

ACADEMIC PLAN 2011-2020

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND CULTURAL STUDIES

Jessie Ann Owens, Dean

Faculty Advisory Committee (2010-2011)

Miroslava Chavez-Garcia (Chicana/Chicano Studies; Ethnic, Gender and Cultural Studies Assembly)

Gail Finney (German, Comparative Literature; Languages/Literature Assembly)

Beth Levy (Music; Graduate Assembly)

Amina Mama (Women and Gender Studies; Dean's appointee)

Christopher Reynolds (Music; Arts Assembly)

Scott Simmon (English; Dean's appointee)

June 30, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. The Evolving Vision of the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies	3
II. Planning Process	4
III. Profile of the Division.....	6
IV. Strategic Goal 1: Align Faculty Resources with Divisional Priorities	10
V. Strategic Goal 2: Enrich Graduate Education	11
VI. Strategic Goal 3: Maintain Excellence in Undergraduate Education.....	15
VII. Looking to the Future	17
Appendix I: Proposed FTE Levels	

I. The Evolving Vision of the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies

The departments, programs, and graduate groups in the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies (HArCS) focus on languages and literatures, social and cultural identities, and the arts. The division provides the foundation for success in the university—where the acquisition of critical and analytical reading and writing skills is at the core of the curriculum—and prepares its graduates for successful careers in education, government, media, law, business and a range of other professions. Together the HArCS programs actively foster our culture’s highest aspirations and prepare students to become literate, articulate, culturally-informed professionals and citizens in an increasingly transnational world.

We are committed to teaching and scholarship in the core humanities disciplines that have long been at the heart of the modern university, and indeed of intellectual pursuits over several millennia, while encouraging the development of exciting, innovative initiatives. As new technologies and global forces reshape the world, it is essential to be at the forefront of change, bringing knowledge of the past to bear on the future.

Because of its mix of departments and programs, its linkages to other divisions and colleges at UC Davis, and its distinctive heritage, HArCS differs in its profile from any comparable division or college in the UC system.

- Its intellectual diversity gives HArCS distinct advantages, reflected recently in large grants from the Mellon Foundation and a number of fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies. The division includes units typically found in social science divisions, including the ethnic studies departments, Women and Gender Studies, and Religious Studies. These units are genuinely interdisciplinary, with faculty from the interpretive social sciences as well as from the humanities. It is telling that the UC Davis Humanities Institute (DHI) uses a broad definition of humanities that includes the interpretive social sciences, and that the DHI enjoys support not only from the HArCS Dean’s Office but also from Division of Social Sciences (DSS).
- HArCS is deliberately constructed to engage in the public mission of a major land grant university, tackling the large questions for which UC Davis is known—notably about energy, health, food, and socio-cultural issues. We engage in “public” humanities through such programs as the Art of Regional Change and the NEH-funded Civility Project. Other manifestations of these outreach efforts include our museums, and the large audiences for productions of the Departments of Music and of Theatre and Dance (the UCTV video of Carl Orff’s *Carmina Burana* now has over 5 million views).
- The division is also intensely engaged with our region and with California’s unique cultural range, responding to the demographics of our student body and celebrating its extraordinary diversity. We engage these issues not only through the diasporas that have brought so many cultures to California but

also through understanding the cultures of origin. Our work addresses present-day issues confronting society—such as through the well-funded, high-impact social programs housed in Chicana/Chicano Studies—but it also is deeply concerned with historical context. Through study of languages we contribute to the urgent campus priority encompassed by the term “internationalization.” HARCS also plays a critical role in providing general education courses, offering multiple literacies such as Writing Experience, Visual Literacy, World Cultures, and Domestic Diversity.

These distinctive and exemplary features of HARCS reinforce its significance for the campus mission as articulated in *UC Davis: A Vision of Excellence*—the framework that has shaped priorities articulated in our strategic plan.

In the current financial environment, it is crucial for the success of our vision to take a hard look at priorities and to align our goals with available resources. Our principal goal is to maintain the highest quality of education to prepare both undergraduate and graduate students for successful careers as future leaders in California and beyond. Closely allied is the goal of fostering innovative and influential scholarship across a range of disciplines.

Our overall priorities are simply stated: to align faculty resources in a way that best advances education and scholarship; to enhance the graduate education that is at the heart of the research university mission; and to strengthen the liberal education that we provide for undergraduates not only in the College of Letters and Science but across the university.

II. Planning Process

The widespread fiscal upheavals that began in 2008 rendered many of the assumptions and aspirations of our 2008 strategic plan moot: from planning for an 8 percent growth in faculty, the division needed to reduce the size of the faculty by 12 percent (27.5 FTE, for a total of \$2.8 million), and to make additional base budget reductions from 2008-2009 to 2010-2011 of almost \$1.6 million, resulting in a 16% overall reduction in the staff and operating budget. These cuts took place at a time when enrollments continued to increase. During this period UC Davis and the UC system also faced the challenge of significant changes in leadership (since 2006, four provosts, two chancellors and two system-wide presidents).

The arrival of Chancellor Katehi in August 2009 inaugurated a new phase in campus planning, and a bold set of aspirations. Chancellor Katehi led the development of a vision statement, *UC Davis: A Vision of Excellence*, which provides a framework within which every school, college and division could develop its own strategic plan.

