

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Jim Chalfant
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: jim.chalfant@ucop.edu

*Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate
Faculty Representative to the Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

December 2, 2016

**AIMÉE DORR
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Approval of Conservation of Material Culture Graduate Program at UC Los Angeles

Dear Aimée:

In accordance with the *Universitywide Review Processes For Academic Programs, Units, and Research Units* (the “Compendium”), and on the recommendation of CCGA, the Academic Council has approved UCLA’s proposal for a graduate program leading to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Conservation of Material Culture.

Because this is a new degree, and the Assembly of the Academic Senate is not meeting within 30 days of CCGA’s approval, Council must approve the program per Senate Bylaw 125.B.7.

I am enclosing CCGA’s report on its review of the new program, and respectfully request that your office complete the process of obtaining the President’s approval.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jim Chalfant".

Jim Chalfant, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Senate Director Baxter
Senate Executive Directors



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)

Kwai Ng, Chair
kwng@mail.ucsd.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

November 14, 2016

PROVOST AIMÉE DORR

Dear Provost Dorr:

At its November 2, 2016 meeting, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted to approve UCLA's proposal for a graduate program leading to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Conservation of Material Culture. This program represents an extension of the existing UCLA Interdisciplinary Masters of Arts in Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic Materials (CAEM).

The main objectives of the proposed M.S./PhD are to train the next generation of multidisciplinary researchers and cross-cultural leaders in sustainable preservation of material culture and to bring innovative cutting-edge methods and holistic research to the conservation profession. It is a unique program within the UC system and in the United States, where only one other Ph.D. program exists in the subject area.

The proposal was first discussed at our May 4, 2016 meeting. Four reviews solicited by CCGA were highly supportive. Reviewers noted the strengths of the proposed program in curriculum, facilities, support, faculty, and placement prospects. A number of concerns were identified. One major concern was about the low number of core faculty of the program. Some reviewers saw the lack of teaching opportunities for graduate students as a weakness. The target of time to degree in four years was also considered too ambitious by reviewers.

In its response, the program explained that the apparent "low" number of FTEs in the Conservation Interdepartmental Degree Program (IDP) was in part a result of its split appointment, given the fact that IDPs in UCLA could not hold full-time employment (FTE) at 100%. But all of the current split-appointment faculty have their primary responsibilities in the Conservation IDP. The IDP has also received assurances from UCLA campus leaders that future FTEs would be made available for recruiting new tenure-track faculty for the program. The response also clarified that core faculty are complemented by nine 0% joint appointments who serve on a Faculty Advisory Board for the IDP and can teach courses and serve on committees. As a result, the total number of individuals serving the IDP is 11, including 9 ladder rank faculty. As for teaching opportunities and the time to degree, the proposal has been amended to require a minimum of one quarter of teaching for students and the normative time-to-degree is now five years.

CCGA believes the proposed Ph.D. in Conservation of Material Culture has been rendered stronger by the process of review and revision. The expert reviewers have confirmed that it meets the criteria for quality and rigor. Other aspects of the proposal also seem to more than satisfy the expectations of reviewers and CCGA members.

As you know, CCGA's approval is the last stop of the Academic Senate side of the Systemwide review and approval process except when the new degree title must be approved by the President, under delegated authority from The Board of Regents. According to the Academic Senate Bylaws, the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or the Academic Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 60 days of CCGA's approval) must approve new degree titles. This program has CCGA's approval and we commend it to you. For your reference, I have enclosed CCGA's final report on this proposal.

Respectfully submitted,



Kwai Ng
Chair, CCGA

cc: Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair
CCGA Members
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst
Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning Analysis Manager
Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst
Linda Mohr, Los Angeles Division Chief Administrative Officer
Susan Cochran, Los Angeles Division Academic Senate Executive Director
Estrella Arciba, Los Angeles Division Academic Senate Analyst

Enclosures: (1)

