TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair  
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: [Campus Review] Proposed Degree Program: Bachelor of Arts Degree Program in Environmental Studies (B.A. in Environmental Studies [ENST])

Date: November 22, 2023

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the document “[Campus Review] Proposed Degree Program: Bachelor of Arts Degree Program in Environmental Studies (B.A. in Environmental Studies [ENST]).”

In the course of our review and discussion, the following issues arose about the proposed curriculum:

1. Given the stated learning objectives that indicate the importance of students understanding ecological issues locally, nationally, and globally, it is crucial for students to have a thorough grounding in environmental science to comprehend the interplay between the natural world and human societies. A significant concern raised with the current curriculum proposal is its apparent lack of foundational science. Without a robust understanding of environmental science, discussing environmental governance and the scientific underpinnings of environmental inequities becomes challenging.

It is noteworthy that this degree program lacks upper-level or advanced courses in environmental science. The present focus seems to be predominantly on the human aspects of environmental issues, without sufficient emphasis on the scientific aspects. This imbalance could lead to a skewed perspective among students. Overall, the curriculum could be more effectively designed to integrate both natural sciences and social sciences, providing a comprehensive educational experience in this field. Currently, it seems that the curriculum is shaped more by disciplinary convenience rather than a commitment to interdisciplinary learning. This approach risks limiting the depth and breadth of education students receive, thereby hindering their ability to fully understand and address complex environmental issues that humanity faces, particularly in this concerning era of science denialism and less than ideal data literacy.
2. Page 8: Regarding the lower-division requirement “an additional science course with a lab,” the phrasing of “an additional” suggests there is more than one, but this seems to be the only lower-division science course with a lab in the curriculum.

3. The Global and Community Health B.A. curriculum contains a requirement for one lower-division course in data analysis. Why does this requirement not exist for the Environmental Studies degree given that the two degrees are detailed in the document as having considerable focal overlap, sharing some courses like the required methods course?

4. Page 11: Under “Affiliated faculty,” Ariel Dinar is retired from UCR. Hence, it is unclear how up-to-date this list is.

5. Page 15: Under the section header “Chairs’ approval to include their courses in the new curriculum (in 2021 or 2023),” SPP Associate Dean Bruce Babcock is listed. The phrasing of this header can be read in more than one way, so, just to be certain, this approval only pertains to the PBPL courses cross-listed with other units that are listed in this proposed curriculum document (i.e. ENGR 171/PBPL 171) and not any other PBPL courses. This specificity is indicated in the email exchange between SEHE representative Ellen Reese and SPP Associate Dean Bruce Babcock included in the appendix of this document (p. 66).

Sincerely,

Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Professor of Public Policy