by the two dozen additional faculty members in the graduate group.

The departmental faculty overall views the possible development of a confederation or perhaps a center or institute of social scientists working around a theme of social networks as a promising opportunity for at least some of its faculty and graduate students to further develop interdisciplinary perspectives and scholarly networks, as well as to enhance avenues for grant-seeking. Almost all of the linguists either are already familiar with some types of social network analysis, and some use these in teaching or research. No one is opposed to seeing such an emphasis promoted on campus. The faculty would in all likelihood also be receptive to other broad themes of the sort that have been discussed at SSAC meetings.

**Supplementary Discussion of the NRC Rankings with Respect to Linguistics**

The discipline of linguistics shows up with some surprising results in the 2010 NRC rankings. Programs that do well in the regression-based (R) rankings do so, by and large, not by having high publication citation rates or by fully funding students or placing them in academic positions, but by virtue of providing dedicated work space to students with high quantitative GRE scores and having faculty who are neither diverse nor interdisciplinary. We estimate that the UC Davis linguistics program would not fare well in the R-based rankings … and that is as it should be for a program in a public, land grant university. On the other hand, because of the weight placed on such things as faculty publication records, interdisciplinarity, and student support and outcomes, we estimate that the UC Davis linguistics program would fare quite well in the survey-based (S) rankings, overall, and would do better than other UC linguistics programs, with the exception of the UCLA program in applied linguistics and the joint SDSU/UCSD program in language and communicative disorders. Precisely because of our program’s focus on applications of linguistics, including second language acquisition and language and mind/brain, we are less like the traditional theoretically-oriented linguistics programs and more like the clear winners in the S-based rankings, i.e., the linguistics program in cognitive science at Johns Hopkins and the applied linguistics program at UCLA. Based on a careful analysis of the data that is available and comparable, our findings can be summarized as follows.

- UC Davis Linguistics would place somewhere in the top 20 of 53 programs in the S-based ranking, ahead of UCLA (theoretical), UC Berkeley, UC San Diego, UC Santa Cruz, and UC Santa Barbara.
- One key to our doing well in this kind of ranking procedure is that our student support and outcome measures are very good.
- The other key is the interdisciplinary nature of our program and, in particular, its inclusion of faculty from the Center for Mind and Brain with laboratory research programs focusing on language and cognitive neuroscience.
• With the impending return of the general field of linguistics to its empirical and experimental bases and the corresponding move away from the speculative bent that Noam Chomsky gave to theoretical linguistics, the linguistics programs that are likely to thrive are those with strong suits in both traditional language analysis and typology and one or more applied or experimental areas.

• Because Linguistics at UC Davis is poised for success in the kind of academic world that puts the Johns Hopkins cognitive science program at the top for programs in linguistics, our departmental hiring strategy for the near future (either for growth or to compensate for attrition or both) should be guided by our 2008 academic plan, which calls for grant-funded applied researchers with collaborative ties in such areas as computer science, cognitive neuroscience, medicine, or education.

Linguistics Programs and the NRC Ranking Procedure

As is well known, the R-based ranking procedure and the S-based ranking procedure can give different outcomes for programs. This is even more the case in linguistics than in most other disciplines included in the Division of Social Sciences at Davis. As shown in Figure 1, the coefficients for some of the key variables are inversely strongly weighted in the two procedures, notably percent of interdisciplinary faculty and percent of first-year students with full support. The survey of faculty found these to be important factors in program quality; however, it is their degree of absence in programs that is actually proportionate to the degree of general program esteem.

---

8 All disciplines other than communication have higher R-based coefficient values for program size (as indicated by average annual number of PhDs produced). But, both the difference between R- and S-based coefficients and the size of the coefficients are much less pronounced in linguistics than in other disciplines for this measure. In anthropology, economics, history, and political science, program size is a huge factor for the R-ranking. On the other hand, only linguistics has such a big difference between high R-based coefficient values for provision of individual work space and low S-based coefficients and such huge differentials between big (positive) S-based coefficients and negative R-based coefficients for student support, citations per publication, percentage of interdisciplinary faculty, and placement of students in academic positions.
Figure 1: Coefficients for linguistics variables.

For the S-based rankings, the most important variables, based on size of coefficients, are number of publications per faculty per year, number of citations per publications, percentage of faculty with external grants, percentage of students placed in academic positions, provision of full support for students, percentage of interdisciplinary faculty, percentage of students completing the PhD within six years, awards per faculty member, and student scores on the Quantitative GRE (GRE-Q). To the extent that the coefficients are directly indicative of weight in the rankings,\(^9\) it appears that although numbers of publications and awards do contribute positively to the R-ranking, high GRE-Q scores of students and provision of individual offices for them are at least equally important. Moreover, to get an optimal ranking it would be best for a program to have few faculty members with high citation rates or that are interdisciplinary, female, or from underrepresented minority groups and few students who are international or female or who complete the degree within six years. Partly because of this, there are some very surprising overall results. For example, UCLA has two quite different linguistics programs: one in applied linguistics and one in theoretical linguistics. The former is clearly number 2 in the S-based rankings among all 52 linguistics programs (ranking range = 2-2), but doesn’t even make it into the top half of programs on the R-based rankings (range = 12-50). The latter has an R-based ranking range that is clearly near the top (2-15), tied with Stanford and just below the University of Chicago (1-14). Yet, its S-based ranking range (23-32) places it somewhere in the middle of

\(^9\) The opacity of the statistical procedure, particularly with respect to the determination of standardized program values, makes it difficult to know for sure what the effective relative weights of the variables are. It is clear from our own calculations that estimated absolute S-rankings correlate most highly with the variable with the highest S-based coefficients, i.e., publications per allocated faculty ($R = .71$). However, the percent of students completing within 6 years has much higher S-based coefficients than median time to degree, but the latter variable has a slightly higher correlation with estimated absolute S-rankings ($R = .26$ vs .20).
Using averages of the range boundary numbers to determine estimated absolute S-based rankings, the programs in linguistics, and their corresponding average R scores, are as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Estimated absolute S-based rankings for linguistics programs and R-based averages.

In addition to the big mismatch between actual features of the most highly esteemed programs and what are generally agreed to be the features that good programs have or ought to have, the ranking of linguistics programs is made difficult by the heavy weight placed on number of faculty publications and number of citations per publication for the S-rankings. There are three significant problems that need to be recognized both for comparing programs in linguistics among themselves and for attempting to compare linguistics, in general, with other disciplines. First, the publication data that were used to determine program values come exclusively from the Thompson Reuters social sciences index, which gives relatively sketchy coverage of linguistics journals, some of which are only found in the arts and humanities index, at least for certain periods. Second, linguistics is not primarily a journal discipline, at least for the traditional core areas (syntax, semantics, phonology, typology, and theory). The landmark works in these areas are mostly books. And, book chapters are, overall, at least as important in the history of the field as journal articles. Third, because work in the core areas of linguistics typically involves intensive individual work on documenting and analyzing language data without the use of

---

10 By way of example, *Linguistic Inquiry* (MIT Press), which has always been among the most prestigious theoretical linguistics journals, was not covered by this database in the period used to count publications per faculty per year and citations (2000-2006).

11 For example, in Chomsky’s bibliography (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bibliography_of_Noam_Chomsky and links cited there), the landmark (i.e., field-changing) works are mostly books (*Syntactic Structures, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, The Sound Pattern of English, Lectures on Government and Binding, Barriers, and The Minimalist Program*) and articles that appear mostly as chapters in edited books (i.e., “Remarks on Nominalization,” “Conditions on Transformations,” “On Wh Movement,” and “On Phases”). The only landmark articles that appear in journals are “Review of Verbal Behavior, by B.F. Skinner” (in *Language*) and “On Binding” (in *Linguistic Inquiry*) and both of these are reprinted as book chapters.
laboratories and experiments, multiple authorship is much less common than in the hard sciences and experiment-oriented disciplines such as psychology and cognitive science.\textsuperscript{12}

These problems concerning linguistics publications, which have repercussions both for number of publications and citations per publication, shed light on differences between linguistics and other disciplines, in general, as well as some differences between linguistics programs themselves. To begin with, it is futile to compare publication values, out of context, across disciplines. As shown in Figure 3, the high, low, and median figures for publications per allocated faculty differ considerably across the disciplines represented in the Division of Social Sciences at UC Davis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Publications per allocated faculty across disciplines and all programs.

One clear difference is that because of their inclusion in the humanities category, philosophy and history publications were counted in a completely different way.\textsuperscript{13} For disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences, program values were not determined by total number of publications (books and papers) listed on CVs during a certain period of time. Rather, the values were determined by counting for each allocated faculty member the publications for 2000-2006 found in the journals in the Thompson Reuters social sciences index, multiplying that number by the allocation percentage, and then dividing the sum of the numbers for all contributors by the number of years and the number of allocated faculty, so as to get a yearly average for the faculty as a whole. The differences among the social sciences disciplines are attributable to variation in the degree to which books rather than journals are used, the degree of experimental/laboratory research, the degree of co-authorship, and the degree of coverage of journals in the database.

When looking across linguistics programs, the same reasoning suggests that programs with experimental and applied foci are likely to fare better in publication counts than traditional theoretical linguistics programs. It is no fluke that the clear winner in the S-ranking procedure overall as well as in the average number of publications category is Johns Hopkins, since theirs is actually an interdisciplinary program in cognitive science, in which students are given a strong

\textsuperscript{12} This is important to note because the NRC methodology would, by our reckoning, give the same value in the number of publications per author category to Chomsky's \textit{monumental} 46-page sole-authored "On Binding" article in \textit{Linguistic Inquiry} (if it were even covered in the database) and Eric Taylor's \textit{minimal} contribution to the following 2-page article in \textit{Behavioral and Brain Sciences}: Arthur B. Markman, Sergey Blok, Kyungil Kim, Levi Larkey, Lisa R. Narvaez, C. Hunt Stilwell and Eric Taylor (2005) "Digging beneath Rules and Similarity." It is explicitly noted in the guide to the methodology that "for multi-authored articles, a publication is awarded for each author on the paper who is also on a faculty list" and, by all indications, article size is not taken into account.

\textsuperscript{13} The program value for humanities disciplines is "the number of published books and the number of articles published during the period 1986 to 2006 that were listed on the résumé ... [calculated as] the sum of five times the number of books plus the number of articles for each allocated faculty member divided by the faculty allocated to the program."
foundation in language analysis as well as psychology and neuroscience. 98% of the reporting faculty in 2006 had external grants and most of them and their students work in laboratories focusing on cognitive neuroscience, language acquisition, and the neurobiology of language. The result is a publishing routine that more approximates that of the Center for Mind and Brain at UC Davis than those of the theoretically-oriented, traditional linguistics programs at UC Berkeley and UCLA, for example.

