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Presented by: Ed Caswell-Chen, Chair, Undergraduate Program Review Committee
John Smolenski, Chair, General Education Committee
## Cluster 2 Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAES</th>
<th>CBS</th>
<th>CLAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>Cell Biology</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Toxicology</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African &amp; African American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(interim review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematical Analytics &amp; Operations Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Important Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>Programs notified of pending review &amp; Kickoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2015</td>
<td>Deadline for RT nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2015</td>
<td>Data Appendices sent from BIA to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – December,</td>
<td>Programs complete Self-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for completed Self-Reviews to Academic Senate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-April, 2016</td>
<td>Review team meetings with programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – June, 2016</td>
<td>UIPR reviews all reports &amp; forwards to UGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UGC reviews all reports and forwards recommendations to Provost, Deans and Department Chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: Debbie Stacionis, 754-4791 dstacionis@ucdavis.edu
Goals for Program Reviews

- Uniformity of reviews
- Include outside perspective
- One-year completion
- Effective engagement and accountability of administration
- Tracking outcomes to foster program improvements
Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review (UIPR) Program Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February-April</th>
<th>April - June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **UIPR**
  - Notification followed by kickoff meeting
  - UIPR analyst receives data (appendices) from BIA and posts on whiteboard
| **Programs**
  - Receive notification and request for RT nominations
  - Programs receive data (appendices) from BIA
| **October - December**
  - Programs complete self-review & AS office coordinates RT visits with programs
  - Completed Self-reviews are sent to UIPR analyst
| **Review Team visits. Completed reports are sent to UIPR analyst to forward to programs and college/division level review committees & College FECs**
| **UIPR members review all reports and summarize**
| **Summaries are reviewed & approved by UIPR members**
| **UIPR committee-approved reports and cluster summaries are submitted to UGC**

**Dean's Office**
- Deans receive notification and request for RT nominations

**Budget and Institutional Analysis**
- BIA is notified and compiles cluster data
- Cluster data (appendices) sent from BIA to programs with copy to AS Analyst

**Academic Senate Undergraduate Council (UGC)**
- UGC reviews full report and sends to Office of the Provost, Deans, programs, & FECs
Phase 1: Late Spring Quarter

- UGC notes recommendations for programs & admin to consider in a cover letter forwarded with the clustered Program Reviews to the Provost’s office. Recommendations for each program will be sent to Deans and Program Chairs with copy to FEC.

Phase 2: Fall Quarter

- Dean’s Office receives recommendations
- Provost’s Office receives recommendations
- Program receives recommendations

- Provost mtg with Deans and Program chairs to discuss UGC recommendations. (1 mtg for all programs in each college = 3 mtgs)

Phase 3: Winter Quarter

- Provost Office follow-up meeting with Deans and individual program chairs to determine if concerns have been addressed. Provost’s office & programs will notify UGC and Dean’s office of actions taken.

- Provost reports how concerns have been addressed
- Program reports how concerns have been addressed

Phase 4: UGC reviews reports from Provost and Programs and records whether concerns have been addressed
Major Self-Review Template

Section 1) Overview of the major
Section 2) Outcome of the last review
Sections 3-8) Major information
  3) faculty in the major
  4) instruction in the major (including courses, staff, space, and facilities)
  5) students in the major
  6) students’ perceptions of the major
  7) post-graduate preparation
  8) assessment
Section 9) Major strengths and weaknesses
Section 10) Future plans
1. Overview of the Major

Questions: What are the student learning objectives identified for this major? What is the role of this major in undergraduate education on the campus, i.e., how does the major contribute to the undergraduate educational mission of the campus? Is the major clearly distinguished from other similar majors on campus?

Refer to the catalog description of the major and the other majors reviewed in the same cluster (Appendix A). Describe any inaccuracies in the catalog description and explain plans for correcting them. Identify the other majors in the cluster that are most similar to yours and explain how your major differs from them.

2. Outcome of Previous Program Review

Please list the recommendations made at the conclusion of the previous review (these may have been made by the review committee, Executive Committee and/or Dean) and comment briefly on the current status of the matters noted in the recommendations. Discuss any other significant changes in the major since the last review.
3. FACULTY IN THE MAJOR

Questions: Who does the bulk of teaching in the major? What are the demographics of instructors in the major? Will the program be affected by substantial changes in the faculty (e.g. anticipated retirements) in the next review period?