The plan for HARCS was the principal activity of the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) in 2010-2011. The FAC consists of six members of the Academic Senate; four were

elected by the four assemblies—the informal working groups consisting of the chairs of the Arts; Ethnic, Gender and Cultural Studies (Hart Hall); the Language and Literature departments; and the graduate advisors (Graduate Assembly)—and two were appointed by Dean Owens. The FAC is broadly representative of the division as a whole.

The FAC followed a multi-step process in engaging the HArCS faculty, and especially the chairs and directors, in the process. Given the difficulty of establishing a single set of metrics that would be appropriate across a division as complex and diverse as HArCS, the FAC decided to work with both qualitative and quantitative measures. Working together, the FAC and Dean Owens provided to chairs and directors a preliminary set of workload data in December 2010 and requested responses to it as well as narrative statements about the distinctive features and strengths of each department (January 2011).¹ In light of the comments on the data, we developed additional ways of analyzing student demand and faculty workload. In response to the eloquent statements by the chairs as well as our own sense of how the strengths of the division fit within *A Vision of Excellence*, we decided on four priorities that would guide decisions about the future shape of the division as it moved from its high of 208 filled FTE in 2009 to the new level of 189 FTE.

In March 2011 we presented in schematic form an outline of the priorities, together with a preliminary list of FTE “targets.”² We invited commentary on the priorities and the proposed FTE and requested that each department submit a departmental plan by the end of April. The responses as well as the departmental plans informed the crafting of the strategic plan. Critical to the shaping of the final product was the list of challenging questions posed by the provost in his letter of April 8, 2011, discussed with the HArCS chairs.

The Academic Plan was presented in draft form to the chairs and directors in early June, and then circulated to the entire HArCS faculty for comment.

Strategic planning is never easy, but it is particularly difficult in a time of downsizing, when many departments will lose positions. We have used a process that is as transparent and iterative as possible, with three phases of consultation between December and June. In addition, Dean Owens met monthly with chairs and directors, and with each chair individually in December and March, as well as with groups of chairs and graduate advisors, and with faculty in an open forum. All of the documents have been circulated by email and posted on the division’s SharePoint site.

¹ “Strategic Planning: Next Steps,” email to HArCS chairs/directors, December 12, 2010 (<http://sharepoint.ls.ucdavis.edu/harcs/Pages/default.aspx>). All of the documents referred to in this report can be found at this site.

² “Strategic Planning: A Framework,” email to HArCS faculty March 16, 2011. Although the term “target” was explained as a kind of “floor,” it nonetheless continued to be problematic; we have instead adopted the term “level” for this plan.

One lesson learned from this process is that the more that data are used, the more that data themselves can become a locus of contention. We recommend that the Dean's Office work with the 2011-2012 Faculty Advisory Committee and/or Budget Advisory Committee to develop a mutually agreed-upon set of "key performance indicators," perhaps similar to the ones used effectively at the University of Michigan, to help guide future decisions about FTE allocation.³

III. Profile of the Division

Academic units

HArCS consists of twelve departments and eight FTE-bearing programs, organized in three main sections.

Arts

- Department of Art and Art History (M.F.A. in Studio, M.A. in Art History)⁴
- Cinema and Technocultural Studies Program (a consolidation of Technocultural Studies and Film Studies)
- Design Program, departmental status pending (M.F.A. in Design)
- Department of Music (M.A. and Ph.D. in ethnomusicology, musicology and composition; M.A. in conducting)
- Department of Theatre and Dance (M.F.A. in Dramatic Art).

Languages and Literature

- Classics Program, pending Senate approval (Latin, Greek; with oversight also of Arabic, Hebrew, Hindi-Urdu languages)
- Department of Comparative Literature (M.A. and Ph.D. in Comparative Literature)
- Department of East Asian Languages and Culture (Chinese and Japanese)
- Department of English (M.A. in Creative Writing, M.A. and Ph.D. in English)
- Department of French and Italian (Ph.D. in French)
- Department of German and Russian (M.A. and Ph.D. in German)
- Religious Studies Program, departmental status pending
- Department of Spanish, which will become Spanish and Portuguese, pending Senate approval (M.A. and Ph.D. in Spanish)
- University Writing Program.

In addition, there are two programs that do not hold FTE: Medieval and Early Modern Studies and the Humanities Program.

³ This effort can be coordinated with the "dashboard" initiative currently under way in the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA). Measuring trends against relevant benchmarks is not a simple task in a division as varied as is HArCS in the kinds of instruction it offers.

⁴ Art History proposes to merge with Art Studio, thus returning to the senate-approved structure of a single department.

Ethnic, Gender and Cultural Studies

- African American and African Studies Program
- American Studies Program
- Department of Asian American Studies
- Department of Chicana/Chicano Studies
- Department of Native American Studies (M.A and Ph.D. in Native American Studies)
- Women and Gender Studies Program.

Three HARCS-based graduate groups draw faculty from across and beyond the division:

- Ph.D. Graduate Group in The Study of Religion, approval expected 2011
- Ph.D. Graduate Group in Cultural Studies
- Ph.D. Graduate Group in Performance Studies.

In addition, our faculty participate in the

- Ph.D. Graduate Group in Linguistics
- Ph.D. Graduate Group in Education, among others.