**UC Davis Linguistics and the Rankings**

The program in linguistics at UC Davis is not included in the 2010 NRC rankings because the first cohort of PhD students entered in Fall 2004 and the data were collected in 2006. In order to compensate for this, we used more recent years to calculate program values for those factors for which we have the data and the capacity to replicate the reported methodology. Thus, for example, we used the Fall 2004 cohort to calculate the average percentage of students completing the program within 6 years because only that cohort met the main criterion for inclusion that was used for the NRC report, i.e., cohorts for whom the possibility of completing within 6 years existed. Due to lack of access to the data source used, we were unable to calculate awards per allocated faculty. Although we know that this is a variable with a relatively high coefficient and a median value of .34, we were unable to include it in our analysis and cannot even provide a guess as to how we would do relative to the median. We also did not use percentage of faculty with grants because we could not replicate the methodology for collecting this data in a plausibly non-rigged way. Since we have numerous faculty members in the graduate group whose research is currently funded by external grants, we think we would fare reasonably well in a rigorous count. Because of their low S-based coefficients and because our rough calculations suggest that we would at least not be hurt by the data, we ignored the variables having to do with diversity, health insurance, and work space. For the publication data, it was necessary to determine which members of the graduate group could count as either core or associated faculty, based on participation in dissertation committees and admissions and curriculum committees. We only used publication data for the 16 members of the graduate group who met the definitional criteria for inclusion. We then had to decide on their percentage of allocation, which is independent of their departmental FTE appointment. We estimated allocation percentage based on number and degree of other PhD program affiliations, in a way that approximated the actual reported methodology. Thus, for example, because her FTE appointment is not in a department with a PhD program and she is equally involved in dissertation supervision in both Education and Linguistics, we gave Dana Ferris a 50% allocation. By the same token, even though Robert Bayley has a 100% appointment in the Department of Linguistics, we gave him only a 75% allocation for purposes of this variable because of his involvement on PhD dissertation committees in Education, Spanish, and French.

Consistent with our general approach to gathering data, we used the period 2003-2009 (rather than 2000-2006) to obtain publication and citation data from the Thompson Reuters social sciences index for the faculty members in question and applied the same algorithm as the NRC

---

14 The problem is that the value for this variable was constructed by dividing the sum of faculty members who reported on a questionnaire that they had an external grant of some kind by the number of respondents (independently of core vs. associated status and independently of allocation percent).

15 If we do the calculation by giving an allocation of 1 to all and only the 100% FTE faculty appointments in the Department of Linguistics, the numbers are not markedly different, although they are slightly lower: publication index = .33; citation index = .53.
for calculating average publications and citations per “allocated” faculty member. We then ran our version of the complex data collection procedure and index calculation algorithm on another linguistics program with known values to verify that it gave the same results as the actual NRC procedure, which it did. The findings are summarized in Table 1, which shows a comparison between UC Davis and a sample of programs from across the spectrum of rankings on the 13 most important usable variables for the S-based ranking procedure. This sample includes all the UC programs in linguistics. In a nutshell, it appears that the UC Davis program in linguistics would place within the top 20 programs, ahead of UC Berkeley, UCLA (theoretical), UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Santa Cruz. We have lower-than-median values only on average GRE-Q scores and citations per publication and these values appear to be more than compensated for by quite high values for other important variables, for all of which there are top 20 programs, in most cases several, with lower values than ours. Moreover, no program with a value for the average number of publications variable of .25 or higher failed to make the top 20 (= S-score range of 11-23 or better), except for the University of Chicago, whose publication value is .27 and whose estimated absolute S-based ranking is 21. The reason for the low S-ranking for this program is also, of course, a big part of the reason for its high R-ranking: anomalously poor values for average time to degree (9.75 years), average percentage of students completing within 6 years (11.5%), and percentage of first-year students with full support (37.5%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Average ranking</th>
<th>Average GRE-Q</th>
<th>Percent Faculty Interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Average 1st Year Students with Full Support 2002-2006</th>
<th>Average Ph.Ds 2002 to 2006</th>
<th>Percent Completing within 6 Years</th>
<th>Median Time to Degree</th>
<th>Percent Students in Academic Positions with Portable 1st Year Fellowships</th>
<th>Student Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN'S HOPKINS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSU/UCSD (Communicative disorders)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURDUE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA BLOOMINGTON (Theoretical)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U CHICAGO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA (Applied Linguistics)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANFORD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT AUSTIN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC BERKELEY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YALE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA (Theoretical)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>746.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY BUFFALO</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>695.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>702.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U HAWAII AT MANOA (SLA)</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>553.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN (All 52 programs)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>667.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Program Values for Selected Variables for a Sample of Programs and Estimated Values for UC Davis**

16. This is a number derived by summing core and associated faculty and then dividing the number of associated faculty by this sum. We used for the total the 16 faculty members that qualified for at least “associated” status by virtue of service on dissertation committees and the dividend was the number of faculty (= 6) without an FTE appointment in Linguistics.

17. Average for Fall 2008-2010 cohorts used for UC Davis.

18. A lower number is a higher value on this variable. 2009-2010 was used for UC Davis, since our first Ph.Ds finished in 2009.

The fact that UC Davis comes out with the *highest value of all programs* on this variable makes us suspect that our calculation is somehow wrong. However, it is clear that all academic positions are supposed to count, including postdoctoral appointments, and that the denominator is the number of doctorates awarded. Of the Ph.D students from our program who have been awarded a doctorate as of this date (n = 10), 2 have tenure-track positions, 3 have postdoctoral appointments, and one has a lecturer appointment at UC Berkeley. 6/10 = 60%. We do not have access to the database that was used to calculate this variable. It is possible that lecturer appointments are not counted, in which case our value drops to 50%.
Department of Philosophy

This section provides an overview of the status of the Department of Philosophy since the Lindert Report in 1998, along with the challenges and opportunities for the department in the coming years. It focuses on excellence in scholarship, using data from the NRC rankings and data from the Philosophical Gourmet Report (PGR) rankings. As noted elsewhere in this document, the NRC rankings are problematic in many ways, but, at least for the Department of Philosophy, together with the PGR ranking they nonetheless provide a helpful index of the state of the Philosophy Department.

Department Overview

The Department of Philosophy has, for its size, substantial undergraduate and graduate programs. In the 2009-2010 academic year, the department had 115 undergraduate majors and 24 graduate students. 46 bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Philosophy in 2009-2010. As shown below, the size of the ladder faculty has increased by 38% since 1998, whereas the number of undergraduate majors has increased by 62%. Large numbers of non-majors also take Philosophy courses as electives or as requirements for their majors.

9.75 in 1998, 13.5 in 2010 = 38% increase
115 majors (8.5 per FTE); 24 graduate students (1.8 per FTE)
 Scholarship in the Department of Philosophy is mainly focused in seven areas, each of which represents a traditional area of specialization in the field: Ancient Philosophy, Ethics, Metaphysics, Logic and Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Mind, and Social/Political Philosophy.

The research emphases in the department have changed considerably since 1998. Today our strongest areas are: Ethics, Logic and Philosophy of Science, and Philosophy of Language. These strengths are owed mainly to strong and key senior hires in these areas. Also emerging as strong areas are: Philosophy of Mind and Metaphysics. These emerging strengths are owed to strong and key junior hires. In both cases, at both the senior and junior levels, retention remains an issue.

Since 1998 there have been 19 hires, 9 resignations and 6 retirements. This has, without doubt, taken a considerable toll on both the department and its graduate program. For example, 5 of the people who resigned were serving as Graduate Advisor when they left. Finally, this year we will face yet another resignation and another retirement.

Details of UCD Rankings

The NRC 2010 rankings were based on data from 2006, with some measures averaged from 2000-2006. According to this data, Davis had 19 allocated faculty (Number of Allocated Faculty, 2006), 16.64 faculty (Total Faculty, 2006), 26% Assistant Professors, and 47% Tenured
Professors. (These figures are highly problematic; our data shows 12.75 FTE in 2006.)

There were 23 graduate students enrolled, with an average of 4.8 being admitted per year. The NRC data file indicates that 5% had research assistantships and 60% had teaching assistantships, but (another discrepancy between reality and the NRC figures) Philosophy provides funding for 100% of its active students for up to 5 years.

The 2006 Davis Philosophy ranking was:
   53-76 on the S-ranking (out of 90 ranked programs).
   19-35 on the R-ranking (out of 90 ranked programs).
   27th by PGR 2006.

For the key variables, Philosophy’s rank by NRC 2010 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rank out of 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>publications per faculty member</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>citations per publication</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>%faculty with grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>awards per faculty member</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>average GRE scores</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>average number of Ph.D.s awarded</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These values indicate that the Davis department does very well in awards per faculty member. The most significant area of weakness is the publications per faculty member. However, this number, again, is problematic due to the disparity, noted above, between the NRC FTE data and our FTE data. The GRE scores show that we are attracting high-level graduate students. The ranking for the number of PhDs awarded is also quite low, but that too can be explained, to a large extent, by the large faculty turnover and the number of faculty who, when they resigned, were serving as Graduate Advisor.

**NRC Comparison with Other UCs**

The S-ranking range for UCD Philosophy (53-76) almost entirely overlaps the range for UCSB (54-77), with UCI (61-88) ranked lower, and Berkeley (2-9), UCSD (9-21), UCR (22-38) and UCLA (30-44) ranked substantially higher.

The R-ranking for UCD Philosophy (19-35) almost overlaps with UCLA (19-40), UCR (20-40) and UCSD (15-27), with UCB (2-11) substantially higher, and both UCSB (41-65) and UCI (66-76) substantially lower.

Philosophy was not ranked by NRC in 1995 due to too few PhDs being granted. Other NRC 1995 rankings were: UCB (4), UCLA (5), UCSD (14), UCI (20), UCR (38), and UCSB (41)

The following table ranks UC programs by NRC 2010 and includes PGR 2006 and NRC 1995 rankings.
PRG Comparison with Other UCs

In PGR 2006, Davis Philosophy was ranked 27th. In PGR 2009, Davis Philosophy had moved down to 36 from 35 in 2008, 27 in 2006, and 24 in 2004 and 2002. Davis Philosophy has become less competitive with UCI (23, 17, 20, 17, 20) and UCSD (21, 18, 20, 17, 20) and is now more in line with UCR (30, 31, 29, 32, 32) and UCSB (41, 42, 39, 44, 44), with UCB (9, 12, 15, 12, 13) and UCLA (9, 7, 6, 9, 8) holding a strong lead.

The following table ranks UC programs by NRC 2010 and includes PGR rankings and the NRC 1995 rankings. These also clearly show that the R-rankings are a more favorable indicator for Davis Philosophy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15-27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19-40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41-65</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>66-76</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRC Comparison with Other Universities

In the S-ranking, the top Philosophy programs are disproportionately private: 13 of top 20. In the S-ranking, the top public Philosophy programs are Rutgers, Berkeley, and Michigan. In the S-ranking, Davis Philosophy is 38th among publics. In the R-ranking, the top public Philosophy programs are Rutgers, Michigan, and Berkeley. In the R-ranking, Davis Philosophy is 10th among publics.
In the PGR rankings, the top Philosophy programs are disproportionately private: 21 of the top 50 in 2006 and 2009.

In the PGR rankings, the top public Philosophy programs are: Rutgers, Michigan, (Pittsburgh), and UCLA in 2006 and Rutgers, Michigan, (Pittsburgh), and Berkeley in 2009.

In the PGR rankings, among public universities, Davis was 15th in 2006 and 20th in 2009.