Refer to the attached data concerning faculty in your department and the other departments reviewed in the same cluster (Appendix B, Tables 1-5). Based on those data and any additional information you wish to include, comment on each of the following for your major over the review period, referring, when appropriate to differences between your major and others in the cluster:

a) Table 1. Instructional Faculty – FTE and Percent by Rank
b) Table 2. Age of Ladder Faculty – Percent by Age Group
c) Table 3. Gender of Ladder Faculty – Number and Percent by Rank
d) Table 4. Under-represented Ladder Faculty – Number and Percent by Rank
e) Table 5. New Faculty Hires and Separations – Number by Rank
4. INSTRUCTION, ADVISING, AND RESOURCES IN THE MAJOR

Questions: How effective is the delivery of instruction in the major? Are faculty engaged in the major? Is instruction meeting the student learning objectives for the major? Is advising adequate? Is there adequate staff support? Are adequate space and facilities available? Is the program keeping pace with developments in the field? Are grading standards appropriate?

Refer to the attached data concerning instruction in the major and the other majors reviewed in the same cluster (Appendix B, Tables 6 -12). Based on those data and any additional information you wish to include, comment on each of the following for your major over the review period, referring, when appropriate to differences between your major and others in the cluster:

a) Table 6. Majors per Instructional Faculty FTE
b) Table 7. Students in Major Enrolled in Upper Division Courses – Percent of Total Course Enrollment
c) Table 8. TAs Assigned to Upper Division Courses – Number By TA Role
d) Table 9. Student Faculty Ratio – By Instructor Type
e) Table 10. Courses Taught – Percent By Instructor Type and Course Level
f) Table 11. Assigned Space – I&R Assignable Square Feet (ASF) – By Department
g) Table 12. Distribution of Grades in Upper Division Courses – Percent of Total Enrolled and Average GPA

Please also address the following issues, for which no data are provided:

h) Comment on the degree of interest and engagement of the faculty in the major.

i) Comment on the adequacy of staff support for the major.

j) Comment on the adequacy of staff advising for the major.

k) Comment on the adequacy of instructional equipment and facilities for the major.

l) Comment on the program’s record of keeping pace with advances in the field.

m) Comment on the program’s record for meeting its student learning objectives.
5. **Students in the Major**

Questions: This section is intended to characterize the students in this major. How have enrollments in the major varied over the period of the review, in terms of both the numbers and quality of the students? Are students succeeding in the major both in terms of qualitative and quantitative academic standards? Are students meeting the learning objectives identified for the major? Are students graduating on time? How do students find out about the major? Is the major reaching a wide and diverse spectrum of students? Are students who enter the major retained in the major, and if not, why not?

Refer to the attached data concerning enrollments in the major and the other majors reviewed in the same cluster (Appendix B, Tables 13-23). Based on those data and any additional information you wish to include, comment on each of the following for your major over the review period, referring, when appropriate to differences between your major and others in the cluster:

- a) Table 13. Number of Students - Duplicated Count and Percent Change
- b) Table 14. Students in Multiple Majors - Percent of Total in Major
- c) Table 15. Gender of Students – Percent of Total in Major and Percent Change
- d) Table 16. Under-represented Students – Percent of Total in Major and Percent Change
- e) Table 17. New Freshman Students Number and Percent Change
- f) Table 18. New Transfer Students Number and Percent Change
- g) Table 19. Average Cumulative UC Davis GPA
- h) Table 20. Students in Good Standing – Percent of Total by Level
- i) Table 21. Degrees Conferred – Duplicated Count and Percent Change
- j) Table 22. Time to Degree for Freshman and Transfer Students – All Students
- k) Table 23. Time to Degree for Freshman and Transfer Students – In Same Major

l) In light of the information presented in Tables 13-23, describe and evaluate the effectiveness of any efforts by the program’s faculty and staff to retain students in the major.

Please also address the following issue, for which no data are provided:

m) Describe and evaluate how students find information about the major (websites, course catalog, etc.).
6. Students’ Perceptions of the Major

Question: What are current students’ and recent graduates’ opinions of the major?

Refer to the attached data obtained from surveys of current students and alumni concerning their perceptions of the quality of the major and the other majors reviewed in the same cluster (Appendix C, Figures 1-53). Based on those data and any additional information you wish to include (e.g., results of departmentally administered course evaluations), comment on each of the following for your major over the review period, referring, when appropriate to differences between your major and others in the cluster:

a) overall understanding of the major (Figures 1-4)
b) overall satisfaction with the major (Figures 5-22)
c) satisfaction with instruction in the major (Figures 23-36)
d) satisfaction with academic advising in the major (Figures 37-43)
e) satisfaction with courses offered in the major (Figures 44-53)

7. Post-graduate Preparation

Questions: How well does the major prepare students for postgraduate education and careers? Do the students have sufficient contact with the faculty to get internships or letters of recommendation?

