

March 21, 2008

Rod Ogawa  
Education Department  
Marc Mangel  
Applied Math and Statistics  
Daniel Press  
Environmental Studies  
Nirvikar Singh  
Economics Department

**RE: CPB response to Professional School Pre-proposals**

Dear Rod, Marc, Dan and Nirvikar,

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has completed the first phase of the review of the four pre-proposals for professional schools. For each proposal, we have provided a written response (see attached) that addresses a common set of questions based on the criteria in our memo of December 19, 2007. Each response includes an assessment of the overall viability of the proposal and ends with a series of questions to be addressed before the next phase can be undertaken. (See below for a complete list of these questions.) We hope to schedule consultations with each of you in early April in order to discuss our questions and outline a timetable of next steps.

In addition, CPB would like to provide a summary of the responses from other Senate Committees that reviewed the pre-proposals (Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), Committee on Library (COL), Committee on Research (COR), Committee on Teaching (COT), Graduate Council (GC). CPB has incorporated the specific comments about individual proposals into our written responses to each of them, so here we will focus on highlighting general criteria that emerged in all the committee responses.

Three issues were brought up in all or most of the committee responses: interconnections of the proposed school to the campus; the advantage of the professional-school structure versus others; the funding picture for the proposed school, specifically how its resources would connect to and impact the campus. In addition, GC focused on metrics and benchmarks: how clearly the proposal lays out determinate stages in which the project will move forward and also under what circumstances the project should be halted.

On campus connections, both CAFA and COT underscore that the proposals be evaluated for the potential interconnections between the programs and undergraduates on campus and how the programs would enhance coordination of graduate and undergraduate education. COT found that “the most promising proposals expanded on preexisting strengths at UCSC in the form of faculty or established focuses.” GC assessed the distinctive niche of the proposal in part by looking at the degree to which the identified foci “build on academic strengths of the campus.” Another term for this criterion is the “synergy” of the proposed school with existing programs, departments or other campus units. All the Senate Committees approached this issue of interconnectedness not in terms of whether the proposed school is an entirely new initiative (taking newness itself

as a value) but rather as a question of the “fit with our core values” (COT), the “benefits to the campus” and a “wise use of resources for the good of the campus” (GC). (The latter suggests the intimate link between intellectual and financial criteria in evaluating the proposals.)

For COR, COT and GC, the issue of the professional-school advantage is critical. That is, the proposals must demonstrate how and why a professional school is necessary to achieve the intellectual and programmatic goals of the proposers. “In every case,” writes COR, “the question of whether a school or a department is the best structure for UCSC needs to be carefully considered.” COR identified the following criteria for assessing when it makes sense for a department to become a school: that a department becoming a “school” makes sense when the department offers professional training/certification and is subject to external accreditation; the campus, division, and department would benefit by its independence from the academic division; its becoming a school would increase its intellectual and research status within the UC system and potentially increase the probability of garnering external funding for research and instruction.

The resource question is addressed by all the Senate Committees. Although the pre-proposals are not yet in a position to provide a detailed financial model, there are some general principles that have been endorsed by the Senate. CFW provides a useful summary: any professional school must demonstrate “financial sustainability within an appropriate time-frame” in order not to divert resources from departments and divisions. COL noted that library and other information resources must be included at the next stage of the proposals. COR specifies that where proposals may implicitly or explicitly assume that they will draw on overhead funds generated by faculty research on the campus, this use of ICR must be directly acknowledged and justified as “a wise use of this resource for the good of the campus.” Finally, CFW notes that the campus must consider both the overall cost of professional schools and the proper funding of them. “An under funded professional school,” CFW concludes, is worse than none at all.”

CPB hopes that this summary will provide a useful context for both the proposers and the campus in considering the next phase of development for the proposals. We look forward to meeting with all of you in April.