**Factors Contributing to Change in Rankings**

The NRC 2010 R-ranking data and PGR 2002-2009 ranking data provide clear evidence that the Philosophy Department is ranked 3rd-4th among UCs and 10th-20th among public universities. We have, however, slipped since PRG 2006. The explanations for this include:

Perhaps the main explanation for our slipping in the PGR rankings, and certainly an obstacle to our future success, are failed retention efforts. Various universities have been aggressively trying to build successful philosophy departments by recruiting our top people. This is perhaps because philosophy is a relatively inexpensive field to build up. *In the face of this competition, we need to do more to retain the top people we hire.*

We are a relatively small department, at 13.5 FTE. The publics that are ranked ahead of us are almost all significantly larger. Looking at the PRG data, the 10 departments at public universities that rank ahead of us have an average FTE of 20.2. *We need at least 2-4 strong new hires to be competitive and to move towards regaining our previous rankings.*

The only research measure that counts, among philosophers, in measuring the productivity of departments, is quality of publications. Grants and awards, for example, are not highly weighted. *To remain in line with other Social Science programs, however, we need to do more to increase our number of grants and awards.*

We can do better in measures of student outcomes. To this end we have made drastic changes, and continue to make on-going changes, to our graduate program. *We need to continue with these changes with the aim of improving student mentoring, student completion times, and student placement.*

**Challenges and Opportunities for the Future**

The Philosophy Department currently has at least eight people working, both directly and indirectly, in areas related to “Networks” and/or “Decision Science,” topics that this Council has suggested for future interdisciplinary collaborations. Several members of the Department of Philosophy work in areas related to “Network Science,” both from a theoretical and from a practical perspective. Landry and Antonelli’s work can be seen, respectively, as providing a theoretical foundation for the use of the mathematical frameworks (from graph theory, to knot theory, to category theory) and logical frameworks (from classical, to “fuzzy”, to non-monotonic, defensible, logics) that underpin network science. From a practical perspective, Griesemer and Milstein, who work in the areas of philosophy of biology and evolutionary theory, make use of biological networks, especially as these concern the relation between information networks and the concept of causation. Our ethicists Copp, Dworkin and Oshana, consider the
use of social and moral networks with the aim of reconstructing the “is-ought” distinction that underwrites ethical behavior and choice. Finally, Molyneux and May, our philosophers of mind and language, respectfully, use cognitive and semantic networks for modeling the structure of thought and of language. In the broad area of "Decision Science," the faculty’s interests include the theoretical underpinnings and practical uses of graph theory category theory, lattice theory, complex systems analysis, decision theory, classical, defeasible, and alternative logics, game theory, rational choice theory, theory choice, and Bayesianism.

In terms of strengthening Philosophy and contributing to the proposed interdisciplinary efforts, there are two directions we can take: (1) build on our existing strengths by making top hires in (a) Philosophy of Science/Logic and (b) Ethics; (2) broaden our strengths by making top hires in Epistemology (with attention given to formal epistemology and/or epistemological decision-making).

In either case, new hires together with more focus on successful retention are needed to maintain and further develop the excellence of the Department of Philosophy.
This section provides an overview regarding the recent progress and future challenges faced by the Department of Political Science. In spite of its small size relative to other departments of political science at major public universities, the UC Davis department ranks among the best in the country. Moreover, in spite of its small size relative to other departments on our campus, it ranks among the leaders in the number of majors, as well as in the number of student credit hours generated. In order to build the quality of the Department as well as to secure the quality of our undergraduates’ educational experience, the Department has consciously chosen a strategy that focuses on ladder rank faculty, with relatively few lecturers on staff. This strategy depends on our ability to enhance the quality and size of our faculty and our graduate program, and hence we have focused on targeting resources toward those ends.

**Department Overview**

In spite of its small faculty, the Department of Political Science sustains a very large undergraduate program of study as well as a substantial graduate program. In the 2009-2010 academic year, the Department served 895 Political Science majors, 85 Political Science-Public Service majors, and 697 International Relations majors. In the same year, 269 bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Political Science, 7 bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Political Science-Public Service, and 266 were awarded in International Relations, for a total of 542 degrees. During the past 5 years, the number of ladder rank faculty in the department has decreased from 28 to 25 (see Table 1A). During this same period, the ratio of majors to faculty has been increasing. The Department has the largest major to ladder rank faculty ratio in the Division of Social Sciences – a ratio that is 48% higher than the campus overall (see Table 1B). Large numbers of non-majors also enroll in political science courses as electives or as requirements for their majors. Hence, the Department offers over 9,300 seats in its courses each year, and it sustains a very high ratio of student credit hours per ladder rank faculty that is among the very highest in the Division of Social Sciences (see Table 1C).

The Department offers graduate training in five areas: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Methodology, and Political Theory. In order to maintain the quality of the Department in spite of its small size, we have chosen to focus and specialize. That is, we do not attempt to provide comprehensive coverage in all areas of Political Science, but rather to target our resources on our areas of excellence. This strategy has paid enormous dividends during the past ten years, and the Department has made striking gains in the quality of its faculty and its graduate program.

The graduate program has been particularly successful in locating our Ph.D. students in faculty positions, and many of our students go on to major universities, including Vanderbilt, UC Irvine, professional life within and beyond the department, and we believe that this strategy is proving to be successful.
Table 1. Faculty and undergraduates, UC Davis Department of Political Science.

A. Ladder rank faculty in the Department of Political Science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Ratio of Majors to Ladder Rank Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Student credit hour production per ladder rank faculty by Department in the Division of Social Sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, Texas A&M, Florida State University. The quality of the entering students has increased dramatically. The incoming students have an average GPA of 3.6, with average GRE quantitative scores in the range of 680-700, and average GRE verbal scores in the range of 600-650. A hallmark of our department and graduate program is the level of collaborative research involving faculty and graduate students. Our goal is to thoroughly incorporate our graduate students into a vigorous
**Rankings**

The Department’s progress over time is perhaps best illustrated on the basis of reputational data from the US News and World Report rankings. As Figure 1 shows, the Department improved more than any other UC political science department. It went from near the bottom of the UC departments in the late 1980s to a point in the middle of the distribution in the 2009 ranking. This improvement has been especially pronounced since the 1995 rating.

The current quality of the Department is best illustrated on the basis of the recently released NRC ratings, displayed in Table 2. The UC Davis scores are reported along with the scores for the other Political Science Departments in the University of California, as well as in the Big 10. The Big Ten Departments include some of the best public universities in the country, as well as leading Departments of Political Science, and hence we see the Big 10 departments as an obvious peer group.

The NRC reputational rankings are shown in the first column -- “R Midpoint”. The NRC provides a confidence interval around each of the rankings, and for purposes of this analysis, we select the midpoints of that interval. Among all publics, UC Davis is ranked 13th, in the middle of the distribution for the combined reference group. We should note that all of the schools above us in this ranking have much larger faculties – a factor that is highly correlated with reputational rankings.

The second column ranking (the “S Midpoint”) is based on departmental ratings on a set of objective criteria. In this column the Department is ranked 5th in the reference group and 6th among all publics. The only departments that ranked clearly above Davis were Michigan, Penn State, and UC San Diego. UC Davis and UC Berkeley are virtually tied.

What accounts for the improvement between “S” and “R”? Not only are the departments as much (or more) than twice as large as the Davis department, they also have long histories of excellence. In order to improve our reputational rankings, UC Davis must maintain excellence over the longer haul, and hence it becomes particularly important that we look to the future in our recruitment efforts.

The Department ranks 4th in the reference group and 5th among all publics in “research activity,” and it ranks 3rd in the reference group and 8th among all publics in “graduate student support and outcomes.” While the Department has made a concerted effort and genuine progress in advancing the diversity of faculty and graduate students, more work needs to be done, as is illustrated by the “Diversity” ranking.

The NRC rankings also show the relatively small size of the Department, which ranks at the bottom of the combined reference group. The size of the graduate program is also relatively small, and the Department is pursuing an effort to increase the size of the program.
Figure 1. Historical Changes in USNWR Rankings for UC Departments of Political Science.

A. Net change in rankings for UC Departments of Political Science, 1988-2009.

Table 2. NRC Rankings: Political Science Departments in the University of California and the Big Ten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Midpoint</th>
<th>S Midpoint</th>
<th>Research Activity Midpoint</th>
<th>Student Support &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Michigan</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 Penn State</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3 UCSD</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 UCB</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5 UCDAVIS (6)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6 Illinois</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7 Indiana</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8 Michigan State</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UCDAVIS (13)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>9 Wisconsin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10 Ohio State</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11 Minnesota</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>12 UCR</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13 UCLA</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14 Northwestern</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>15 UC Irvine</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16 Purdue</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>17 Iowa</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18 UCSB</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the number in parentheses for UC Davis is its ranking among all publics on the relevant dimension.
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Midpoint</th>
<th>Total Faculty 2006</th>
<th>Students Enrolled Fall 2005</th>
<th>2009 US News</th>
<th>all</th>
<th>public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Purdue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Michigan</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Penn State</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 UCLA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Michigan</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3 UCSD</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Northwestern</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4 UCB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Illinois</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5 Indiana</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Minnesota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6 Michigan State</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 UCSB</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>7 Northwestern</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 UC Irvine</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8 UC Irvine</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 UCLA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9 Penn State</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Indiana</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10 Wisconsin</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ohio State</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11 Illinois</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Michigan State</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12 Minnesota</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 UCR</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13 Ohio State</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Wisconsin</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14 Purdue</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Iowa</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>15 UCSB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 UCSD</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16 Iowa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 UCB</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17 UCDAVIS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>UCDAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 UCDAVIS (65)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18 UCR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>UCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Given the divergence between the “R” and “S” rankings from the NRC, as well as the convergence between the “R” rating and the US News reputational rating, one might question the veracity of the “S” ratings. Hence, we validate the “S” ratings with publication data for all the UC campuses that have been collected by a colleague from another UC campus.

Table 3 shows the rates and numbers of articles published by faculty in the top three political science journals. In spite of the fact that Davis has a “young” faculty, we have the highest average number of papers published per faculty member, and the highest percentage of faculty members with 10 or more papers. (A more detailed breakdown of the data by UC departments is shown in Table 4.) In spite of the fact that we have a small faculty, we have the second highest number of papers, the second highest number of faculty with 10 or more papers, and the second highest number of faculty who rank in the top 10 percent of production.

Different styles and types of scholarship lead to different publication outlets. For example, some political scientists are more focused on producing books rather than articles. The last column of Table 3 shows little difference in the rates at which UC political scientists publish university press books across the UC campuses. With the exception of Riverside and Santa Cruz, all the political science faculties in the UC have published between 1.6 and 1.9 books per faculty member. In summary, the NRC rankings are sustained by a close comparative analysis of publication data.

**Challenges**

The Department faces a number of challenges related to size, recruitment raids on its faculty, and research support. Perhaps most importantly, our size remains at a critical level both in terms of accomplishing our mission on campus, as well as in maintaining and enhancing our national prominence. Our courses are over-subscribed, and we should be offering additional classes. In terms of national prominence, the reputation and standing of the Department

**Table 3.** Publication Rates in Top-Three General Political Science Journals and in University Press Books, UC Departments of Political Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># Faculty</th>
<th>Average years to Ph.D.</th>
<th>Average number papers</th>
<th>Number of faculty in top 10% of production (7+ papers)</th>
<th>Number of faculty with 10 or more papers</th>
<th>Percent of faculty with 10 or more papers</th>
<th>Average number of University Press books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAVIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1994</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

depends on the scholarly visibility of our faculty, and ultimately this requires more faculty. We want to make two things clear in this regard. First, we understand that we are not alone among departments in the Division of Social Sciences in facing this problem, but this does not reduce the severity of the problem we face. Second, we do not anticipate having a faculty of 40 any time soon, but it is imperative that the size of the faculty increases within the Department.

The Department is particularly vulnerable to raids, and we are seeing abundant evidence that our faculty is being targeted for recruitment by other campuses. We are vulnerable for two reasons. First, the size of our faculty means that every loss is a significant loss. Second, we share a severe problem with the rest of the campus. Many of our colleagues are not being paid salaries that are in line with the national market, and hence we are particularly vulnerable to raids.