Refer to the attached data obtained from surveys of current students and alumni concerning preparation by the major for postgraduate education and careers (Appendix C, Figures 54-80). Based on those data and any additional information you wish to include, comment on each of the following for your major over the review period, referring, when appropriate to differences between your major and others in the cluster:

a) quantity and quality of research and creative activities provided by the major (Figures 54-59)
b) quality of preparation by the major for postgraduate education (Figures 60-64)
c) quality of preparation by the major for the workforce (Figures 65-74)
d) the degree to which students have sufficient contact with faculty to help them in their postgraduate education and careers (Figures 75-80).
8. ASSESSMENT

Question: How does the program monitor and evaluate itself, and how are problems, once identified, rectified?

No data are provided for this section.

a) Describe the indicators and/or methods that you use to demonstrate areas of strengths or that are in need of improvement in each of the following areas:
   i. Quality of teaching in the program.
   ii. Grading policies.
   iii. The program’s record of keeping pace with changes in the field.

b) Describe any policies or procedures that are in place to address problems in each of these areas.

c) Of the outcome measures provided in this report (see Item 7) and the educational objectives for your program (see Item 8), identify those most effective for evaluating your program. Are there other measures you presently use or would like to use?
9. **Major Strengths and Weaknesses/Problems**

Summarize the major overall strengths of the program as well as any current problems that you perceive.

10. **Future Plans**

Describe current or proposed plans to strengthen educational objectives of the program, such as increasing enrollments, improving student performance, and increasing the contribution of the program to the campus educational objectives. Describe and justify if new resources are needed to preserve or strengthen the program.
General Education section asks programs to:

1) Identify all of their courses that fulfill General Education Core Literacies

2) Identify the largest courses that satisfy General Education Core Literacies

3) Examine syllabi and assignments to see how instructors in these courses teach and assess these GECLs

4) Provide examples of representative student work from these courses

5) Describe how programs ensure that courses continue to deliver and assess the GECLs for which they have been approved, per the General Catalog
Identify all of their courses that fulfill General Education Core Literacies

How many courses does your program offer that fulfill each particular Core Literacy (e.g., how many courses satisfy the Scientific Literacy Core Literacy, Domestic Diversity Core Literacy)?
Identify the largest courses that satisfy General Education Core Literacies

In the last year, what was the largest-enrollment course your program offered that satisfied each particular Core Literacy (e.g., the largest course that satisfied the Writing Experience Core Literacy, the largest satisfying the Quantitative Literacy Core Literacy)? How many students enrolled in each such course?
Examine syllabi and assignments to see how instructors in these courses teach and assess these GECLs

Looking at syllabi, assignments, and exams from the courses identified in 2 (above), how do instructors address each Core Literacy? (For instance, in your program’s largest course satisfying the World Cultures Core Literacy, how does the instructor address World Cultures?)
Provide examples of representative student work from these courses

Please provide syllabi, assignments, exams, and a representative sample of student work for each class listed in the answer to Question 2 (above), to provide evidence regarding instruction and assessment of core literacies. (In practice, programs should interpret “representative sample” to mean the inclusion of work by 5-6 students. This work should represent a normal grade distribution for the class. For instance, if 16% of the students recent an A-range grade on a paper, while 32% receive a B-range grade, then one out of the six papers an instructor might submit should be an A paper, while two should be a B paper.)
Describe how programs ensure that courses continue to deliver and assess the GECLs for which they have been approved, per the General Catalog

What strategies does your program use to ensure that instruction in courses that satisfy particular General Education Core Literacies continues to meet the requirements for satisfying that particular General Education requirement? (For instance, how do you ensure that instructors for courses listed in the catalog as satisfying the Domestic Diversity requirement are presenting material covering the Domestic Diversity requirement and assessing the students’ learning of this General Education Core Literacy?)
Data Provided to Programs from BIA

- Appendix A, provided by the Office of the Registrar, includes catalog descriptions of all programs in the cluster.
- Appendix B contains information on instruction, students, and faculty gathered by Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) using data from a variety of sources.
- Appendix C includes the results of two surveys conducted by BIA: the first gathered the opinions of students in selected classes one and four years after graduation, and the second is a subset of data taken from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which focuses on current upper division students.
- Appendix D, provided by the Office of the Registrar, is a list of the educational objectives of the campus, as published in the General Catalog.