The past decade has seen several noteworthy changes in academic structures, and consequently in the composition of the faculty:

- Religious Studies has been transformed into a substantial program devoted to the critical study of world religions and the place of religion in society. The faculty FTE has grown by 167% (3 FTE to 8 FTE) from 2001 to 2011; the program can now sustain a graduate group and is applying for departmental status.
- The University Writing Program (UWP) was created in 2004 and has now successfully filled the 5 FTE authorized by the provost when the program was launched. It has drawn national attention for its quality, no doubt partly attributable to the development of the curriculum by Academic Federation faculty over a number of years. For the fourth consecutive year, UC Davis has been ranked among the 23 colleges and universities cited in 2010 by *U.S. News & World Report* for its emphasis on writing in the disciplines: "These colleges typically make the writing process a priority at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum. Students are encouraged to produce and refine various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines." UC Davis was one of only 12 public institutions receiving this recognition and, with Stanford, one of two in California.⁵ UWP has in addition established a Designated Emphasis in Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies as well as a minor in Expository Writing.

⁵ <http://writing.ucdavis.edu/uc-davis-is-once-again-listed-by-u-s-news-as-one-of-23-best-colleges-writing-in-the-disciplines>.

- The Design Program moved from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences in 2005, bringing with it an allotment of 11 FTE, and has been remaking itself from a professional training program to broad-based program in a liberal arts context; its M.F.A. has been restructured and reopened, and its departmental status is pending senate approval.
- Technocultural Studies, a unit devoted to the production and study of digital arts and media in their cultural context, was formed in 2004 as an interdepartmental program; effective July 1, 2011 it will merge with Film Studies to form a new program: Cinema and Technocultural Studies.
- Languages: The decision to add faculty in applied linguistics to all foreign language departments has improved language instruction and contributed to a vital Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition and the graduate group (Ph.D.) in Linguistics. Three languages were recently added (Arabic, Hindi/Urdu and Portuguese). In addition, Quechua is taught in Native American Studies, bringing the total number to 14. Students also do independent study in dozens of Native American languages.⁶

In the past several years, three programs achieved departmental status (Asian American Studies, Chicana/Chicano Studies and Comparative Literature), with two more pending (Design and Religious Studies). HARCS remains unusual in the UC Davis context for its large number of FTE-bearing interdepartmental programs: African American and African Studies, American Studies, Classics (pending approval), University Writing Program, Women and Gender Studies, and the newly formed Cinema and Technocultural Studies. In terms of administration and budget, programs function like departments; the program committees need to be approved annually by the Letters and Science Executive Committee.

Faculty Profile

As of July 1, 2011, HARCS will have approximately 190.10 filled FTE.⁷ 54.5 or 28.7% are in the Arts; 44.1 or 23.2% are in Ethnic, Gender and Cultural Studies; and 91.5 or 48.1% are in Languages and Literature (including Religious Studies). These percentages have remained virtually unchanged since 2001.

An analysis of filled FTE⁸ shows rapid growth during the period 2001 to 2009 as the new FTEs allocated to the division were filled; at its largest, the division had 207.6 FTE,

⁶ During 2010-2011 there were 4 students working together regularly on Cherokee, and 3 meeting twice a week learning Navajo. In NAS 107, the undergraduate course in which each student works on a language of his/her choice, there were 14 students studying 11 different languages: Ho-chunk, Cherokee (2 students), Lakota (2 students), Nahuatl, Hawaiian, Navajo, Sekseka (language of the Blackfeet), Quechua, Central Pomo, Mutsun (2 students), Shasta.

⁷ This figure includes retirements through October 2011.

⁸ We use adjusted figures instead of the campus staffing list, which can be inaccurate.

a growth of 36%. Since 2009, the number of faculty has been decreasing to meet the reduction in FTE assigned by the campus, primarily by not replacing retirements.

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Filled											
FTE	152.6	158.6	181.5	190.7	191.7	195.7	197.7	199.3	207.6	199.6	190.1

For the first half of the decade beginning in 2001 there was a large number of hires each year (2001: 9, 2002: 10; 2003: 22; 2004: 20; 2005: 10; 2006: 13; 2007: 11; 2008: 15).⁹ From the beginning of the economic crisis, hiring slowed markedly: 2009: 8; 2010: 5; 2011: 3. The consequence of the earlier pattern of growth and recruitment is a substantially new faculty: of the total of 203 faculty (headcount¹⁰), 64 were recruited before 2000, 139 (or 68%) since 2000. In keeping with national trends, many of these new recruits work across disciplines. Nearly all were the top choice in rigorous recruitment processes.

The division is committed to hiring a diverse group of faculty in all departments. While we represent only 17.5% of the general campus Senate Faculty (excludes professional schools), our faculty make up 50% of African American faculty, 33% of /Latino faculty, and 71% of Native American faculty. Twenty-nine percent of our faculty are listed as underrepresented, as opposed to 16% for the general campus units.¹¹ Of our 49 recruitments between 2006 and 2011, almost 38% of our hires were from underrepresented groups, and 49% were women.¹² The current breakdown by gender is 97 males, 106 females.

Although it is harder to quantify, the increasing quality of the faculty is nonetheless readily apparent. This is due partly to the large number of recruitments—both senior and junior—in a time when large numbers of highly qualified Ph.D.s are seeking academic positions, but also to deliberate divisional policies to support research (an in-residence teaching policy, a generous fellowship “top-off” policy, publication subventions). Faculty are receiving prestigious national fellowships, including from the American Council of Learned Societies, National Endowment for the Humanities,

⁹ These numbers count faculty recruited in that year who are still at UC Davis. From 2006 until the present, 19 faculty resigned, many of them for positions at other highly-ranked AAU institutions, including Brown, Cornell, UC Berkeley, NYU, Stanford and the University of Virginia.