Finally, the discipline of political science faces a funding problem related to the availability of external support. Support for political science has never been lavish, and a primary source of support, the National Science Foundation’s Political Science Program, has become a target of budget cuts in Washington. In this context, members of the Department have done quite well in obtaining support from the NSF and elsewhere. Moreover, members of the Department have become more actively involved in pursuing funding for large scale interdisciplinary funds.

**Table 4.** Numbers of articles published by each faculty member in the three most prominent political science journals, by UC Political Science departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of articles</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>UCD</th>
<th>UCI</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UCM</th>
<th>UCR</th>
<th>UCSB</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>UCSD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

We believe our Department’s high ranking validates the strategic plan we have pursued over the past decade, which entails a scholarly focus emphasizing multiple approaches including...
quantitative methods, experimental research, and interdisciplinary studies. We have also emphasized, via both our hiring decisions and our graduate training, bringing together scholars pursuing research projects that cut across the traditional political science subfields of American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, and research methods. This is reflected in an unusually large number of scholarly collaborations between the faculty in our Department (and between faculty members and graduate students) across these different subfields. We believe this approach has propelled the dramatic rise on our Department’s national standing. Indeed, the improvement in our department’s NRC ranking between 1995 and 2009 is virtually unmatched among political science departments nationwide.

Our department’s strong showing vis-à-vis other UC programs has been achieved despite the fact that our faculty size (25 members) lags far behind that of several of the other prominent Political Science Departments in the UC system (Berkeley, UCSD, and UCLA) which each have at least 40 faculty members. In order to maintain our Department’s national standing and fill critical gaps in our program, we will need to hire several new faculty over the next few years.

The death in 2009 of our senior colleague, Distinguished Professor Robert Jackman, a recognized leader in the fields of political institutions and comparative political behavior, has left a void in our graduate curriculum and also in our ability to train and mentor graduate students majoring in Comparative Politics. The retirement of Professor Randolph Siverson has had a similar effect in the field of International Relations, and the pending departure of Larry Berman produces the same effect in American politics.

The Department also has pressing needs for discretionary resources for use to attract and support graduate students. In this regard, our supplemental block grant funding has been reduced over the past several years, resulting in less overall block grant funding available for our graduate students. As a result we have been compelled to reduce support to both incoming and continuing graduate students.

Finally, the NRC rankings have prompted our faculty to discuss strategies for enhancing the diversity of our academic environment. In this regard, we note that the proportion of female faculty and graduate students in our department at the start of this academic year (24% and 40%, respectively) has actually increased since the time when the NRC collected the data used for the department rankings. We also recognize the important contributions that international students can make to our program and we plan to increase our recruitment outreach towards these students, to the extent this is feasible given our budget constraints (due to the cost of Non-Resident Tuition, international students cost an additional $15,000/year for at least three years, a cost that imposes severe constraints on the number of such students we can afford to fund). We plan to vigorously promote our outreach to minorities, in an effort to attract talented minority students to our graduate program. Specifically, the members of our Graduate Affairs Committee will make contacts with faculty in other political science departments around the country, in an effort to identify promising minority undergraduates who are planning to apply to political science graduate programs, and we will then contact these undergraduates to encourage them to apply to our program. We also plan to accelerate our recruitment efforts for minority admits to our graduate program, via frequent faculty contacts with these students.
Department of Psychology

This section provides an overview of the progress made by the Department of Psychology since the Lindert Report in 1998, along with the challenges and opportunities for the department in the coming years. It focuses on excellence in scholarship, using data from the NRC rankings. As noted elsewhere in this document, the NRC rankings are problematic in many ways, but even if they are flawed, they nonetheless provide an important index of success in scholarship.

Department Overview

The Department of Psychology has very large undergraduate and graduate programs. In the 2009-2010 academic year, the department had 1775 undergraduate majors and 85 graduate students. 611 bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Psychology in 2009-2010, which was the largest number of any major and accounted for approximately 10% of undergraduate degrees at UC Davis. As shown below, the number of ladder faculty has increased by 37% since 1998, whereas the number of undergraduate majors has increased by 109%. Large numbers of nonmajors also take Psychology courses as electives or as requirements for their majors, and the department offers over 10,000 seats in its courses each year.

Scholarship in the department is focused in five areas, each of which represents a traditional subdiscipline in the field: Developmental Psychology; Social and Personality Psychology; Quantitative Psychology; Psychobiology; and Perception, Cognition, & Cognitive Neuroscience. Unlike the majority of psychology departments in Research I universities, we do not offer doctoral training in clinical psychology (which allows us to avoid the large overhead associated with embedding a professional program inside an academic department).

---

20 This number is taken from the official statistics at [http://budget.ucdavis.edu/data-reports/enrollment-reports](http://budget.ucdavis.edu/data-reports/enrollment-reports). However, it is likely an underestimate because it does not include late transfers into the major.
The research emphases in the department have evolved considerably since 1998. The Lindert Report called for a university-wide initiative in Mind Sciences, which led to the founding of the Center for Mind & Brain (CMB) in 2002. The CMB has been an extraordinarily valuable asset to the Department of Psychology, making it possible to hire several excellent junior and senior faculty in one of the fastest growing areas of the field. UC Davis is now widely regarded as a leader in this subfield of Psychology. In addition, the department began bolstering its Developmental Psychology area in 2003, several key hires (plus several in the Department of Human Development in the Ag School) have made this a thriving area. Finally, key junior, midlevel, and senior hires in the Social and Personality Psychology area have vaulted UC Davis into the top five U.S. programs in this area, according to a recent scholarly review of publication impact reported in the Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, one of the field’s high-impact journals.

**Overall Ranking Information**

In the 1995 NRC rankings (based on data from 1993), the UCD psychology program was ranked #47 among all U.S. universities and #26 among U.S. public universities. The UCD ranking improved markedly in the 2009 NRC rankings (based mainly on data from 2006). However, quantifying the improvement is made difficult by the fact that the 2009 NRC rankings do not provide a single ranking value, but instead provide a confidence interval for the ranking (giving 5th and 95th percentiles). Moreover, the 2009 NRC rankings weight the different values in two ways, one that reflects expert judgments about the importance of different variables in assessing scholarship (called S Rankings) and one that reflects reputation (called R Rankings). The reputation-based R rankings are strongly influenced by past scholarship and university-wide halo effects, so the S rankings are a more valid measure of current scholarship.

The UCD psychology program had an S ranking between 21 and 57 among all U.S. universities. To provide a simple linear ranking, the midpoint of the confidence interval was computed for all U.S. psychology programs and the programs were ranked by this measure. According to this metric, the UCD psychology program was ranked #29 among all U.S. universities and #14 among public universities. This is a large improvement relative to the #47 and #26 rankings in 1995. It is also important to note that the 2009 rankings were based on a set of 236 psychology programs, so the UCD psychology program is in the top 12.5% of U.S. psychology programs.

The 2009 U.S. News rankings placed the UCD psychology program at #23, which is consistent with the NRC rankings.

**Details of the UCD Rankings**

In the 2009 rankings, the UCD psychology program had 35.78 allocated faculty, 47 total faculty (which reflects the breadth of the Psychology Graduate Program), 26% assistant professors, and 62% tenured professors.

For the key variables contributing to the NRC rankings, the UCD psychology rank21 was as follows:

---

21 This excludes programs that focus on a narrow subarea of psychology, such as the highly ranked Child Development program at University of Minnesota and a large number of clinical-only programs (most of which have low rankings).
These values indicate that the Davis department does very well in publications, and especially impact of publications (as indicated by citations). The most significant area of weakness is the number of awards per faculty member. However, this has improved dramatically since the NRC data were collected, because the department’s faculty have won a large number of prestigious awards over the past few years. The GRE scores are a little low, but this likely reflects the lack of a clinical psychology area (clinical psychology programs are highly competitive, even more than medical school by some accounts). The ranking for number of PhDs awarded is also relatively low, and this warrants some investigation.

**Comparison with Other UCs**

The S-ranking range for Davis (21-57) almost entirely overlaps the range for Berkeley (24-52), UCSD (16-53), and UCSB (16-52), with only UCLA (13-40) being ranked substantially higher. This represents an enormous improvement for Davis relative to the 1995 rankings, in which Davis was #43 and fell far below UCLA (#4), Berkeley (#9) and UCSD (#10).

The following table ranks UC psychology programs by their S-ranking and includes 2009 US News rankings and the 1995 NRC rankings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>US News 2009 Overall Rank</th>
<th>NRC 1995 Overall Rank</th>
<th>Overall Research Activity Rank</th>
<th>Overall Student Support &amp; Outcomes Rank</th>
<th>Overall Diversity Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>6-26</td>
<td>13-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22-73</td>
<td>15-47</td>
<td>16-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23-76</td>
<td>19-56</td>
<td>16-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16-62</td>
<td>24-54</td>
<td>37-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24-67</td>
<td>21-57</td>
<td>21-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Riverside</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42-80</td>
<td>47-83</td>
<td>66-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Irvine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52-99</td>
<td>55-93</td>
<td>72-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>124-211</td>
<td>130-176</td>
<td>146-199</td>
<td>93-177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factors Contributing to Change in Rankings**

Several factors appear to have played a role in the Psychology Department’s rise in the rankings. The most important factor is the department’s success in hiring excellent scholars. This success can be broken down into two components: (1) having opportunities to hire and

---

<sup>22</sup> The “student support & outcomes” rank for UCD is quite low. However, the individual variables used to create these rankings have values that are completely implausible and appear to be based on faulty data.
(2) making the most of these opportunities. Opportunities came in the form of growth (with a 37% increase in ladder faculty FTEs since 1998) and the retirement of a large number of relatively unproductive senior faculty. Making the most of these opportunities can be attributed partially to the relationship between the Psychology Department and the Center for Neuroscience (founded in 1992) and more recently the Center for Mind & Brain (founded in 2002), both of which helped move the department in new directions and helped attract top faculty. It can also be partially attributed to the department’s hiring of many excellent mid-career faculty (at the associate or early full professor level), many of whom were academic couples. By hiring at this level and being flexible about hiring couples, the department was able to attract individuals with proven track records of success who have gone on to be outstanding senior faculty.

The department’s improved rankings also reflect a change in culture to emphasize large-scale projects, extramural grant funding, and collaborative research. This change in culture has led, for example, to the establishment within the Psychology Department of the NIH-funded Asian American Center on Disparities Research and the state-funded Center for Public Policy Research. It has also led to an enormous increase in the number of standard research grants, mainly from NIH and NSF. The research culture has also changed from an emphasis on “fringe” areas of the field to an emphasis on mainstream research topics (including a great deal of innovative, cutting edge research on these mainstream topics). The research culture also emphasizes collaborative research, including collaborations within the department, across the University, and around the world. This aspect of the department’s culture also plays out in hiring: rather than trying to cover every topic across the broad field of psychology, the department has clusters of faculty who focus on related topics (e.g., language, memory, hormones, cognitive development). This has led to more numerous and higher impact publications, improved recruiting of high-quality graduate students, and greater success in attracting large grants.

These aspects of hiring and departmental culture could plausibly be adopted by other departments that are trying to improve the quality of their scholarship, their reputation, and their rankings.

Challenges and Opportunities for the Future

The Department of Psychology has improved enormously since the 1998 Lindert Report, and it is on track to continue its rise in rankings as its faculty continue to excel in their scholarly activities. As a discipline, Psychology straddles the biological sciences and the social sciences. The many existing links between the department and various bioscience-related units across the University will continue to be a source of great strength and growth, and the department therefore depends on the University’s continued support of interdisciplinary initiatives, such as the Center for Mind & Brain, the Center for Neuroscience, the MIND Institute, and the Primate Center. However, although the Psychology Department is administratively located within the Division of Social Sciences, the department is not as strongly linked to other units within the Division as it is to the biosciences. This provides clear opportunities for future development. In particular, the networking and decision science initiatives described elsewhere in this document could provide excellent avenues for creating links between Psychology and the rest of the Division that would advance the University as a whole.