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman, Chair  
Committee on Planning and Budget

Enclosures

Cc: CPEVC Kliger  
VPAA Galloway  
Analyst Moses

### Questions on Pre-Proposals for Professional Schools at UCSC

- (1) What is the added value of the program to the campus? What does the campus gain (a) intellectually and (b) financially?
- (2) Is there an alternative to a professional school, such as a graduate group, that would serve the campus as well or better?
- (3) What are the links to existing programs on campus, i.e., how does the program build on existing strengths?
- (4) What financial commitment for the *campus* is entailed by the proposal? How many FTE would be required?
- (5) What are the trade-offs? Is there a cost to existing or anticipated graduate programs and if so what is the cost?
- (6) What are specific sources of external funding and what contacts have been made?
- (7) Who are the core faculty at UCSC that will launch and staff the school? Identify the program's core leadership.
- (8) Are there faculty specializations needed to launch the program that do not exist on campus, e.g., such as management faculty?
- (9) What is the best estimate of student demand for the degree(s)? Does the proposed curriculum serve the needs of the students? Will it get them a job?
- (10) What is the competition within and outside of UC and how will it affect the likely success or possible failure of the program?
- (11) What are the overall risks and benefits of the proposed school?

## **Report on the Pre-Proposal for a School of the Education**

### **Committee on Planning and Budget**

**March 2008**

First, we are excited about the ideas presented in the preliminary proposal to establish a School of Education. The document clearly demonstrates the need for preparing high-quality teachers trained to deal with diverse populations. It also highlights that UCSC has a number of on-campus units devoted to education, but that there is little coordination currently among these units. The school would help coalesce many of these units and also enhance the visibility of the various educational enterprises here on campus. The school would also provide a range of unique teacher-training programs, thereby serving local and state needs. We thus feel the general rationale for School of Education is sound. The proposal, however, veers in many directions and lacks a clear strategic plan. We propose the following questions to help strengthen and clarify the proposal.

- 1) Please clarify the focus of the school, and how this focus fits with the campus's long term goals. In the pre-proposal, an idea of serving "non-dominant economic, racial, cultural, and linguistic communities" is introduced but when the focus is described later in the document, it shifts to "small, emergent cities and their relations to large, urban centers." While these are not mutually exclusive categories, they are also not the same.
- 2) Please explain what part of your proposal can be accomplished without the official establishment of the school. At what point does the school become critical to implementing your plans?
- 3) What are the overall risks and benefits of the proposed school? Similarly, what are the risks/benefits to staying as a department and not becoming a school?
- 4) The timeline needs to provide a clearer vision of the path for growth. Please provide incremental steps that reflect a sense of priorities. For example, what element in the proposal requires immediate attention? What are the metrics and determinate stages in which the project will move forward to the next phase, and also, correlatively, under what circumstances will pursuit of the project be halted. We also note that the proposal currently suggests that the hiring will not begin until after the school is approved. But if there is space and demand now, why not start hiring sooner?
- 5) Who are the core faculty at UCSC that will launch and staff the school? Identify the program's core leadership. Are particular faculty specializations needed to launch the programs that do not exist on campus?
- 6) Please provide a list of the units that would be affected by and included in a school. Also include evidence that these units wish to be part of an education school and identify what contributions they would make to the school?

7) Please provide a list of the current faculty in other departments who are engaged in educational research, and who might become part of a school. As envisioned, the school derives from a single department and the pre-proposal provides little evidence of its trans-department appeal.

8) Please provide enhanced justification for the proposed number of faculty. As stated, the number of Masters students will grow by 100 in the credential program, and 40 in a new MA in Teacher Leadership. The state funding algorithm gives 1 FTE/18.7 students, equaling ~7 new faculty.

9) Please expand on the “matrix” governance structure, which is presented as an alternative to departments.

10) Please explain what is limiting the enrollments in the Education programs currently? It is very hard to get a sense for the true demand for each of the degrees, which is critical for judging whether a school is warranted.

11) What additional resources are required for the education school beyond FTE? Please include resources required for any incremental steps that might be taken.

12) What are specific sources of external funding and what contacts have been made?

13) Please provide more details about the multi-locational status, with three off-campus facilities that require transportation. Presumably, though it is not discussed in the proposal, on-line and telecast courses along with other extensive use of information technology might be required. It should be more clearly explicated how this multi-locational system would operate

14) Please clarify what the various nearby CSUs and other universities (e.g. within 100 miles) offer in terms of education degrees and explain what kind of relation, if any, they will have with the School. For example, will they be viewed as feeder schools? Will they compete for the same students?