¹⁰ This number reflects the count of actual individuals with faculty appointments, including those on 100% administrative appointments. Because of partial appointments, headcount is larger than total FTE.

¹¹ 2009-2010 data are taken from

http://occr.ucdavis.edu/resources/Affirmative_Action_Personnel_Program_Plan.pdf

¹² These figures are supplied by the Office of the Vice Provost. It is important, when viewing figures such as these, to recognize the increasing number of candidates who decline to answer surveys. In one search in 2007-2008, two African-American finalists were interviewed but the official records based on candidate surveys show no African-Americans among the finalists.

National Humanities Center, and Guggenheim, as well as the Mellon New Directions Fellowship and the MacArthur “genius” award.¹³

IV. Strategic Goal 1: Align Faculty Resources with Divisional Priorities

The need to complete the task of cutting 12% of the faculty has required us to examine how we distribute faculty resources (FTE) across the various departments. We were guided in these decisions by the four main priorities that guide this entire plan and that are based both on the distinctive features of our faculty and the overall campus vision:

- Excellence of the faculty, measured through productivity and distinctions such as grants, fellowships, honors and teaching awards
- Student demand, measured through growth in numbers of majors, minors and degrees awarded, as well as Student Credit Hours (SCH)
- The land-grant mission of UC Davis, which can include the rich array of cultures in our region, the aspiration to increase cross-campus collaborations, and the goal of enhancing transnational perspectives
- The goal of continuing to enhance graduate education while maintaining our historic strengths in undergraduate education.

A core principle of our work on this plan is that cuts should not be across the board but instead be strategic, responding to these priorities. As a consequence, some units have relatively smaller reductions, while others have received significant reductions. See Appendix I, Proposed FTE Levels.

The main challenge we faced was how to help the division *as a whole* to function, and indeed function well, with so significant a reduction in FTE. We were guided in part by trying to identify areas where FTE could be reduced without undercutting the division as a whole.

We recommend reductions in FTE in Comparative Literature and in American Studies out of a conviction that in their different ways each unit can accomplish its goals by drawing on faculty strength across the division. We recognize that Comparative Literature and American Studies are each distinct academic disciplines, with their own methodologies, training and modes of communication (e.g., learned societies, journals, etc.). But we also recognize in both areas, as well as in programs like Women and Gender Studies and the newly formed Cinema and Technocultural Studies, the possibility of joint appointments.¹⁴ Indeed, a feature of all of these programs is their capacity for collaboration.

¹³ It would be foolish to put too much stock in the year-to-year numbers of national fellowships and residencies, given their extremely competitive nature. Still, from an average of two per year between 2003 and 2006, the number has increased significantly, to an average of nine per year.

¹⁴ American Studies at UC Davis is an interdepartmental program, governed in accordance with College Bylaws by a program committee appointed annually by the L&S Executive Committee; the program committee typically consists exclusively of faculty with appointments in American Studies. Comparative

We also recommend reducing the size of the M.F.A. program in Dramatic Art and as a consequence reducing the FTE in Theatre and Dance, as discussed below in relation to graduate education (section V).

One challenge of managing FTE in an increasingly “post-disciplinary” world in a university that is still primarily organized around departments—which need not be co-terminous with disciplines—is to take advantage of opportunities for flexibility, and to recognize and celebrate the increasing fluidity of academic fields. We see in Cinema and Technocultural Studies, for example, an opportunity to develop new areas of strength by “rescrambling” the pieces and the connections among faculty.

We do not take these difficult reductions lightly, but have weighed them against an option that finally seems even less desirable: making all of HArCS departments and programs weaker. In the future, when growth again becomes possible, all of these decisions will be revisited.

V. Strategic Goal 2: Enrich Graduate Education

Graduate Education in HArCS

One way to understand the history of past resource allocations and priorities at UC Davis is to note that, sixty years after the founding of the College of Letters and Sciences, many of the departments and programs in Humanities and Cultural Studies still do not offer the Ph.D.: Chinese, Classics (Latin and Greek), Italian, Japanese and Russian; African American and African Studies, American Studies, Asian American Studies, Chicana/Chicano Studies and Women and Gender Studies; and Art History. Among the ethnic and interdisciplinary studies programs, only Native American Studies has a Ph.D. program.

In the creative arts, only Music has a Ph.D. program, while Art History offers only the M.A.¹⁵ All of the “applied” programs offer a terminal degree appropriate to their fields: M.F.A.s are offered in Design, Dramatic Art, and Art Studio; the M.A. is offered in Creative Writing.

Given this configuration of programs in the division, it is no surprise that there are fewer graduate students in HArCS (by percentage of total student enrollments) than elsewhere in humanities divisions in the UC system. UC Davis has the lowest percentage of Ph.D. students in Fine Arts and Humanities (9.4% compared to 13.1%

Literature, which recently changed from program to department status, is governed by senate faculty with appointments in Comparative Literature. In HArCS, departments and programs are treated the same in terms of budget and staffing.

¹⁵It may be possible at some point in the future to rethink the existing master’s program in conjunction with the UC Davis Museum of Art, for example, with a focus on curatorial studies, museum studies or conservation.

system-wide average). This is partly due to our small number of graduate programs overall, but an even more significant issue is the lack of funding comparable to peer institutions, described below.