The Psychology Department faces some important challenges, however, that could slow or even reverse its upward trajectory. One is growth in undergraduate majors relative to
faculty, which has increased the student-to-faculty ratio from 30:1 in 1998 to 47:1 in 2009 (and has also dramatically increased the number of nonmajors taking Psychology courses). This dramatic change necessarily creates an increased teaching burden for faculty, an increased reliance on non-ladder instructors, a reduction in the delivery of a high-quality education, or some combination of these outcomes. A second challenge is that the department’s home, Young Hall, is an old and decrepit building that is insufficient for the department’s research and teaching needs and is an obstacle to recruiting top faculty and graduate students. But perhaps the most significant challenge is to retain the excellent faculty that were recruited during the department’s period of growth. These faculty are increasingly being targeted by other universities. As California’s budget problems percolate down through the University, it is essential to protect resources that support scholarship and to aggressively retain our best scholars.
Science and Technology Studies (STS) Program

The STS (Science and Technology Studies) Program did not exist in 1998 when the Lindert Report was drafted, and STS is not a discipline ranked by the NRC. By FTE metrics, STS is a very small undergraduate program. It has 1.5 FTEs (distributed over 3 faculty), which represents a fractional increase over the 1 FTE held by its direct ancestor (the History and Philosophy of Science Program, or HPS) in the mid-nineties. The first Director of STS was hired in 2005, and the Program currently graduates about 9 majors a year.

The numbers, however, fail to capture the impact of this highly cross-disciplinary program, which draws faculty from Anthropology, Sociology, Environmental Science and Policy, Law, English, American Studies, Philosophy, Cultural Studies, History, Technocultural Studies, and Religious Studies. Some of the affiliated faculty have formal MOUs with STS while others cross-list their courses in STS or contribute new ones on an ad hoc basis. There is also a substantial network of graduate students writing dissertations in the STS area and being advised by STS faculty, but receiving their PhDs through other departments. The FTE figure also fails to represent the level of local and international events that STS organizes or co-organizes (2 conferences, 1 workshop, and about 15 talks in 2010-2011) and the international visitors it attracts (3 in 2011-2012). Also, for the last few years, we have been organizing a regular UC-wide summer retreat for all STS faculty and graduate students.

Perhaps the best way to describe the STS Program is not as a miniature department but as a node in a network of teaching and research activities around science, technology, society, and innovation. The core and affiliated faculty is quite junior – mostly associate and younger full professors. If there were something like an NCR ranking for STS, we would come below MIT and Cornell (which have full-fledged STS departments), and Michigan, but above other long-standing programs like RPI and Georgia Tech. Within UC, we would probably come below Berkeley but above Irvine, Santa Cruz, UCLA, and perhaps UCSD (whose program is larger but somewhat dysfunctional).

STS faculty address the complex issues of how science, technology, medicine, and engineering have developed and continue to develop within societies and cultures. Our research subject is inherently cross-disciplinary. It is also bound to expand in different directions, following the development of new fields and disciplines (like nanotechnology and synthetic biology) and new disciplinary alliances with other technology-related new fields such as Internet studies and digital media studies. Given the present and future nature of our field, we expect to grow through joint appointments -- mostly in the social sciences but also in the humanities, sciences, and professional schools.

Growth trends:

- STS has received only an additional .50 FTE from the establishment of the Center for Science and Innovation Studies (CSIS), but it is benefiting from the networks that are being established through that Center, especially with the School of Law, GSM, Engineering, and the Sciences. The connection between STS and CSIS also translates into a significantly higher level of activity (conferences, workshops, lectures, visitors) and international visibility.

- We are currently putting forward a Designated Emphasis in STS for graduate students, which we expect to become operational in Winter 2012. That would put
us on par with Berkeley, the only other UC campus to have started a DE in the field for 2011-2012.

- We are in the planning stages of a professional MA in “Science and Innovation Studies,” in collaboration with King Hall, GSM, and Engineering. We expect it to be launched in 2012-2013.

- Three STS faculty (one associate and two core faculty) have just received a Sawyer Seminar Grant from the Mellon Foundation for a project on new environmental politics, which we will partially use to develop further connections with STS-related faculty and graduate students on campus.

- Our top FTE priority is for a scholar specializing in the sociology and ethnography of financial markets – the youngest but fastest-growing subfield of STS.
Department of Sociology

Introduction

The Department of Sociology offers four undergraduate majors (General, Law and Society, Social Services, Comparative Studies and World Development), the interdisciplinary Organizational Studies major, and a departmentally based Graduate Group doctoral program that draws in faculty from other units. Sociology faculty comprise a strong network of diverse overlapping areas of expertise that facilitate undergraduate education and graduate training to students with a variety of interests. A pluralistic vision of sociology encourages the strong engagement of theory and analytic skills with empirical research using field, historical/comparative, and quantitative methodologies. Sociology at UC Davis has grown from a relatively small department in the 1980s to a program of strong national stature now poised for further development.

Department Overview

The Sociology faculty grew from 21.5 FTE in 1998 to 24 in 2009-2010 (11.6%), less in percentage terms than any other program in the Division of Social Sciences. As table 1 shows, this growth has been far outstripped by undergraduate teaching demands, which increased 38.8%, including a 29.8% increase in units taught by ladder faculty. In parallel, the number of undergraduate majors increased 24.7%; 160 bachelor’s degrees were awarded in 2009-2010, the 12th largest number of any major at UC Davis. Over the same time period, the number of graduate students increased by 34.7%. Sociology is thus challenged by substantial increases in teaching loads nowhere close to being matched by a modest increase in faculty. The department has increased faculty teaching loads substantially, while developing an undergraduate curriculum praised by the 2011 review committee for its overall quality and its service to underrepresented students, and fielding a well ranked graduate program that a 2011 review committee found to have a strong PhD placement record, based on significant numbers of placements in Research I universities and in tenure-track positions at liberal arts colleges and Research II universities.

Table 1: Changes in Department of Sociology faculty and students, 1998 – 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998-1999</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>+24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Units</td>
<td>24,255</td>
<td>33,633</td>
<td>+38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociology at UC Davis encompasses an interlinked network of research emphases. Faculty conduct research in seven areas supporting undergraduate courses and graduate training:

- culture, knowledge, and science;
- crime, delinquency, and law;
- economic, organizational, and political sociology;
- identities, interaction, families, networks, and communities;
- inequalities, life chances, and stratification of class, gender, and race/ethnicity;
• social institutions: health, education, and welfare; and,
• global, regional, and urban processes.

Other faculty research connects with these emphases. Of particular note are research on migration and demography, environment and sustainability, social networks, social movements, and conflict and violence. As figure 1 shows, empirically, the research interests of the faculty coalesce into strengths in comparative/historical sociology, culture, political sociology, race and ethnicity, and work/organizations, with supporting strengths in other subfields. In relation to the wider campus, strengths in cultural and historical sociology provide links to the humanities, work on inequality and justice connect to the Law School, research activities in medical sociology link to the Medical School and new School of Public Health, and faculty scholarship on the environment, globalization, and science and technology are beginning to build out connections between the social sciences, the physical and biological sciences, and engineering.

Figure 1: Network analysis of UC Davis Sociology faculty departmental interests [network analysis by Bob Faris].

Through the end of the 1980s, UC Davis Sociology was relatively small, with a faculty in 1987-88 of around 13 FTE. The UC Davis faculty size increased dramatically through hiring initiated in 1989 and 1990, from 15 to 23 faculty with 100% or joint appointments. Over the past decade, the Department of Sociology faculty has managed through limited recruitment to maintain its core strengths despite the loss of six faculty through retirement from regular faculty duties and four faculty recruited away to programs at other universities (UC Irvine, George Mason University, National University of Ireland – Maynooth, and the University of Minnesota). The most significant shifts in areas of specialization over the period include the addition of one faculty member specializing in the sociology of the environment and another in social networks, and the loss through retirement of a faculty member specializing in social interactionism. The department expects the retirement of as many as three senior faculty over the next three years.
Standing of the Department of Sociology

According to a 1980s National Academy study reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education, UC Davis Sociology ranked among the top 50 graduate programs in the U.S. The NRC did not rank the program in 1995, apparently because too few students completed PhDs during the study’s time frame. Therefore, to consider the national standing of the department and its position within UC, we examine the 2010 NRC rankings, and then supplement them with the USN&WR rankings, which allow for analysis over time and in relation to other data concerning sociology programs.23

NRC Ranking Relative to Comparable Departments

For the discipline of sociology, the methodology of the recent NRC report does not take account of books as scholarship in its most highly weighted variable – research. As in certain other disciplines, this flawed measurement significantly biases NRC results, making them a problematic basis for considering relative strengths of sociology programs in the U.S.24 To arrive at assessments with stronger validity, we supplement the NRC data by adding a variable for publications that treats one book as equivalent to five articles (the metric the NRC used in humanities disciplines and history).25 We thus look at six (intercorrelated) measures of program standing: (1) S-midpoint, (2) R-midpoint, (3) Research midpoint, (4) average number of publications not counting books, (5) average citations per publication not counting books, and (6) average number of publications counting books.

For a comparison group, we have included all other UC campuses except for UCSF (which has only a specialized graduate program in medical sociology) and UC Merced. In addition, we analyzed all Big 10 universities with strong sociology programs (that is, excluding Iowa, Michigan State, and Purdue), and we added other public and private universities with highly regarded sociology programs (Arizona, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Duke, Harvard, North Carolina, Princeton, Stanford, Texas). This group thus compares UC Davis with other UC campuses and a set of strong national peers.

The results, reported in table 2, are straightforward. In the non-adjusted NRC rankings of the 27 programs, on the R-, S-, Research Activity Midpoints, and the Average Number of Publications (articles only), UC Davis ranks 21st or 22nd – lower than three or four other UC programs, and higher than three or four other UC programs. Which UC programs are higher or lower varies: only Berkeley is consistently higher than Davis on all four measures. Davis is ranked higher than Santa Cruz on all four of the measures; higher than San Diego on three of them; higher than Los Angeles and Riverside on two of them; and higher than Irvine on one of them. Compared to non-UC universities, UC Davis ranks higher than Illinois on three of the measures and higher than Virginia on all four of them. Overall, then, on the first four variables considered, UC Davis is consistently at around the 75 percentile of the comparison group, with about half of the other UC programs ranked higher, and half ranked lower.

23 Paxton and Bollen (2003) found little in the way of differences between USN&WR and National Research Council rankings for a previous time period.


25 To compile the number of books per faculty member, we used the same time period used for other NRC data, 2000 – 2006. However, the data were only collected for faculty who are currently members of a department. This is not a perfect measure, but if anything, it underestimates the publications of UC Davis Sociology, where a number of individuals with substantial book publications have either retired or gone to other departments, and one-quarter of the current faculty were in graduate school during the time period of the study.
The measure Average Citations per Publication (not including books) offers a basis for going beyond research productivity to tap the impact of research. On this measure, UC Davis ranks considerably higher, 14th among the 27 universities – higher than all other UC campuses, and Washington, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Arizona, Virginia, and Illinois. Among public universities, only Indiana, Penn State, Ohio State, North Carolina, Michigan, and Texas rank higher.