UC Los Angeles M.S./PhD Conservation of Material Culture IDP: CCGA Final Report

UC Los Angeles proposes a non-terminal M.S./PhD interdisciplinary program in Conservation of Material Culture. This program represents an extension of the existing UCLA Interdisciplinary Masters of Arts in Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic Materials (CAEM), leveraging extensively off of existing course work and participants in the CAEM. The lead contact at UCLA is Professor Ioanna Kakoulli. The main objectives of the proposed M.S./PhD is to train the next generation of multidisciplinary researchers and cross cultural leaders in theoretical and experimental developments and policy of conservation and sustainable preservation of material culture and to bring innovative cutting-edge methods and holistic research to the conservation profession. This type of program would be unique within the UC system and relatively unique in the United States, where only one other PhD program exists in material conservation. The program will include seven focus areas, such as Conservation of Material Culture and Science, Preventative Conservation and Care of Collections and Conservation Philosophy and Ethics, as three examples. Admission requirements include a broad range of science disciplines, a minimum 3.3 GPA for Bachelors and 3.5 for Masters. A minimum of one year of course work is required in four areas, including Archaeology/Anthro/Ethnography, Art History, General Chemistry and Organic Chemistry. An additional 400 hours of research or research-based practice in conservation is also required. Admissions will alternate years, with 3-4 PhD students admitted in odd years (2017, 2019), and five MA annually totaling ~ 16 MA & PhD students at steady state by 2021. A total of 56 units of course work will be required for the PhD, plus an 11 month internship. The revised Time to Degree (TTD) is five years. IDP core faculty consist of three 0.5 FTE ladder rank faculty and two other part time faculty as well as nine 0% appointments from multiple departments. The program will be housed in the Cotsen Center, which currently houses the CAEM. Additional support includes six 25% GSR stipends, block grant from the Graduate Division and additional support from over six million dollars of endowments.

The proposal was first discussed in the May 4, 2016 meeting of the CCGA. Four reviews were ultimately obtained, two from within the UC system, and two outside of the system. Outside reviewers included Professor Nikolaos Zacharias (Chair of Department of History and Cultural Resource Management, University of Peleponnese) and Professor Joyce Hill Stoner (Director of Preservation Studies Doctoral Program, University of Delaware). UC reviewers included Professor Judith Habicht-Mauche (UCSC Anthropology Department and Ceramic Research Laboratory) and Professor Rosemary Joyce (Professor in Archaeology at UC Berkeley and former museum curator). Reviews were obtained and discussed at the October 5, 2016 meeting of the CCGA. UC Los Angeles lead proposer Kakoulii was provided a summary and all four reviews on October 10, 2016. Lead reviewer received a final revised copy of the proposal, plus additional supporting materials on October 31, 2016.

Overall, the reviews were highly supportive. All four reviewers liked the contents of the proposed program, noting strengths in curriculum, facilities, support, faculty and potential for placement. The manner in which course work leverages off of existing courses and the Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic Materials was viewed as a strength. The unique aspects of the PhD in the UC system, and nearly unique aspects within North America were also viewed as strengths. However, a number of reviewers did find minor to moderately significant weaknesses that need to be addressed in any response. Three main areas of weakness were noted:

- 1) Faculty resources and sustainability. Concern was expressed at the low number of core IDP faculty, including one member who appears to lack a PhD and all who have partial appointments. Concern was also expressed about the potential adverse effect of retirements and the challenges associate with obtaining necessary FTE from multiple supporting departments, some of which may not be in the Division of Social Sciences. At least three reviewers noted some weaknesses in this area, with one expressing concern that “*the program may be trying to spread itself a bit thin*” with seven focus areas and the requirement that three IDP faculty serve on each PhD Committee (Suggesting this be reduced to two) (**Habicht-Mauche**). Low core faculty numbers was the primary concern expressed by **Rosemary Joyce**.

Program Response

Low number of IDP faculty

To better address the issue of the apparent low number of ‘core’ faculty we feel we need to explain the structure of the IDP which is rather unique in terms of development as it has not followed the usual ‘ground up’ mechanism based on shared faculty interests from different departments which is common across the UC campuses; rather, it was established as a stand-alone graduate degree Interdepartmental Degree Program (IDP) at UCLA (directly under the Social Science Division) in 2003, through a cooperative effort between the J. Paul Getty Thrust (now J. Paul Getty Foundation) and UCLA following an agreement between the two institutions signed in 2001.