The particular distribution of graduate programs in HArCS makes finding ways for all HArCS faculty to participate in graduate education a challenge. Some of the language faculty who work in languages without doctoral programs participate through the Comparative Literature Ph.D. program, if their training qualifies them as comparatists; this promising avenue might well be expanded. Others participate in the two division-based graduate groups, Cultural Studies and Performance Studies, or in the graduate groups in Linguistics (Division of Social Sciences) and Education (School of Education).

Still others are involved with designated emphases (DE), described by the Office of Graduate Studies as “a specialization that might include a new method of inquiry or an important field of application which is related to two or more existing Ph.D. programs.” A distinctive feature of graduate education in HArCS is the large number of designated emphases, which are offered in African American and African Studies; Classics and the Classical Tradition; Critical Theory; Feminist Theory and Research; Native American Studies; Second Language Acquisition; Studies in Performance and Practice; and Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies. More than half of the active DEs on campus are in HArCS, including two of the three largest (Critical Theory and Feminist Theory and Research).

These designated emphases confer benefits to faculty as well as to students. For example, the DE in Classics and Classical Reception allows Classics, which does not offer an advanced degree, to train graduate students in Greek and Latin, teach a graduate seminar (CLA 200A, now offered nearly every year), serve on exam committees, and direct dissertation research. (Classics also offers a post-baccalaureate program to prepare students for doctoral programs.) To cite a second example, the DE in Writing, Rhetoric and Composition Studies has attracted students not only from HArCS but also from DSS and SOE. Each of the DEs makes a distinctive contribution.

With the dual goals of allowing faculty across the division to engage in graduate education and putting UC Davis at the forefront of national trends toward interdisciplinary and collaborative work, the 2008 Strategic Plan called for the development of one or more Ph.D. graduate groups in the following areas: Religion and Society; Comparative Race Studies; History and Critical Theory of Visual and Media Arts; Performance and Performativity Studies. Program development funding was provided on a competitive basis for faculty to develop these programs. From this group, one is now established, a second is awaiting approval and a third continues to be contemplated (section VII). The departmentally-based Ph.D. program in Performance Studies was reconstituted as a graduate group in 2009. The new graduate group in the Study of Religion is currently awaiting approval and expects to admit its first class in 2013.

The recent NRC rankings, although controversial, give a sense of the standing of our Ph.D. programs included in the study¹⁶:

- Spanish (S-Ranking 1-6 of 60) is the highest ranked program at UC Davis as well as in the UC.
- Performance Studies (S-Ranking 4-16 of 27) is ranked second among the UC.
- Music (S-Ranking 12-28 of 63), ranked for the first time, was third nationally among public universities, behind the much larger programs at UCLA and Indiana, on a par with UC Berkeley and ahead of Stanford.
- Comparative Literature (S-Ranking 14-28 of 46) ranks second among the eight UC programs, behind only UC Berkeley.
- French (S-Ranking 22-34 of 43) ranks third among the four UC programs, on a par with UC Berkeley.¹⁷
- English (S-Ranking 44-75 of 119) ranks in the second quartile in the NRC. It is important to note, however, that the department has essentially remade itself since the years when the data was collected, with 11 new hires. English ranks 26th in the 2010 *US News & World Report* list of best graduate schools.

In terms of other measures of excellence, for example, attractiveness to applicants and selectivity, most of the programs are competitive in terms of admissions, and two programs—Art Studio and Cultural Studies—are routinely among the most selective on campus, admitting about 10% of applicants. Music, NAS and Performance Studies are experiencing significant growth in numbers of applicants.

Graduate Education and Faculty FTE

At present, graduate programs in HARCS face two primary challenges. The first and more recent challenge arises from real and potential reductions in faculty FTE across the division; the second is the long-standing difficulty of maintaining programs competitive with our peer institutions without being able to provide competitive funding.

Graduate students are keenly affected when a faculty member departs and/or a position remains unfilled; reduction in faculty size can be expected to bring with it a decrease in the health and in some cases even the viability of graduate programs, as areas of specialization are weakened or eliminated and graduate seminars become harder to fit into the curriculum. HARCS faculty are already responding to this challenge with great creativity through the graduate groups, innovative cross-listed courses, and a widespread willingness to advise students working substantially outside their particular areas of expertise. Nevertheless, actual FTE cuts and the threat of as yet unrealized reductions are presently an impediment to successful graduate recruitment.

¹⁶The Ph.D. program in German was not included in the NRC rankings because the program had been suspended for two years in the late 1990s and then reinstated; its number of Ph.D.s awarded was below the NRC threshold for review. The NRC did not include either Cultural Studies or Native American Studies among the fields it investigated.

¹⁷ <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/nrc/reports.html>

For these reasons, one of the priorities underlying FTE allocation decisions is the desire to strengthen graduate programs wherever possible, and also to make difficult decisions that may perhaps prove beneficial in the long run.

One such recommendation is to reduce the size of the M.F.A program in Dramatic Art, and as a consequence to reduce the number of FTE in Theatre and Dance. The goal is to encourage the department to continue developing its distinctive strengths as an interdisciplinary M.F.A. program, while maintaining a robust undergraduate A.B. in Theatre and Dance and playing a central role in the cross-divisional Ph.D. Graduate Group in Performance Studies.