Finally, when publications data are adjusted to include books, they provide a much more appropriate measure of research productivity. Understandably, departments, including UC Davis, that have higher numbers of “book” faculty fare much better than they do when books are not considered as scholarship. On this measure, UC Davis ranks 11th, higher than all other UC campuses other than Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, and Berkeley, and higher than all other public universities than Minnesota and Texas. Overall, on the key core variables concerning research – productivity (including books) and citations – UC Davis does well: better than any other UC program on citations, and better on publications per faculty than Harvard, Stanford, or 14 comparable universities, including 4 UC campuses.

Table 2. Rankings of UC Davis Sociology and a comparison group of 26 other programs, using NRC data plus the NRC Publications variable adjusted to include books [book data analysis by Bob Faris, Phyllis Jeffrey, and Emerald Nguyen].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HARVARD [private]</td>
<td>PRINCETON [private]</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COLUMBIA [private]</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
<td>DUKE [private]</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>DUKE [private]</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>COLUMBIA [private]</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>CORNELL [private]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>DUKE [private]</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CHICAGO [private]</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>DUKE [private]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>COLUMBIA [private]</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>DUKE [private]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>STANFORD [private]</td>
<td>STANFORD [private]</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UC-LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>STANFORD [private]</td>
<td>COLUMBIA [private]</td>
<td>CHICAGO [private]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>CHICAGO [private]</td>
<td>CORNELL [private]</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>HARVARD [private]</td>
<td>UC-DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>UC-REVERSE</td>
<td>UC-REVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>CHICAGO [private]</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UC-SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>UC-SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>STANFORD [private]</td>
<td>UC-REVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>UC-CHICAGO</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CORNELL [private]</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>UC-REVERSE</td>
<td>UC-SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>UC-LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>UC-DAVIS</td>
<td>UC-LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>UC-DAVIS</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
<td>UC-SANTA BARBARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>UC-DAVIS</td>
<td>UC-LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>UC-DAVIS</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>UC-SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>UC-REVERSE</td>
<td>UC-SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>UC-SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>USC-SANTA CRUZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>UC-LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UC-BERKELEY</td>
<td>UC-SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UC-SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>UC-SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>UC-SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>UC-SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>UC-SAN DIEGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A somewhat different but not inconsistent picture emerges when we look at the *U.S. News* rankings. The current ranking of sociology graduate programs by *U.S. News & World Report* [http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/sociology-rankings](http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/sociology-rankings) shows UC Davis Sociology tied at 31st with Rutgers University, UC San Diego, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and Vanderbilt University. In the UC system, programs at Berkeley (ranked 1), Los Angeles (9), Irvine (27), and Santa Barbara (28) receive higher rankings, and UC San Diego is tied with UC Davis at 31. Aside from Berkeley and UCLA, four “second-tier” UC programs are basically comparable in rank, clustered with five non-UC programs, for a total of nine programs ranked at 27, 28, or 31. In addition to its overall ranking, the UC Davis sociology program has been ranked at or near the top ten programs in certain subdisciplinary areas evaluated by USN&WR. At various times during the past decade, it has been among the top ten programs nationally in both economic sociology and historical sociology, and currently it is ranked 10 in sex and gender.

According to the 1998 USN&WR survey, after UC Davis Sociology faculty size increased dramatically, from 13 to 18 in 1989, the program’s ranking increased substantially, to 28th. Since 1998, the program has lost faculty at the senior ranks, either through retirements or because faculty were recruited away by other programs, while recruitment into the department has only occurred at the junior level. At the same time, there has been a substantial increase in undergraduate sociology majors. And during the same period, other UC Sociology departments – for example, at UC Irvine – have increased their faculty numbers. Thus, the UC Davis sociology program has faced increasing resource constraints in the past decade, and during that period, it has slipped, but only slightly, in its USN national ranking.

The reasons for the position of the Davis program – or any other – are partly structural. A study on rankings of sociology programs (Baldi 1997) identifies program age and size as the most significant factors shaping a program’s ranking. Concerning age, the second-tier UC campuses are certainly the youngest among top-ranked programs. Concerning size, an analysis of the USN&WR rankings in relation to American Sociological Association (2009) data on graduate programs shows two broad types of programs that are highly ranked (20th or higher) versus those ranked 25th to 39th:

1. programs at private universities that tend to have lower undergraduate teaching loads which permit somewhat smaller faculties to give more emphasis to research and graduate training;
2. programs at public universities that have relatively larger faculties and relatively lower numbers of undergraduate majors than comparable lower-ranked public-university programs (see table 3).

Not surprisingly, the most strategic way to build excellence and reputation is to engage in well planned and effective recruitment to increase the size of a program’s faculty in a way that coherently builds on and develops strengths.

---

26 Because of ties, the UC Davis ranking of 31 is the next highest after 28.
27 Five programs were tied at 20; two programs were tied at 39.
The UC Davis program today is strikingly highly ranked, relative to its minimal gain in faculty size over the past decade and its extraordinary increase in undergraduate program responsibilities. Among public-university programs ranked by USN&WR, Davis ranks 25th in faculty size, and is tied for 19th in ranking. No program among the top 20 has a higher ratio of undergraduate majors to faculty than UC Davis, and UC Davis has the 6th largest number of undergraduate majors of all programs ranked higher than 40th in the USN&WR rankings – public or private.28

Table 3. ASA graduate program data by USN&WR ranking (tied rankings yield 24 programs ranking 20 or higher; # of Ph.D.s listed for 2-year period to correct for yearly variation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Programs</th>
<th># Core Faculty</th>
<th># Ph.D.s 2006-8</th>
<th># Undergrad Degrees, 2007-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 ranked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 ranked</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>208.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 ranked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>239.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis (31st)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, UC Davis Sociology is more highly ranked than would be predicted on the basis of a structural analysis alone. Even under conditions constrained by operating a successful and growing undergraduate program, it has managed to hold on to the gains in ranking initially made possible by its quantum growth in 1989-1990.

Summary and Conclusions

The UC Davis Sociology program remained relatively small up through the end of the 1980s. After its dramatic increase in size in 1989-1990, the program gained significantly in its national rankings. Over the decade since the Lindert report, departmental faculty size did not grow substantially, most significantly, in comparison to dramatic increases in number of undergraduate majors and credit units taught. The department has sustained its ranking relative to a comparison group of sociology programs, but it has done so under conditions of increasing strain. These circumstances will have to be addressed in order for Sociology at UC Davis to maintain, much less advance, its present position as a competitively ranked center of sociological excellence.

Like other programs in the Division of Social Sciences, the Department of Sociology faces the challenge of a highly restricted and uncertain resource environment. An additional challenge concerns maintaining and developing the strengths and national stature of the department in a period of significant generational transition that is the result of faculty “raiding” by other universities and retirements over the past decade and in the immediate future. The combination of hires in recent years entirely at the assistant professor level and

28 Only two programs ranked equal or higher than UC Davis have more undergraduate majors per faculty member than Davis – UC Santa Barbara and Rutgers – and both of these programs have significantly larger numbers of affiliated, joint, and emeriti faculty who take part in graduate education.
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the loss of key mid-career faculty has created a strikingly young faculty. No department can expect substantial growth. However, strategic hiring decisions will have to be made. For Sociology, the pivotal action needed now is an infusion of scholarly leadership through one or more associate and full professor hires, possibly of a chair, to capitalize on and consolidate emergent synergies and areas of excellence in the face of ever increasing undergraduate curriculum demands (Mohr 2011).
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Appendices
Appendix A. Ideas for a Social Network Analysis Center (SNAC)

1. Introduction

This document lays out the vision for and planned scope of a Social Network Analysis Center (SNAC), which the Social Sciences Advisory Council considers worthy of further consideration. The proposal for this center stems from the reality of a significant community of scholars doing path-breaking research in network sciences at UC Davis. There is also a concentration of interdisciplinary collaboration—across the social sciences and in the physical, biological, and health sciences—among scholars working on networks. The Council believes that the SNAC will provide a logistical infrastructure and serve as an interdisciplinary hub for research and teaching on what Duncan Watts, author of *Six Degrees: The Science of a Connected Age* (W.W. Norton, 2003), called “the science of the 21st century.”

The following sections lay out the background for this initiative, a vision of the center, the rationale for making it a pivotal aspect of a new Social Sciences initiative, and the logic of placing such a center in the Division of Social Sciences. They also outline ideas about the scope of the center, its structure, the proposed range of its activities, and its expected contributions to the university in general and to the division in particular.

2. Background

Network science is the systematic study of the emergence, evolution, and structure of relationships and interactions among biological, physical, social, and ideational units. It has become a central focus of research across a wide range of disciplines. The concepts, methods, and substantive insights generated over the last two decades by this science have spanned virtually all of the social sciences, the biological sciences, the physical sciences (including the more applied fields such as engineering), computer science, and even some of the humanities (examples include philosophical analyses of the mathematical characterization of networks, philosophical and psychological analyses of cognitive, semantic, and underlying neural networks, and studies of Shakespeare’s plays, works by Russian dramatists, and Beethoven’s symphonies). In contrast to many other interdisciplinary undertakings in the sciences and humanities, social scientists interested in networks have played a leading role by developing and applying social science methods and approaches, as well as social science data.

Some of the work of UCD scholars in this field illustrates the breadth and depth of research on networks. A partial list of social science faculty working on networks includes scholars in Sociology (Diane Felmlee, Bob Faris), Anthropology (Mark Grote, Richard McElreath), Communication (George Barnett), Economics (Robert Feenstra, Burkhart Schipper), Philosophy (Elaine Landry, Aldo Antonelli, David Copp, Marina Oshana, Bernard Molyneux) and Political Science (Bob Huckfeldt, Zeev Maoz, Stephen Haptonsthal). Over the past few years, a group of scholars spanning different disciplines have met and jointly applied for extramural grants exploring central questions in network science. These include people from computer science (Norman Matloff, Felix Wu, Raissa D’Souza), Engineering (Chen-Chee Chua), Public Health (Laurel Beckett), and Environmental Science and Policy (Mark Lubell, Pete Richerson, Alan Hastings). The organizational center of this
interdisciplinary activity has been in the social sciences with the generous help of the Institute of Governmental Affairs (IGA).

Networks are also central to the study of innovation and scientific collaboration, as evident in UCD’s Science and Technology Studies Program (Mario Biagioli, Tim Choy, Joe Dumit, and affiliated faculty). Following the widespread adoption of Actor-Network Theory (ANT), the field’s methodology has shifted from older group- or community-based models to networks of human and non-human agents. Network-based models have proven very effective at bringing together social and epistemic questions thanks to their ability to describe both the social behavior of scientists and engineers and the production of new concepts and objects. At the empirical level, networks are uniquely suitable for describing specific dimensions of the contemporary technosciences, as shown by the wealth of data provided, for instance, by the ISI “Web of Knowledge” platform. Phenomena of interest include: cyberinfrastructure and open source collaborations; citation patterns in scientific literature and patent applications; “invisible colleges”; the development of standards; university-industry relations; patterns of mobility, funding, and training; the settling of scientific disputes; the dynamics of the publication system and peer review. Networks are also a standard tool in the study of historical science and technology, from webs of patronage, correspondence, and communication to exploration and growth of the international structure of science.

Several UCD social scientists have obtained joint interdisciplinary grants that have generated important research on networks. Other researchers have produced research that has attracted a wide range of media attention (see, for example, the work of Diane Felmlee and Bob Faris on bullying in the American Sociological Review and the attention it received). Still other scholars have become leading authorities in their respective disciplines through their pioneering use of network analytic methods to study substantive questions (e.g., Bob Huckfeldt in political science, Mark Lubell in public policy, Alan Hastings and Pete Richerson in cultural evolution, George Barnett in communication).