*For the establishment of the Conservation IDP, UCLA and the Division of Social Sciences in particular supported three full time tenure-track faculty appointments. These are held by David A. Scott, Ellen Pearlstein and Ioanna Kakoulli. Given that IDPs cannot hold full time employment (FTE) at 100%, these faculty appointments are **50% split appointments** (with Art History as the Home Department for Scott; Information Studies Dept. for Pearlstein and Materials Science and Engineering Dept. for Kakoulli). While the entire FTEs belong to the Division of Social Sciences, half for each position has been ‘loaned’ to another division or school. Split appointments within an IDP is another unique feature of the Conservation Program as the norm for IDPs at UCLA is to have **joint (not split) appointments at 0%**. As these appointments were made to serve the Conservation IDP (design and delivery of courses, student supervision and mentoring etc.) these faculty members have their primary responsibilities within the IDP. Commitments to their home departments vary per department/division or school and entails: offering of multi-listed courses (with Conservation), specialized courses or seminars, supervision of Master’s and Ph.D. students, service to committees etc. The agreements were made so that the faculty of the IDP would not be overwhelmed by the dual appointment.*

*Due to this structure, the definition ‘core’ faculty of the IDP was given to faculty members with a 50% split appointment in the IDP (**please see bylaws of the IDP, Appendix I** in the proposal). However, the IDP also has a faculty advisory committee (FAC) (for the list of names, please refer to the original proposal, Table 2; page 7) constituted by professors across campus with different expertise, appointed by the Dean of Social Sciences in consultation with the ‘core’ faculty of the IDP. These faculty members are considered as **‘internal’ members of the IDP** thus adding to the IDP’s ‘core’ faculty (**please see Appendix XV** in the revised proposal). The FAC members have the same voting rights as the ‘core’ faculty members (except on personnel*

actions) and can teach, supervise and mentor IDP students, as well as, chair Conservation IDP student committees. Furthermore, 0% visiting faculty (an appointment held by Tharron Bloomfield for two years), non tenure-track faculty appointments in the Professor in Residence Series (an appointment held by Christian Fischer for three years) and a joint appointment split between the Specialist and the Lecturer Series (held by Vanessa Muros) can vote on programmatic matters and provide additional support in teaching, mentoring and supervision of IDP graduate students. Therefore, while the number of the 'core' faculty is small, the IDP consists of a larger number of faculty and academic staff that serve its educational (teaching, research, mentoring, service) needs. Currently the total number of faculty and academic staff members of the IDP is eleven (nine of which are tenured faculty). This excludes academic members of the university that do not have 'formal' affiliation with the IDP, however, who conduct collaborative research with faculty (also involving students of the IDP) and who serve in student thesis' committees (**please see Appendix XVI in the revised proposal** with the names and affiliations of all individuals - including faculty and other professionals - who have served in M.A. Committees as 'regular' or 'additional' members). We also wanted to point out that we are currently pursuing 0% faculty appointments from various departments in different divisions and schools, and we are revising our bylaws, in order to change the definition of 'core' faculty to better reflect the size and faculty involved in the IDP, to include 0% joint faculty appointments (**please see Appendix XVII in the revised proposal** with a list of potential 0% appointments and/or members appointed by the Dean of the Division of Social Sciences (as for example members of the FAC).

Adverse effect of retirements and the challenges associate with obtaining necessary FTE from multiple supporting departments

We agree that recruitment for interdisciplinary fields is always a challenge, especially for positions that need to fill a particular and primary role within an IDP; more so when the appointment is split at 50%. However, we have a very rigorous and enthusiastic group of faculty (including core and FAC members) that are strong advocates within their departments and divisions or schools. At present the following departments and divisions or schools are represented by our members:

<i>Department</i>	<i>Division or School</i>
<i>Art History</i>	<i>Humanities Division, The College</i>
<i>Chemistry</i>	<i>Physical Science Division, The College</i>
<i>Classics</i>	<i>Humanities Division, The College</i>
<i>Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences</i>	<i>Physical Science Division, The College</i>
<i>Information Studies</i>	<i>Graduate School of Education and Information Studies</i>
<i>Materials Science & Engineering</i>	<i>Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences</i>
<i>Near Eastern Languages and Cultures</i>	<i>Humanities Division, The College</i>

Furthermore, through assurances by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost of UCLA, Scott Waugh and the support of the Interim Dean of Social Sciences, Laura Gómez (**please see Appendix XIV in revised proposal**), a 50% appointment to a home department can be made within or outside the Social Sciences Division; if outside the Social Sciences Division, the FTE

will be given as 'loan' to another division/school as currently done for all tenure-track FTE in the IDP. We believe that these actions will support the recruitment of new tenure-track faculty in the Conservation IDP.

Focus areas of IDP & faculty Ph.D. committee constitution

The seven research thrusts or focus areas cover fields that are part of the expertise of the IDP faculty ('core' and 'internal' FAC). Furthermore, these are research thrusts that can benefit from expertise of other faculty from different departments across campus that will provide excellent partnerships for collaborative cross-disciplinary research and co-advising. There is a twofold goal for having different focus areas and not restricting them to one or two: first, it will enable us to recruit the best Ph.D. candidates, as applicants will not be restricted to specific undergraduate fields and second, we will be able to accept students in specific areas that might benefit from external funding, ongoing collaborative projects with museums and other agencies.