The data presented in Appendices A-C provides the basis to make comparisons between programs being reviewed in the same cluster as well as division, college, and the entire campus. Generally, the BIA data on students and faculty were compiled for the home department of the program, while the survey data (the undergraduate experience survey and the alumni survey) were compiled by the students’ majors. If, in consultation with departments, it is determined that this approach would not provide useful information for the major, alternative information is provided based on the core courses that the department has identified for the major.
Review Team Selection

- UIPR and Davis Divisional Chair select the Review Team (RT) to be comprised of one campus-wide and one nation-wide reviewer from the nominations received from programs and colleges. The campus-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate campus issues. The campus-wide reviewer should be familiar with the discipline but should not be a member of the program faculty or administration. The nation-wide reviewer will be asked to evaluate the program from a national perspective.

- The standard will be to have one off-campus reviewer and one campus reviewer for each program, however if UIPR feels it necessary, they will propose addition of a reviewer to UGC and the Academic Senate Chair. UGC will be authorized to approve the additional reviewer; the Academic Senate Chair will approve expenditure of additional funding.

- Nominations for members of the RT will be requested from the program faculty, and the associated FEC(s) and Dean(s). Each group will be asked to compile one list of five individuals from outside the UCD campus and one list of five individuals from within the UCD campus (4 lists/program) identifying any possible conflicts of interest. Nominations are sent to AS office by May 15.

- Based on ranking of nominees performed by the UIPR, invitations and confirmations are sent for each team member solidifying the Review Team membership by September 1.
Review Team Qualifications

Qualifications:

• To avoid conflict of interest nominees cannot be members of program being reviewed, should not have been involved in teaching for the program

• Will not have collaborated with members of the program in the last 5 years. It is the program’s responsibility to note if there has been collaborative research and to indicate why this does not constitute an important conflict of interest.

• Programs do not need to contact the nominees for willingness to serve or availability: just provide 5 UCD faculty and 5 external faculty nominations!
External reviewer nominees can be from any college or university outside UC Davis, or from other institutions. To avoid a conflict of interest, the individuals nominated as external reviewers cannot have been involved in an active collaboration in either teaching, research, or be a co-author on any research publications with faculty in the program within the past five years, be currently listed as a Co-PI on a proposed grant or co-instructor on a proposed course.

Conflict of Interest Policy: In the case of a perceived conflict of interest, nominees may still be submitted along with an explanation of the potential conflict. The UIPR Committee will review the information and make a determination if a meaningful conflict of interest exists.
Review Team Visit

• The Academic Senate Office will schedule dates for review team (RT) two-day visits.

• The program will schedule the itinerary for those two days, that will include the RT meetings interviewing the program chair, Deans, faculty, students, staff, supporting committees and others as appropriate.

• UIPR analyst forwards program self-review to the RT prior to review visit.

• Completed RT reports are sent to UIPR analyst within two weeks of the RT visit. The reviewers are free to determine if they wish to submit individual or separate reports so long as both perspectives are addressed.

• UIPR forwards RT report to programs and college/division level review committees & College FECs for correction of fact. Any correction of fact must be rec'd by UIPR analyst within one week.
• UIPR members are assigned majors/programs to review and write draft assessment summaries

• Draft summaries are discussed by UIPR members during a committee meeting

• UIPR generates a report to identify status of any outstanding follow-up issues from previous reviews, program specific strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for corrective action including a proposed time line for completion. UIPR’s report will include (as attachments) the program self-review and RT report.

• It should be only in rare circumstances that necessitates additional information requests from the program. If additional information is requested by UIPR committee, responsible UIPR member asks for requested information and a revised report is presented to UIPR. This continues until report is approved by that committee.

• UIPR forwards reports to Undergraduate Council (UGC).
Undergraduate Council (UGC) will review the report during a Council meeting. If UGC has questions or concerns, the report is returned to UIPR for clarification and resubmission to UGC. In this process UGC should not request that UIPR recommendations be changed. It is to be UGC’s prerogative to make recommendations different than UIPR.

Following review and endorsement of the UIPR report, UGC will forward to the Provost, Dean and program chair a program specific report summarizing strengths, weaknesses and corrective action necessary (the report will include the UIPR review report). The Provost has agreed to coordinate all administrative corrective action (budgetary allocation, FTE, space, safety, etc.) with the Dean and program. UGC will communicate directly with the program concerning academic corrective actions such as issues with curricula/academic matters. Therefore UGC’s summary will be addressed to the Provost and program chair with a copy to the Dean, FEC chair and Academic Senate chair.