Other recommendations concerning levels of FTE are intended to strengthen existing graduate programs in English, French, German, Music and Spanish, as well as the two new or newly reopened programs in Design and Religious Studies.

We also believe that investing an FTE in Chinese may make it possible to begin a Ph.D. program; the importance of growth in this area, as well as in the other “BRIC” languages, can hardly be over-emphasized. The strategy of investing faculty resources in languages with Ph.D. programs should in due course, by careful recruitment and joint appointments, maintain the high profile of Comparative Literature as well.

Indeed, a key to creating clusters of excellence—areas where UC Davis can and has achieved distinction—is to imagine faculty recruitment, wherever possible, not as the responsibility of a single department but rather as an appointment with potential resonance across units. We know that graduate groups such as Cultural Studies and Performance Studies, which do not hold FTE, as well as the designated emphases that are a distinctive feature of HArCS, draw their strength from faculty across and beyond the division. An appointment, thought of in this way, may be able to strengthen areas of high priority, for example, critical theory, gender and sexuality studies, cultural and ethnic studies, post-colonial studies, performance studies, the study of religion, immigration/diasporic studies, California studies, environmental humanities, as well as the late antique world, early modern studies, eighteenth-century studies. (This list, which is not exhaustive, hints at the rich intellectual palette in the division.) Recruitment strategies include possible joint appointments, the crafting of position descriptions to incorporate priorities as possible subfields, and the composition of search committees to include representation from relevant graduate groups/designated emphases.

All of the graduate programs should be assessed periodically, not only to gauge faculty productivity, but also to review performance measures such as selectivity in admissions, time to degree and, above all, the placement record of our graduates.

Graduate Funding

The second major challenge facing HArCS graduate programs involves funding. In comparison to other UC campuses, HArCS graduate students:

- carry the highest debt burden, relying heavily on loans: 37% of HArCS graduate students receive loans with an average loan amount of \$11,500; in 2007 -08, HArCS graduate students received more support in loans (\$1.5 million) than in fellowships (\$1.4 million).
- receive the smallest per capita fellowship support—UC Davis provides less fellowship funding for humanities Ph.D. students than the other UC campuses (only 37% of the system-wide average); other campuses typically provide twice as much university fellowship funding to humanities students as compared to engineering and science graduate students.
- are disproportionately supported by TAs and carry heavier teaching burdens—UC Davis humanities Ph.D.s rely on more support from TAs compared to other campuses (66% of total competitive support is from TAs compared to 49% system wide average).

Despite our award-winning faculty, graduate recruitment is hampered by financial offers that are not competitive with those of comparable institutions. Non-resident tuition continues to be a significant obstacle, eating up an overwhelming percentage of block grant funding while remaining mostly “invisible” to prospective students.

Summer funding is another key area for needed intervention, both in recruitment and in retention. Other schools routinely offer summer funding to prospective students that we cannot match, and increased summer funding for continuing students would allow them to complete their research and writing more quickly and with less debt. Some students use the summer months for research and fieldwork away from UC Davis. Others, however, could benefit from the opportunity to teach during summer sessions; these positions typically attract more potential TAs than current course offerings will support.

The question of multi-year packages is also pressing. Many equally ranked humanities departments offer multi-year packages that free students from teaching during their first year, during a dissertation-writing year, or both. While our students do sometimes achieve this level of funding (through internal and external fellowship competitions), it can rarely be guaranteed during the recruitment process or secured early enough to facilitate the initial stages of independent research.

VI. Strategic Goal 3: Maintain Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Changes that have already begun to accelerate—especially in transfer-student demographics and in the cost of a UC education, alongside the reductions in faculty and staff support—will make maintaining the excellence of undergraduate education a genuine challenge across campus. But nowhere are the challenges greater than in the College of Letters and Science and in the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, which are at the heart of preparing undergraduate students to become literate, articulate, culturally informed citizens and professionals. HArCS is the primary locus for

training in writing, in language instruction, and in the new general education literacies.

All undergraduates fulfill general education requirements, and it is revealing that 24% of all lower-division Student Credit Hours are taught in HArCS, and 21% of the overall SCH (69,452 in 2010-2011). HArCS offers courses in the topical breadth area of “Arts and Humanities” as well as in the new GE literacies. The division’s contributions are particularly strong in “Literacy with Words and Images,” which includes the composition requirement, writing experience, oral skills and visual literacy; and “Civic and Cultural Literacy,” which includes American Cultures, Governance and History, with its domestic diversity requirement, as well as a world cultures requirement.

HArCS provides essential campus-wide instruction in writing and languages. The division is home to the University Writing Program, whose genuinely interdisciplinary mission is to provide lower- and upper-division writing courses tailored to the varying needs of all UC Davis undergraduate departments and programs. Most of its courses have been developed in collaboration with other units. The division is also the primary home of language instruction, a degree requirement for students seeking the A.B. degree in the College of Letters and Science, but also a valuable resource for students across campus.

Campus admissions policies have reduced and then eliminated having slots designated for specific majors and this has resulted in a reduction of students wishing to major in HArCS at the time of admission. Studies of the migration of students from their intended major at the time of matriculation, however, show that many students end up choosing HArCS and DSS majors. That may indicate that better enrollment management—specifically recruiting more students who intend to major in HArCS and DSS—would help the campus avoid the expense of introductory science courses for students who will not persist in majors that require these courses.