In the course of this work, a number of important datasets on social (e.g., adolescent, friendship, romantic), computer (Facebook contacts, citations), political (snowball voting surveys, alliance, conflict, international trade, international organizations, cross-national culture), communication (telephone, mail, media), and evolutionary networks have been generated. The current interest of scholars requires the collection of additional datasets that would help answer central questions about the formation, evolution, structure of, and interrelations among, different networks.

These exciting developments suggest three basic points about the need for a center for the study of networks at UC Davis.

- Networks science is an increasingly central focus of inquiry across disciplines. UCD scholars have been actively involved and have played an important role in this research.
- There is a flurry of activity and cross-disciplinary coordination and collaboration among UCD researchers interested in the development and application of this science. Social scientists have played a leading role in this enterprise.
- In contrast to other universities that had already invested a great deal in establishing institutions facilitating and supporting this science (e.g., the Center for the Study of Complex Systems at the University of Michigan, the Networks Institute at the VU University of Amsterdam, Center for Complex Networks at Northeastern University, Center for Network Science, Central European University, Center for Complex
Networks and Systems Research at Indiana University), UCD has yet to establish an organizational infrastructure supporting this kind of research and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration on networks.

• The proposed center would contribute to the university’s standing and reputation as an important hub of research and scholarship on networks, and placing the center within the Division of Social Sciences would enhance the standing of the division within the university.

3. Vision

The Social Network Analysis Center will promote research and teaching on social, physical, and biological networks and on the interaction between human and other networks. The center will provide a logistical setting for collaboration among social scientists studying social networks, and between social scientists and physical, biological, environmental, and health scientists, as well as scholars from the humanities. This collaboration will involve joint research, the formation of a graduate group of network studies, and outreach to institutions, government agencies, and corporations whose work requires knowledge about networks, and interaction with network scientists. Given the connectivity of social activities, and the constant interaction between human and biological, ecological, and physical networks, a key aspect of the networks vision is to contribute to a better understanding of networks and cross-network interactions and to help foster improved policies for designing and managing these networks.

The principal objectives of the SNAC include the following:

• Supporting and promoting research on social networks within the various social science departments
• Supporting collaborative research on social networks across the departments in the division
• Supporting collaborative research on social networks between social science scholars and other disciplines within UCD
• Providing support to a future graduate group on networks that would include students from the social sciences, the physical and mathematical sciences, computer sciences and engineering, and the health sciences
• Supporting a central depository of data on social, biological, ecological, and physical networks
• Conducting and promoting policy research and interaction with the policy community and businesses, by applying knowledge on networks to practical problems

4. Potential Contributions of the Center

• To enhance the university’s reputation as a leading center of knowledge on networks
• To provide a central focus for generating revenues via grants, contributions, and collaboration with government agencies, private and public companies, and individual donors
• To contribute to the educational mission of the university through the development of and support for an interdisciplinary graduate group on networks

5. Conclusion
Now is the time to create a vibrant center for the study of networks, taking advantage of strengths already present at UCD and making the Division of Social Sciences and the University more visible in the expanding field of network science.
Appendix B. Ideas for a Center for Decision-Making, Communication, and Uncertainty

Uncertainty is a constant challenge for individuals and groups as they attempt to reach decisions, form judgments, and communicate about a range of issues relating to the investment and allocation of individual and collective resources. Individual and group responses to uncertainty are a primary research focus across the social and policy sciences, and in philosophy as it is configured at UCD. A central component to progress in these areas is basic research in behavioral decision-making, including attitude formation and change, persuasion, and social influence, and the manner in which these individual-level cognitive processes interact with group-level phenomena such as social movements to drive public opinion and behavior. In philosophy, there is work on the mathematical and logical frameworks used to characterize decisions and networks (e.g., graph theory, category theory classical and alternative kinds of logic). There is also philosophical work on moral and ethical decision-making, and on cognitive and semantic processes involved in the mental and linguistic processes involved in decision-making.

The UC Davis faculty includes many scholars who are making fundamental and continuing contributions in these diverse areas, at the levels of theory, basic research, and applications. They are, however, dispersed across units that lie both within and far beyond the Division of Social Sciences. By building a Center dedicated to the decision sciences, we would enhance visibility and communication within and beyond current efforts, yielding a whole that is more than the sum of its constituent parts.

At a substantive level, problems of interest in the program would include: moral and ethical decisions, financial and investment decisions, decision-making regarding health care and education, social and cultural evolution, cooperation in the use of common property and resources, investments in political information, voting and political participation, investments in social and human capital. Decision-making and communication in contexts marked by uncertainty are central to many of society’s most pressing problems, from the dynamics of democratic politics and political participation to effective reform of social security and health care finance. In these and other areas, social scientists across various fields have recognized that uncertainty constrains decision-making and hence has the potential to impede beneficial societal outcomes. It may generate inefficient allocations in markets, lead to ineffective governance, allow for distortion of information by lobbyists, produce breakdowns in political bargaining, impede conflict resolution, and more.

Decision-making and communication in uncertain circumstances are especially relevant to the policy-making process, and its importance is clearly recognized, for example, among environmental scholars. It is widely recognized that environmental policy problems cannot be solved simply through the direct application of a scientific understanding of environmental challenges that gives rise to an obvious policy solution. Actors with vested interests see alternatives in terms of these vested interests, in ways that are often preconscious and automatic. Arguments are conceived on the basis of deeply held beliefs, and hence communication is compromised both by biased patterns of communication and by inherent biases in social cognition and processing.

In these situations, decision-making is imbedded in a process of conflict resolution, and it requires the disentangling of complex and competing issues in complicated policy environments. When resolving conflict among parties, opposing sides attempt to aggregate scientific data to prove themselves right, not to arrive at an objective version of truth.
Research on decision-making and communication has given rise to distinctive theoretical and methodological approaches: the widespread use of experimentation, both in the laboratory and in the field; theories of cognition; theories of communication and cooperation; game theory; network theory; computational methods; general equilibrium theory; decision theory; as well as other individual- and group-based measurement strategies. These approaches are widely and expertly employed across the Division and the campus, and many UC Davis scholars engage in sophisticated research within relevant areas.

At the present time, much of this research activity is scattered across the UC Davis campus, occurring in disciplines as diverse as political science, sociology, economics, psychology, philosophy, environmental sciences, neuroscience, and engineering. Although scholars in each of these disciplines use common methodological approaches to answer questions related to uncertainty, communication, and decision-making, there is currently no institute or center to bring them together. A Center for Decision-Making, Communication, and Uncertainty would create a common place for these scholars to exchange ideas, share findings, collaborate, and engage in dialogues. Such interactions would not only spawn new interdisciplinary collaborations across the campus, but they would also enable scholars to apply for grants and other sources of funding that are dedicated to interdisciplinary research.

Another benefit of creating a Center for Decision-Making, Communication, and Uncertainty is that it would promote the sharing of resources across campus. For example, scholars in psychology, political science, and economics all conduct laboratory experiments with student samples to address questions related to the goals of the center. Currently, all three departments have their own separate subject pools and resources for running experiments. By bringing together scholars from these fields, the center could facilitate the sharing of scarce resources, such as equipment, computer software, and human subjects.

In addition to sharing physical resources, the center would also facilitate the sharing of intellectual resources. For example, a scholar who studies public policy and one who studies networks might both be interested in studying how new public policies spread or diffuse across cities. The public policy scholar would have intimate knowledge of particular policies and where they have been adopted, while the network scientist would have expertise in studying and modeling diffusion. By bringing these scholars together, the center would promote the sharing of these different areas of expertise for a common project. Similarly, the center would promote the sharing of speakers and other invited guests. Currently, individual departments invite their own sets of speakers each year, and these talks are often not advertised beyond an individual department even though they are often of interest to scholars in other departments. Thus, another benefit of the center would be to facilitate the advertising of speakers who have broad appeal, and ideally, it could also host speakers of its own that would be of interdisciplinary interest.

In summary, a Center on Decision-Making, Communication, and Uncertainty would build on rich and vibrant areas of research shared across social science disciplines at UC Davis, at the same time that it would lead to profitable interdisciplinary collaboration with policy scholars in a wide array of policy areas. It would also build on our campus strengths in network sciences and neurosciences –particularly with the proposed Social Network Analysis Center (SNAC) and the existing Center for Mind and Brain.
Appendix C. Draft Proposal for a Center for Environmental Decision-Making

A proposal initiated by the John Muir Institute of the Environment; provided to the Social Sciences Advisory Council in draft form by Professor Monique Borgerhoff-Mulder

There is now a clear consensus among environmental scholars that environmental challenges cannot be solved solely through the scientific understanding of environmental processes. To effectively address environmental challenges and prioritize conservation actions, our scientific understanding must be successfully integrated with the conflicting needs of parties whose economic and personal interests are often at odds. This process of conflict resolution requires disentangling complex and competing issues in very complicated biological, social, and economic environments. When resolving conflict among parties, opposing sides attempt to aggregate scientific data in order to prove themselves ‘right.’ A clear recognition that the problem is one of differing interests allows all parties to agree upon a set of criteria for decision-making that integrates objective environmental information with the social science of conflict resolution focused on differing perspectives.

Numerous models for decision-making under uncertainty, complexity, and conflict exist. These include Structured Decision-Making (Hammond et al., 1999), the Open Standards Framework for Conservation (Conservation Measures Partnership, 2007), Joint Fact Finding (Karl et al., 2007), Six Thinking Hats (de Bono, 1985), Bayesian Decision Analysis (Varis, 1997), Value of Information (Runge, 2011), Failure Analysis (Bhattacharya et al., 2010), Risk Assessment (Burgman et al., 2005), and Evidence-Based Conservation (Sutherland et al., 2004) among others. While numerous ideas are active, there is little clarity on the relative effectiveness of these different models in different contexts and situations.

We propose a Center for Environmental Decision-Making to accomplish the following three objectives for social, biological, and physical environmental scientists on and off campus:

- Develop partnerships around conflict and complex management decisions in an effort to facilitate successful decisions on important environmental problems.
- Engage students in decision-making processes as a learning opportunity for graduate students seeking careers outside academia.
- Use complex environmental decision-making and conflict resolution as a platform to study efficiencies in environmental decision-making.

We describe several frameworks for environmental conflict resolution briefly below.

**Joint Fact Finding**
Joint Fact finding strives to engage diverse and potentially adversarial parties (example: private water users and public agencies in the San Francisco Estuary). Parties collaborate to identify, define, and answer critical policy questions that inform policy development (Karl et al., 2007). For example, parties might agree on an explicit, quantitative research question; data sources that will be explored; analytical methods that will be applied to the data; and thresholds for inferences that might inform policy decisions or actions.

The use of scientific research to inform decision-making is affected by dynamic social and political processes that affect the feasibility and ease of communication among researchers.
and users of research (van Kerkhoff & Lebel, 2006). When these two groups work together to define goals and agendas, the ability of research to inform decisions increases without compromising the authority of decision makers (van Kerkhoff & Lebel, 2006). Iterative shared learning, including joint fact finding, can create knowledge that is scientifically credible, has public legitimacy (i.e., is perceived as unbiased in conduct and attentive to diverse interests or values; Cash et al., 2003), and is relevant to management and policy (Karl et al., 2007).

**Demonstration Project Development**

Developing demonstration projects can better connect research with management. Others have suggested this link is weak because of differing perspectives and lack of interactions between researchers and managers. Explicit documentation of robust demonstration projects may increase success in translating conservation science into practice.