If necessary, UGC may ask UIPR to conduct an interim review. If an interim review is desired, the time frame for the review and matters to be re-examined will be outlined in the UGC summary described above. An interim review will be focused on specific serious issues requiring correction within 1-3 years from UGC report. This review must remain focused on the issues identified, and should not serve to uncover additional issues in need of attention. In the event that additional issues arise, UGC will be notified to decide on subsequent action.
Closing Each Cluster

• If corrective action is requested prior to the next program review, the Provost or Program Chair will report back to UGC on or before a specified deadline. Most often matters should be resolved and reported to UGC by follow-up memo. UGC will maintain a record of recommendations and actions assuring an archive for use during the next review.

• UIPR will provide UGC a Cluster Summary report assessing trends within the cluster following completion of all program reviews

• UGC will review and approve the Summary report forwarding it to the Provost, Deans and all Programs

• The UIPR analyst will maintain a complete file (all correspondence and reports, action assigned and taken) associated with the programs and cluster reviewed
# Important Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April, 2015</td>
<td>Programs notified of pending review &amp; Kickoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2015</td>
<td>Deadline for RT nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2015</td>
<td>Data Appendices sent from BIA to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – December, 2015</td>
<td>Programs complete Self-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for completed Self-Reviews to Academic Senate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-April, 2016</td>
<td>Review team meetings with programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – June, 2016</td>
<td>UIPR reviews all reports &amp; forwards to UGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UGC reviews all reports and forwards recommendations to Provost, Deans and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: Debbie Stacionis, 754-4791 dstacionis@ucdavis.edu
The Vice Provost / Dean for Undergraduate Education has pledged to support programs in Clusters 2 and 3 that are interested in developing capacity to engage in best practices of outcomes assessment. The Undergraduate Education Assessment Team is available to help: identify / revise program goals and outcomes statements; articulate research questions; collect and analyze multiple and varied lines of direct and indirect evidence of student learning; and apply results of analyses to support program review self-studies, strategic planning, and continuous improvement efforts.

Contact the Undergraduate Education Assessment Team for help collecting, analyzing, and reporting about direct evidence of student learning.

http://assessment.ucdavis.edu

assessment@ucdavis.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College &amp; Program</th>
<th>Main Contact Name</th>
<th>Program Chair</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>MSO/CSO/CAO</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>phone #</th>
<th>Master Advisor</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Robert Rice</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhrice@ucdavis.edu">rhrice@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christine Harlan CAO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdharlan@ucdavis.edu">cdharlan@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-6584</td>
<td>Taka Shibamoto</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tshibamoto@ucdavis.edu">tshibamoto@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>Randy Southard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjsouthard@ucdavis.edu">rjsouthard@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christine Harlan CAO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdharlan@ucdavis.edu">cdharlan@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-6584</td>
<td>Kyaw Tha Paw U</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ttpawu@ucdavis.edu">ttpawu@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Toxicology</td>
<td>Randy Southard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjsouthard@ucdavis.edu">rjsouthard@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christine Harlan CAO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdharlan@ucdavis.edu">cdharlan@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-6584</td>
<td>Peter Hernes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pjhernes@ucdavis.edu">pjhernes@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Jodi Nunnari</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu">jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christina Jones MSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctjones@ucdavis.edu">ctjones@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-9093</td>
<td>Charles Gasser</td>
<td><a href="mailto:csgasser@ucdavis.edu">csgasser@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Biology 9/19</td>
<td>Jodi Nunnari</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu">jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christina Jones MSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctjones@ucdavis.edu">ctjones@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-9093</td>
<td>Frank McNally</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmcnally@ucdavis.edu">fmcnally@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics 9/19</td>
<td>Jodi Nunnari</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu">jmnunnari@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Christina Jones MSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctjones@ucdavis.edu">ctjones@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>530-752-9093</td>
<td>Jeanette Natzle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jenatzle@ucdavis.edu">jenatzle@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Susan Kauzlarich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smkauzlarich@ucdavis.edu">smkauzlarich@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Jessica Potts MSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lpotts@ucdavis.edu">lpotts@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>(530)752-3988</td>
<td>Perry Gee SAO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pggee@ucdavis.edu">pggee@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Nina Amenta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cschair@ucdavis.edu">cschair@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Meshell Louderman MSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mlouderman@ucdavis.edu">mlouderman@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>(530)752-7005</td>
<td>Lori Avellar &amp; Natasha Coulter SAOs</td>
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