As mentioned earlier, our faculty cohort who can server as 'internal' committee members and/or chair a Ph.D. committee consists of eleven members (nine tenured faculty). Furthermore, there is a misunderstanding that three internal members or 'core' faculty members are required for each Ph.D. committee. Our program (for now) has accepted the **Minimum Standards for Doctoral Committee Constitution, Effective 2016 Fall** established by the UCLA Graduate Division and approved by the Graduate Council, which requires "a minimum of four members among whom a minimum of three members must hold current UCLA Academic Senate faculty appointments" and only the "chair always must hold a current Academic Senate faculty appointment at UCLA in the same department or interdepartmental program as the student" (please see *Minimum Standards for doctoral Committees at UCLA, Effective 2016 Fall*:

<https://grad.ucla.edu/ucla/gasaa/doccommitteestandards.pdf>). With a very small Ph.D. cohort of only three students, accepted on a two-year admissions cycle and with only one member of the IDP required to be the chair of the Ph.D. committee, the burden on our faculty is minimal. At the same time, having Ph.D. students in the IDP will support faculty research and promote new interdisciplinary areas and advance research.

- 2) The lack of opportunities for teaching. This was a weakness noted by two reviewers, **Stoner** (UD) and **Joyce** (UCB). **Rosemary Joyce** expressed this most clearly, pointing out that any program that wishes to graduate students to be placed in academia, needs to provide adequate teaching opportunities to make graduates competitive on the job market. She expressed concerns that a lack of teaching opportunities may leave graduates from this program at a disadvantage when seeking jobs in academia.

Response

We consider teaching essential to research and education at a Ph.D. level and we appreciate the contribution of the art of teaching to one's future career not only as an educator but also as a leader. We have made the relevant changes to our proposal indicating that at least one quarter of teaching will be required (please see section 2.4.5; page 17 in revised proposal).

- 3) Several reviewers expressed concern about the four year time to degree (TTD). Five years was considered to be a more reasonable expectation given their experiences. This also raised questions regarding plans to support students when they exceed the four years of support offered.

Response

Concern was expressed that the 4 year TDD was overly optimistic. UCLA responded to adjust the TDD to five years, writing

Normative-Time-To-Degree

Our proposed four-years normative time-to-degree (TTD), aimed to come closer to the European model of three years Ph.D. that is well established in Britain (also in France and other parts of Europe) and to give our program an edge of competitiveness and to attract excellent candidates who would opt to study at a European Institution for the Ph.D. Currently there are quite a few Americans that are enrolled in British and other European Institutions (despite the high costs) to pursue a Ph.D. in Cultural Heritage Conservation. Our proposed mentoring plan with two co-advisors and examination process leading to ATC has been structured in such a way to enable students to focus on their research early on and to have adequate time to complete a rigorous and high level doctorate research and to graduate within four years. However, we do understand the concerns of the reviewers and we have revised our proposal to a five-year TTD and six-year maximum time to degree. We have also confirmed with Assistant Dean of Graduate Division April de Stefano that there is no penalty if students exceed the expected TTD or maximum-time-to-degree and no exceptions are required (pers. comm. Dr. April de Stefano, UCLA Assistant Dean Graduate Division: 10/12/2016). Funding beyond the four years guaranteed support, is addressed in the following paragraphs.

Funding (exceeding four year guaranteed support)

*Our five-year itemized projected budget (please see section 7 and Appendix XI in the proposal) from the starting date of the CMC Ph.D. program (2017) clearly illustrates a robust support system for three CMC Ph.D. students for four years of their studies. **The budget is based on a very conservative assessment of known available funds and resources**; it does not take into consideration soft money from grants that faculty of the program has been successful at obtaining – in the last 10 years the money in research grants brought in by core faculty exceeded \$2,900,000 excluding the \$4M endowed funds raised) – other Ph.D. fellowships the students may be awarded as for example, **the Eugene Cota-Robles, Graduate Research Mentoring, Graduate Summer Research Mentoring, Dissertation Year Fellowships, additional funds for TAships (from other departments), or extra-mural funds from NSF, NEH, and other museum or agencies fellowships** that can support **a fifth year** of studies and also provide additional support over the summer. Furthermore, if Ph.D. students pursue part of their academic research in another academic institution, museum or other agency (outside California) to enable and advance their research, students will be eligible to register **in absentia** (up to 6 quarters= two years). Monetary costs for in absentia are estimated to 15% of the combined Tuition and Student Services Fee. This reduction in tuition fees will give the program additional flexibility to extend funding for a fifth year if needed. Financially, the program is in pretty good shape and offers better packages to both Master's and Ph.D. students than many other departments and IDPs at UCLA. With a small cohort of Ph.D. students (three students every two-year admissions cycle), and the funding opportunities available to Ph.D. students, as well as, faculty grants and extramural research fellowships, we are confident that we can secure the necessary additional support beyond the four-year-guaranteed funding.*

