## COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET Professional Schools at UCSC

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) report of February 2008 (<a href="http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/Professional%20School%20Update.pdf">http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/Professional%20School%20Update.pdf</a>) outlines a brief history of campus engagement with the question of graduate growth through professional schools. As noted in that report, the Committee has spent this academic year enabling a broad campus dialogue on professional schools.

To comply with CPEVC David Kliger's request that the Senate assess options for professional education at UCSC, a joint Senate-Administration forum was held in the fall, at which the Senate made a call for professional school pre-proposals. In the winter quarter, CPB reviewed the four pre-proposals that were submitted. During this phase, we provided a written response for each pre-proposal, formulating a common set of questions based on criteria developed through the process and outlined in our memo of December 19, 2007. Each response included an assessment of the overall viability of the proposal and ended with a series of specific questions to be addressed during our individual consultations in the spring with representatives from each group. <a href="http://senate.ucsc.edu/ProfSchlsindex.html">http://senate.ucsc.edu/ProfSchlsindex.html</a>

Now, having completed those consultations, we have provided final recommendations for each pre-proposal, outlining possible next steps to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs, Alison Galloway.

CPB sees the fundamental test for any professional school, given a sound intellectual and pedagogical conception, to be whether the proposed school's structure will accomplish the school's research and training goals (or whether an alternative, such as a graduate group, would serve as well or better), and whether there is an identifiable milestone when school status becomes critical. We looked for timelines with conditional plans for growth based on observable metrics and decision points.

On these grounds, of the four projects only the proposed School of Environment has not made a sufficiently compelling case to go forward with further planning and resources. We have prioritized the other three groups with Public Health and Education ahead of Management. (Please note: these are not formal rankings.) All three need more work before they can move forward to the full proposal stage.

Public Health is the least well developed of all the initiatives (as indicated by the need for stable faculty leadership to provide the vision that will bring together all of the related work in this area spread out over the campus) but has the best proposed timeline of growth with clear incremental advantages at each stage. Education is closest to the transition from department to school but further planning is required to decide on its size and scope, from both short and long-term perspectives. Management is the most fully developed proposal, reflecting the generous resources it has received that are far greater

than any of the others, in part from the Office of the President funds earmarked for Silicon Valley planning. The requirements to mount this proposal are not, for the most part, met by current campus resources. Both the costs and risks of implementation of the proposed school are therefore the greatest of all the proposals. In the next phase the proposed School of Management will have to provide a detailed timeline for conditional development, based on fixed fundraising targets as well as the other standard metrics.

We want to conclude by thanking the faculty who have worked on these proposals and produced a range of intellectual and pedagogical visions that we believe represent possible futures at UCSC. They are not the final word on graduate and professional education on our campus but rather initiate what we hope will be more experimentation with different kinds of programs--academic as well as professional--to create the mix of undergraduate and graduate education and the balance between teaching and research missions that we are seeking.

We want to acknowledge the role of the administration, particularly the academic deans, in doing more than simply supporting pre-existing faculty interests (as indispensable as that is). In the case of Public Health specifically, the deans of Engineering, PBS and Social Sciences took the initiative to provide the conditions for a trans-divisional collaboration that, by the account of all participants, would never have emerged so quickly and so full blown without the process of the professional school pre-proposals that we developed and oversaw through this year.

Finally, the critical question of allocating resources and developing firm priorities among these three initiatives remains for the administration. For this decision making, CPB recommends a comprehensive reassessment, in light of the evidence and analysis we have provided, of the differential investment made thus far in professional school development on our campus.

## Respectfully submitted;

## COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Karen Ottemann
Michael Brown
Emily Honig
Lori Kletzer, ex officio
Tracy Larrabee
Herbert Lee
Grant Pogson
Olga Najera-Ramirez
Quentin Williams, ex officio
Susan Gillman, Chair

Kyle Simerly, SUA

May 16, 2008