Demonstration can be viewed as a formal process and a logical step in the translation of scientific understanding to end users who are unwilling to risk implementing new approaches without clear information on performance and cost. In this context, “formal” means (1) establishment and, ideally, review by independent experts of explicit performance objectives, metrics, data requirements, success criteria, sampling frame, and cost model, and (2) that results and inferences should be documented in the primary or gray literature.

Demonstration can be defined as the translation of scientific understanding resulting from practical research into metrics of performance and cost of implementation under real-world conditions. Demonstration processes and outcomes rarely have been formalized and documented, especially when a test of a new technology or method has failed (Redford & Taber, 2000; Knight, 2006; Zedler, 2007). Simply illustrating the feasibility of a method (e.g., opening a demonstration forest that provides the public with opportunities to learn about silviculture) does not qualify as demonstration. To evaluate unambiguously the performance of a new technology or method, its proponents must establish a priori metrics for each performance objective, thresholds of success for each metric, data requirements, and a robust scientific design. Results are assessed against the predetermined thresholds. Data on cost of implementation also are gathered to facilitate development of a cost model that includes cost elements such as labor and equipment. If a proposed technology or method is meant to replace an existing approach, then the demonstration project can incorporate a comparison component. If spatial or temporal scaling of a technology or method is of concern, then the demonstration project can be designed specifically to enable scale-dependent extrapolations.

Demonstration provides documented, transparent evidence that determines whether assumptions about environmental phenomena are valid and associated management responses are practical. Demonstration is a convincing mechanism for quantitatively reducing scientific uncertainty. In this context, demonstration enables placement of bounds on the applicability of the performance and cost data, including the transferability of an approach under different environmental conditions. This can help address whether an end user’s site is sufficiently comparable to the demonstration site(s) to enable application. Demonstration quantitatively reduces the perceived risks connected to adoption of a new practice, especially if such practices have regulatory significance, by providing a defensible basis for their adoption. When a method or tool for addressing a specific environmental need or requirement already exists, demonstration allows for objective comparison between approaches and in some cases their costs.
Six Thinking Hats
The key attribute of the ‘six thinking hats’ framework is to allow groups to set aside different kinds of responses to a problem, compartmentalize them, and then discuss them in order. The six thinking hats are: information (white), emotion (red), disapproving judgment (black), affirmation judgment (yellow), creativity (green), and thinking (blue). Sequentially talking through each ‘hat’ encourages each party to see the other side of the problem in each case (encouraging them to participate in helping make the other parties’ case for a potential outcome) and segregating the information phase from the emotional response phase. This allows people to disentangle the interests from the knowledge to move toward use of knowledge to find a resolution that involves compromising on the normative values that are the foundation of the disagreement. Six thinking hats has been used in business management and learning. Very little has been written about its use in environmental resolution.

Strategic Decision Making
The National Conservation Training Center uses the PrOACT framework described in “Smart Choices” (Hammond et al., 1999). PrOACT is: Problem; Objectives; Alternatives; Consequences; Trade-Offs (Uncertainty, Risk Tolerance). This is generally a strategy that has been applied to thinking through difficult choices, not necessarily conflicting choices. The program is basically a structured logical exercise of tabulating lists in order to break down complex problems into essential elements that are more easily resolved.

Open Standards Framework
The Conservation Measures Partnership promotes a structured thinking model for complex decision making that entails creating “results chains” for adaptive management. Results chains are a logical chain of if-then statements: if we apply this treatment, then we expect this outcome. By linking results chains to a conceptual model of goals and objectives, conservationists can isolate the essential elements of a problem and focus on what they think will be the most effective strategies to fulfill project management objectives and monitor for success of actions.

Key Resource People on Campus
Monique Borgerhoff-Mulder. Anthropology. Conservation development programs
Richard McElreath. Anthropology. Game theory; Bounded rationality
Narine Yegiyan. Communication. Information processing and prioritizing
David Rapson. Economics. Industrial organization and energy/environmental economics
Joaquim Silvestre. Economics. Environmental and resource economic theory
Mark Lubell. Environmental Science & Policy. Decision making under uncertainty; network analysis
Michael Springborn. Environmental Science & Policy. Bayesian decision analysis
Jim Sanchirico. Environmental Science & Policy. Value of information
Roberta Millstein. Philosophy. Environmental ethics
David Copp. Philosophy. Cost-benefit analysis in public policy decision-making
Tom Beamish. Sociology. Conflicts over environmental hazards; Local rationalities
Patrick Carroll. Sociology. Water policies and conflicts in the Central Valley
Davis Kyle. Sociology. Immigration and public health
Drew Halfmann. Sociology. Health policy; Social policy; Political sociology
Brady Mattsson. *USGS Western Ecological Research Station*. Structured Decision Making; PrOACT.

**Potential Off-Campus Participants/Partners**
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
- Arizona State University
- Udall Center for Conflict Resolution
- Murray Rudd, University of York, Ecological economics
- Lars Hallstrom, University of Alberta, Rural economics; Sustainable rural communities
- Terre Satterfield, University of British Columbia, Social theories of risk
- Lawrence Susskind, MIT, Urban and environmental planning; Environmental negotiations
- Bill Sutherland, University of Cambridge, Evidence-based conservation

**Contact Information**
An organizational meeting will be held towards the end of spring quarter 2011 to identify additional campus participants and discuss options in seeking funds for an NSF Research Coordination Network (RCN). If you are interested in attending, please contact Mary Brooke McEachern at the John Muir Institute (mbmceachern@ucdavis.edu).

For additional information about the proposed Center for Environmental Decision-Making contact:
- Mark Schwartz (mwschwartz@ucdavis.edu)
- Monique Borgerhoff-Mulder (mborgerhoffmulder@ucdavis.edu)
- Erica Fleishman (efleishman@ucdavis.edu)

**References**
- Sutherland, W.J., A.S.Pullin, P.M. Dolman, and T.M. Knight. 2004. The need for
The Conservation Measures Partnership. 2007. Open Standards for the Practice of
conservation organizations, including The Nature Conservancy, African Wildlife
Environmental Modeling and Software 12: 177-185.
Appendix D. Proposal for a Working Group on Environment and Human Security
Submitted on January 17, 2011, by Professors Tom Beamish and David Kyle

The proposed Working Group on Environment and Human Security (EHS) will advance cross-disciplinary social science research on issues at the intersection of environmental transformations and societal responses, including the cognitive, cultural, and organizational dimensions of human security. The EHS will contribute to the faculty and students in the College of Letters and Sciences by providing a forum and resource that is currently not available to them while also opening up links to overlapping interests both on and off campus through sponsorship of nationally and internationally renowned speakers for campus lectures, panels, and book events, extra-mural fund-raising, UCD and UC-wide partnerships, curriculum development and graduate student support, and research publications.

While rapid global scale environmental transformations pose a direct threat to human societies, our ability to understand their many implications, including challenges and opportunities, is still highly underdeveloped. Part of the reason is that we live in a world where social and ecological systems are woven together in ways that defy conventional disciplinary emphases and programs of study, but that require a topical focus. The bases of life such as predictable climate, clean water, available food, medial care, and energy supplies—and with them human health and security—are intimately tied to rapidly changing environmental conditions. Changing environmental circumstances and their impact on resource availability and in turn social resourcefulness are further linked to issues of political stability, human mobility and resettlement, human rights and social justice, military readiness and national security, and emerging economic opportunities such as the solutions in energy efficiency and sustainability that UCD is a leader in innovating. While a listing of all the connections between environmental change and human security is surely inexhaustible, greater attention to the nexus of changing environmental conditions as both an objective and subjective basis for equally dramatic response and change in human social systems requires greater attention and investigation in the social sciences. By failing to do so, we stand the chance of missing perhaps the critical link and force currently touching every aspect of our lives and one that will continue to transform the lives of future generations as well.

The Working Group on Environment and Human Security we are proposing will seek to promote an interdisciplinary approach to environment-related research and training with special emphasis on the role that environmental transformations play in social, cultural, political, and economic change, mobilization, and conflict. The EHS would also explore how transformations in social life resulting from rapidly changing environmental conditions feed back into and shape subsequent perceptions and uses of the environment. Through our development of the EHS we seek to provide for the social sciences at UCD a timely resource and leadership that does not currently exist, and further seek to enable and enhance potential linkages with related interdisciplinary efforts across the campus including those pursued at the Energy Efficiency Center, Gifford Center for Population Studies, John Muir Institute for the Environment, Global Health Institute’s UCD COE’s of Migration and Health and One Health, IGERT (Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship) REACH (Responding to rapid environmental change), as well as several others that have recently started up related programs or projects such as the Davis Humanities Institute. All of these function largely without the benefit of sustained, state of the art social science as part. That is, while several social science faculty do work with or in (including the authors) some of these existing centers, this only points to the potential for what they could be doing within social sciences and with a broader base of expertise. Many faculty have research agendas in
overlapping areas of population, health, natural disaster, and risk and security, but are only now beginning to consider the “environmental nexus” of their work.

In short, we believe there is already much research and scholarship taking place within the College of Letters and Science relevant to the EHS mission and vision. The proposed research center will leverage faculty, student, and funders interests and resources in ways that will enhance social sciences at UC Davis, including recruitment, retention, and funding, during this time of global social and environmental change touching every community and state in somewhat different ways.

Structure

Because we have ambitions for The Working Group on Environment and Human Security, our agenda would involve an initial and then secondary steps dependent largely on access to resources and be built from several components. We are also modeling some of what we are proposing after the very successful clusters that are associated with the Davis Humanities Institute.

First, as a working group we would initially focus on the following aspects while seeking to institutionalize our efforts:

• Provide a topically focused EHS relevant research cluster for faculty and graduate students so that they can more easily generate intellectual communities across disciplines based on shared interests and thus form dynamic new interdisciplinary research fields.

• Provide a place to meet regularly to critique work and host public events and in so doing serve as a seedbeds for new campus initiatives concerning EHS issues.

• Provide funding for faculty seminars and bring together mixed disciplinary groups to explore timely EHS issues and share EHS-related works in progress.

• Provide a place for hosted EHS-related events and for nationally and internationally renowned speakers to visit campus and give lectures, sit on panels, and stop by for book events and participate in campus forums.

Once we have gotten up and running our hope is to begin to initiate other more ambitious projects related to the EHS working group that would involve it becoming more of a center that working cluster. These could include:

• Sponsoring conferences on topics related to environmental politics

• Providing competitive graduate student fellowships, travel and conference support.

• Making proposals for new faculty positions in EHS -related fields and topical concentrations

• Developing a minor for undergraduates in this field

• Developing a summer institute for graduate students who would like to pursue research and study in overlapping areas of interest with the EHS.
EHS, Important Contributions

• Promote a vibrant and interdisciplinary intellectual community for social scientists across the campus engaged in environmental politics topics;

• Increase linkages between the social sciences, related disciplines, and the natural/physical sciences

• Contribute to multi-disciplinary and collaborative UC Davis “brand” and its current innovation centered approach to contemporary social and environmental problems;

• Deepen active engagement of UC Davis social scientists with state and federal policy makers and media outlets focused on environmental transformation and societal response;

• Enhance opportunities for graduate students’ research mentorship and with it placement in a highly competitive national and global marketplace

• Increase the visibility of UC Davis’s College of Letters and Sciences in a high visibility area of research and problem solving

• Generate increased extramural funding from public programs (e.g., NSF, NIH, HUD) and private foundations (Ford, Kellogg, Robert Woods Johnson, Rockefeller, MacArthur) to support faculty and student research.