## **Report on the Pre-Proposal for a School of the Environment**

### **Committee on Planning and Budget**

**March 2008**

At the outset, we should note that we appreciate the work that the committee put into this pre-proposal, especially the very detailed description of environmental programs at UC and other universities. This information will undoubtedly be helpful in Senate discussions of this proposal and academic planning. In this report, we set out the issues and questions that need to be addressed. This report reflects the views of not just CPB but other Senate committees that have commented on the proposal. We note this pre-proposal defers answering many of the key questions pending some indication of faculty and administration interest. Instead, the proposal focuses mainly on organizational issues pertaining to the creation of a School of the Environment. These include discussion of why a school instead of an institute should be established and different approaches to faculty affiliation with the school.

There is very little in the proposal that details intellectual justifications for a school of the environment and sets out the intellectual theme and vision. The main justifications for creating a school at UCSC are that a school would “integrate, expand, and publicize environmental” research and instruction on campus and that it would train “leaders dedicated to solving environmental problems.” The proposal argues that by bringing “new resources to the table rather than reshuffling existing assets it will possible to “foster exciting interdisciplinary collaboration across the entire campus” (p. 2). Such interdisciplinary collaboration is easier, the proposal suggests, if faculty are in one administrative unit.

There is very little discussion of the intellectual value of the school of the environment in the proposal other than to suggest that its theme might center on “regional environmental change.” Is this focus is too narrow, especially since environmental scientists and researchers are concerned with questions of scale and the relationships among global, regional, and local environmental problems? What would a UCSC School of the Environment contribute that is substantially different from the programs at other UC campuses and other universities? (In the description of other programs at UC and universities outside California in an appendix there is no evaluation of how UCSC’s proposed school might differ or what it would add.)

The pre-proposal contains no clear statement of the financial benefits to the campus. An enrollment of 25 students per year is unlikely to generate much in the way of financial benefits and under current UC policies a school of the environment could not charge differential fees (only those schools accredited by a professional association other than WASC can charge differential fees).

A key question raised by both CPB and the Graduate Council is whether a professional school is truly necessary to achieve the proposers’ goals? Is there an alternative to a

professional school that would serve the campus as well or better? The Committee on Research notes that “the question of whether a school or a department is the best structure for UCSC needs to be carefully considered.” One alternative would be the creation of a Masters program for environmental policy professionals in the Environmental Studies department. Another alternative would be creation of an interdisciplinary graduate group, using a Masters Degree program as a foundation. In either case, alternatives to a school of the environment should be carefully considered.

One of the key arguments for the school is that would promote interdisciplinary collaboration, but the proposal recommends against creating an “umbrella institute” as we already have such an institute (STEPS). What is the relationship between STEPS and the proposed school? Is a school necessary to promote interdisciplinary collaboration? What would it do that STEPS does not already do? How would it enhance interdisciplinary collaboration?

A third issue concerns the financial costs to the campus of launching a school of the environment. Members of Senate committees reviewing the proposals agree that “any professional school considered must demonstrate its financial sustainability within an appropriate time frame in order not to divert resources from already resource limited departments and divisions....” The school of the environment pre-proposal contains no analysis of costs and impact on the campus budget.

The pre-proposal anticipates initial UC funding for an unspecified amount based on a market study, and then would use that as a basis for solicitation of private funding. The proposal anticipates that “a number or existing FTE would move their affiliations to the school” and that new FTEs would be allocated for the school. In other words, creating the school would require an augmentation of campus resources or a reallocation of existing campus resources, but the proposal gives no specific estimate of how many FTE would be needed. We note that the estimate of admitting 25 students per year while maintaining a steady state enrollment of 50 seems low and could probably be accomplished in some other way than establishing a school.

In any case, the costs must be clearly specified. This includes not just financial costs (how many FTE would be needed) but costs to existing or anticipated graduate programs. If launching of the school requires reallocating resources, what are the impacts on other programs and how could these costs be mitigated? A small program based on an Environmental Studies Masters degree as a stand alone program or as part of an interdisciplinary graduate group would be less costly than launching a school. At the very least these options should be carefully evaluated.

There is no statement indicating specific sources of external funding and no potential donors have been contacted. We think the proposal requires a list of private sources of funding and some indication, perhaps including a record of contacts, of the likelihood of donations. We do not think it is possible to launch a School of the Environment solely with University funds, and as the Committee on Faculty Welfare notes, “an under funded professional school is worse than none at all.”