One other area of concern involved the Science pre-requisites in which students will be drawn from diverse academic backgrounds (including arts and humanities), yet may lack adequate course work in science to perform well in the program (**Stoner**: Section 1.7).

Response

Science Prerequisites

UCLA responded clearly to these concerns, reiterating strong science requirements for admission writing

Please refer to our admissions requirements (please see page 11 in the original proposal) indicating that regardless what their bachelor's or master's degree is, qualified candidates should also have academic credit equivalent to one year of general chemistry with lab and one year of organic chemistry with lab (in addition to other pre-requisites upon admission):

Admissions Requirements

Undergraduate preparation for admission and application requirements

In addition to the University's minimum requirements, all applicants are expected to have by the time of admission:

- 1) A Bachelor's degree (B.S. or B.A.) and/or a Master's degree (M.S. or M.A.) preferably in the fields of Conservation, Archaeology, Anthropology, Art History, Chemistry, Materials Science, Physics, Life Sciences, Earth sciences, Visual Arts, Museum Studies, Information Technology and other relevant disciplines with minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.3 for a bachelor's degree (although complete candidates will have GPA over 3.5) and 3.5 for a master's degree;*
- 2) Sufficient academic background (with credit) of a minimum of one academic year (2 semesters or 3 quarters) of study in each of the following areas:*
 - 1. Archaeology, Anthropology, or Ethnography;*
 - 2. Art History (studies in archaeological or indigenous materials and/or traditions preferred);*
 - 3. General Chemistry (with lab);*
 - 4. Organic Chemistry (with lab);*
- 3) A minimum of 400 hours of research or research-based practice in conservation or a conservation related field.*

Whether applicants come from a Humanities/Social Sciences/Arts or STEM background, the admissions requirements including credit equivalent to a minimum of a year of Archaeology/Anthropology or Ethnography, a year of Art History, a year of General Chemistry and a year of Organic Chemistry with laboratories will provide them with a balanced set of skills (drawn from humanistic methodology and scientific inquiry) to successfully pursue a graduate research degree in the interdisciplinary field of material culture studies.

Furthermore, as stated in the original proposal, depending on the research thrust that a student would like to pursue, an undergraduate or master's degree relevant to that focus area will be preferred (please see Table 5, pages 15-16 in revised proposal indicating preferred degrees per research thrust).

Based on my review of the proposed M.S./PhD Conservation of Material Culture, the revised version of the proposal has addressed the main concerns expressed by internal and external reviewers. The most significant concern expressed was the low numbers of core faculty of the IDP and the distribution of FTE across multiple departments, many of which are outside of the Division of Social Sciences. This concern was addressed by clarifying that the FTE supporting the IDP actually originate from Social Sciences and are distributed as 0.5 FTE to IDP members, with the other 0.5 FTE “loaned” to supporting departments. UCLA further clarified that core faculty are complemented by nine 0% joint appointments who serve on a Faculty Advisory Board for the IDP and can teach courses and serve on committees. As a result, the total number of individuals serving the IDP are 11, including 9 ladder rank faculty. Another concern was a four year TDD, which was considered overly optimistic. This was addressed by increasing the TDD to five years. A third major concern was a lack of teaching opportunities, which was viewed as damaging the academic job prospects for graduates. This was addressed by including a teaching requirement in to the program. This revision had the added benefit of increasing funding, which was already an area of concern. Additional concerns included a lack of adequate science preparation, which was addressed by reiterating science pre-reqs in the proposal. Concerns regarding the potential adverse impacts of retirements was addressed by addition of a supporting letter from the EVC. The only major concern that was rebutted, was a suggestion that the number of focus areas be reduced from seven. Based on my final read of the revised proposal, I recommend approval by CCGA.