Notwithstanding admissions policies, the number of HArCS majors has grown more than the growth in faculty FTE (a 36% increase in HArCS majors between 2001 and 2010 compared to a 31% increase in filled FTE). It should be noted that HArCS majors as measured by the campus can be a misleading number. Many students add HArCS majors as a second major, often in their final year. Given this pattern, using degrees awarded is often more useful to determine actual workload. (For example, in 2009-2010, HArCS majors represented 11.3% of the total majors, but HArCS had 14.5% of the total undergraduate degrees awarded.)

HArCS also serves the undergraduate population as a whole by providing minors in many departments and programs, including ethnic studies and languages and literature departments. In 2009-2010, there were 509 minors awarded in HArCS programs, many to students from other divisions. It is common for a student to major in one of the science disciplines and minor in writing or ethnic studies or the languages.

The division’s commitment to serving the entire range of UC Davis students is evident in the number of degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities. Of the HArCS degrees

awarded in 2009-2010, 23.1% were earned by underrepresented minorities (URMs). The next closest college/division is DSS with 14.5%.

HArCS is proud of its outsized role in undergraduate education across the campus, but we understand that maintaining this excellence cannot be taken for granted. As student demographics and financial strategies change, we need to plan for increased numbers of transfer students. Between 2008 and 2010 the number of transfer students in the College of Letters and Science increased by over 22%. Still to be fully understood is the impact of this significantly higher number of transfer students on HArCS lower and upper division courses. It is likely that departments will have to rethink the need for large lower division courses. We will also need to make sure that we are addressing the specific needs of non-resident and international students.

HArCS departments and programs routinely address the success of their majors, either through the TPPRC periodic review or through the normal intersection of faculty resources and curriculum. (The curriculum falls under the exclusive purview of the Academic Senate.) However, given the much higher costs of attending UC and the changes in the undergraduate demographics, we must do more than before to help students graduate in four years. Have departments addressed road blocks caused by pre-requisites or added flexibility to major requirements? Is the size of the major and the sequence of courses appropriate? Does advising adequately help students understand how to select courses and plan for their future after UC Davis? How well do we track student satisfaction and assess learning outcomes? It's an increasing ethical responsibility, given rapidly escalating tuition costs, that we make changes that permit undergraduates to complete their education—an undiminished education—in a timely manner.

VII. Looking to the Future

For the past two years, the division has focused on how to make cuts in the faculty, a process made much more difficult because of the unpredictable nature of retirements and resignations. For the first time since the creation of the division in the mid-1990s, we are establishing, and making available, a set of FTE levels. The intent is to help departments plan; departments whose numbers fall below the level will be able to fill the faculty positions, once authorization from the provost is secured.

With these levels, we have satisfied the reductions in FTE imposed on the division. It should be clear, however, that cuts of this order of magnitude have truly had and continue to have negative consequences. It is our hope that the campus, especially as it seeks to increase the number of out-of-state students, will recognize the importance of investing in a division that teaches 21% of all UC Davis undergraduate student FTEs. Furthermore, as the campus seeks to become a “Top Five” public research university, we think it important to recognize that none of the universities ranked higher has a

humanities division as small or under-resourced as ours, no doubt largely due to historical decisions about campus resources.¹⁸

We recognize that future investments cannot simply undo past reductions. We therefore present, in highly schematic form, a series of opportunities for strengthening the division.

1. Arts

- The establishment of the Cinema and Technocultural Studies program, from the consolidation of Film Studies and Technocultural Studies, as well as the renovations planned in Cruess Hall to support film and digital media, provide a major opportunity to reconfigure faculty, curriculum and resources. We hope to create a vibrant program in film history/theory/criticism; digital media; film/documentary/sound practice. Northern California is a leader in digital media creation, but thus far UC Davis has no program that responds to this regional opportunity.
- The campus is part way through a \$10 million renovation of arts facilities. We need to build the long-delayed music recital hall/classroom building and to raise the funds for a new art museum next to the Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts.

2. Ethnic, Gender and Cultural Studies

- We recommend adding FTE, when resources become available, in African and African American Studies, Asian American Studies, Chicana/Chicano Studies, Native American Studies and Women and Gender Studies. Additional faculty resources will address the urgent demographic changes taking place in California, provide support in units with very high student/faculty ratios and help HARCS create a distinctive scholarly profile in the area of critical ethnic, gender and cultural studies. The outreach by many faculty to students from under-served populations creates unusual demands: this is an area where the FTE cuts have proved particularly problematic.
- To pursue excellence in exciting and productive new ways, we propose to launch an Initiative for Critical Race and Gender Studies in Hart Hall. Broadly defined, the Initiative would provide the intellectual space for interested faculty to come together across disciplinary boundaries as well as across ethnic and geographic areas of research to launch new and expand current collaborative research projects. The Initiative builds on the call in our 2008 Strategic Plan for

¹⁸ It is frequently said that HARCS has too many small programs. It is arguable that the main problem is in fact that the programs are too small rather than too many, though no doubt further program consolidation could occur. To cite but one example, compare the size of our Classics faculty (4 senate, 2 lecturers) with the numbers of core faculty at the top five public universities (UC Berkeley 23, UCLA 17, University of Virginia 11, University of Michigan 24, and University of North Carolina 15).

development of a Ph.D. graduate group in Comparative Race Studies, the planning for which has continued over the last few years. The groundwork for the Initiative exists in the form of the Hart Hall-based Designated Emphases in African American and African Studies, Feminist Theory and Research, and Native American Studies. The Initiative would also focus on developing a cross-disciplinary Ph.D. This innovative graduate program would train students as culturally competent experts prepared (intellectually, socially, and politically) to engage with communities to develop solutions for our increasingly diverse society. The Initiative would provide the opportunity for faculty and graduate students to make broader connections across gender and race as well as ethnicity, class, and culture, and to build on the strengths of their differences to generate ideas and products to further the university's larger mission.

The development of any such an initiative would be the responsibility of interested faculty.

3. Languages and Literature

- As part of the larger campus goal of internationalization, as well as to prepare students through the benefits of knowing languages and cultures other than their own, we recommend that the faculty explore structures that will enhance the study of language as a wider “campus good.” In addition to the mission of preparing students to be able to major in languages, we hope that there will be greater outreach across campus to encourage functional literacy that can serve students as they study abroad or in their careers (e.g., medical Spanish or business Chinese or languages for international relations). One goal would be to increase campus resources devoted to language instruction by outreach to students in a variety of majors, including the sizable population of heritage learners.

We recommend that a retreat for language faculty be co-sponsored by the provost and dean to explore possible ways of expanding language instruction.

4. Digital Humanities

- The digital revolution is rapidly transforming the ways in which humanists conduct research, and UC Davis needs to be at the forefront of these changes. With a few notable exceptions, however, the campus has not provided the infrastructure or staffing that would harness the talents of our faculty and students. The funding by Office of Research of the Humanities Innovation Lab (<http://modlab.ucdavis.edu/projects/>) is a good example of the possibilities. As a humanities and arts division on a science-intensive campus, we should be setting the pace nationally.

The ideas suggested here fall well short of a blueprint for the future. It is a source of regret that so much of the work of the 2010-2011 Faculty Advisory Committee has had to be concerned with the reduction in FTE. We are cognizant that this strategic plan is focused on the present and immediate future, leaving only the values it articulates as the basis for a vision going forward. As the campus prepares for the future, the next Faculty Advisory Committee will need to assess the consequences of the current reductions, understand opportunities presented by student interests, and develop focused and effective strategies for innovative growth.

Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies (HArCS)--Filled Faculty FTE														Appendix I
						2001-05						2006-10		Proposed
Unit	7/1/2001	7/1/2002	7/1/2003	7/1/2004	7/1/2005	Average	7/1/2006	7/1/2007	7/1/2008	7/1/2009	7/1/2010	Average	7/1/2011	* Level
African American Studies	5.40	5.40	6.00	5.00	6.00	5.56	5.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.60	7.00	7.00
Art History	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	6.00	7.30	6.00	5.00
American Studies	4.10	4.50	6.50	6.00	5.00	5.22	7.00	7.50	7.50	6.50	7.50	7.20	7.50	4.50
Asian American Studies	4.80	5.40	8.40	8.40	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.50	6.50	6.50	6.00	6.90	8.00	7.00
Art Studio	12.00	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.20	12.00	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.20	11.00	10.00
Chicano/a Studies	6.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	7.60	7.00	8.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	6.80	8.00	9.00
Chinese	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.60	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Classics	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
Comparative Literature	4.30	5.80	7.50	7.50	7.50	6.52	7.50	8.00	8.00	8.50	7.50	7.90	8.50	6.50
Design **	8.30	8.30	8.30	8.30	8.30	8.30	8.85	7.15	10.40	10.20	10.70	9.46	10.00	11.00
English	31.85	32.70	37.35	38.35	35.75	35.20	36.75	36.75	38.25	39.25	36.25	37.45	34.00	36.00
French	6.10	6.60	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.54	7.00	7.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.60	4.00	6.00
German	6.50	6.50	5.50	5.50	6.50	6.10	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	4.00	6.00
Italian	3.75	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.50	4.05	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.00
Japanese	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.70	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Music	10.00	11.00	12.00	12.00	13.00	11.60	12.00	13.00	13.00	14.00	12.00	12.80	12.00	13.00
Native American Studies	7.40	7.60	5.60	7.60	7.60	7.16	8.60	8.60	7.60	7.60	7.60	8.00	6.60	7.60
Religious Studies	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.50	3.80	4.50	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	7.50	8.00	9.00
Russian	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.80	2.00	2.00
Spanish	11.00	10.00	10.00	13.00	12.50	11.30	13.50	13.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.10	13.50	14.00
TCS	1.00	1.50	2.50	3.00	4.00	2.40	4.50	4.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.10	5.00	4.00
Theatre and Dance	5.87	5.77	12.11	12.51	12.51	9.75	11.51	12.17	12.00	12.00	12.00	11.94	10.50	7.00
UWP						0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.20	5.00	5.00
Women and Gender Studies	6.25	6.25	8.00	9.00	9.00	7.70	9.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	7.60	7.00	7.00
	152.62	158.57	180.01	189.16	191.16	174.30	195.21	197.17	198.75	207.55	198.55	199.45	190.10	189.60
* Includes ongoing searches in Ethnic Studies programs, excludes visiting FTE provisions, and includes projected retirements/transfers from 7/1/11 to 10/31/11.														
** Design transferred from CAES to HArCS in 2005-06, for display purposes years 2001 through 2004 assume the same level of filled FTE as 2005-06 (8.3 FTE).														