The pre-proposal does not identify the core faculty and leadership, though we assume that would come from the Environmental Studies department. One obvious strength of the proposed school is that it would build on the substantial number of excellent faculty whose research addresses environmental issues spanning at least 5 departments (i.e., Environmental Studies, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Earth and Planetary Sciences, Environmental Toxicology, and Ocean Sciences). However, the program as envisioned would require faculty with expertise in management and public policy that does not currently exist on campus. This includes both generalists in public policy and specialists in environmental policy. To be viable, a thorough statement on the kind of faculty needed to launch this school is required.

The pre-proposal indicates that the core professional graduate program in the new school would be a Master's degree program for environmental policy professionals, but it is not clear what the market is actually like for such professionals. The proposal cites Bureau of Labor Statistics data that the estimated demand for environmental professionals and policy analysts will increase by 17 percent over the next decade, but outside of this and some discussion of the growth of this field there is no attempt to assess the market. What would be the market for a UCSC school? Absent a full-blown market study, which is proposed, what readily available data would provide a better answer to this question?

The discussion of the curriculum for the Master's Degree program is vague. The proposal refers to "tracks" in environmental studies, e.g. sustainable development or "environment and health" but do these tracks fit with existing demand for professionals? What is the fit between "market" and "tracks"? Moreover, the proposal assumes the necessity of courses in management and public policy, but there no discussion of these courses and the faculty needed to staff them.

There are only three other major environmental schools programs in University of California, and a UCSC School of the Environment may not face substantial competition from other UC programs. But we believe there is a need for a more detailed analysis of this question.

The overall risks and benefits to establishing a school of the environment are not clearly stated or analyzed in pre-proposal. We would like to see a clear statement of the intellectual and financial benefits of such a school and the costs to the campus budget and existing or anticipated graduate programs. Many of the committees reviewing this pre-proposal agree that alternatives to a school should be seriously considered. Instead of converting the Environmental Studies department to a school, as the proposal suggests, the low risk option, and the path to a larger program, may be to start with a very limited Masters degree program. Such a program could later be folded into a larger school if that should become a possibility.

## Report on the Pre-Proposal for a School of the Management

### Committee on Planning and Budget

March 2008

Overall, this pre-proposal is impressive in scope and integrative in pitch. It provides a comprehensive overview of the proposed school's intellectual motivation and focus, targeted niche, costs and revenues. The proposal represents a sizeable investment of time and other resources, at a scale well above other preliminary professional school ideas.

We have a number of specific comments:

1. The case for new thinking on global management is well-described and quite compelling. It appears to be a vision that is effectively supported by observable trends. There is a clear historical sense of how prior managements needs and trends have given way to distinctive changes in the current context as well as the foreseeable future. The niche, as exemplified by its slogan, "A UC management school built in partnership with and for Silicon Valley," is persuasive. The particulars of that niche:

- a. world-class management education and research in the heart of Silicon Valley;
- b. innovations in themes, programs and delivery methods to serve the evolving needs of students, the region, and the state of California in coming decades

The pre-proposal offers a useful structure for defining a new professional school. The section on educational context is sound, and overall the academic case is very strong.

2. Much of the document refers to current UCSC strengths and approaches as integral to building a new school. These strengths are listed as: international trade, finance, global studies, leadership, engineering and science. Mostly absent from the proposal is a discussion of how these strengths can be bridged to a *management* school. These strengths may well be higher-order variants of management training, and seem far from foundational. It is critical to the success of the proposal to establish clear links between current campus strengths and the operation of SOM.

3. The UCSC strengths, along with SOM's core themes, boil down to the second-year curriculum. To use a perhaps tired analogy, strengths and core themes are ornaments of a tree, namely the core curriculum that is under-specified. How will the core be established? How do current strengths help establish the core? More importantly and perhaps symptomatically, much of the gap analysis in table two points to training in core areas, not in strengths or proposed themes.

4. One particular strength, in international trade and finance, seems overworked. The proposal is not persuasive on the point of building a SOM from campus strengths in this area. The need is for expertise in management training.

5. In the discussion of research programs, “management” is notable in its absence. Is the conception of “management” now entirely domain-specific, such that “management” is not a research area? The proposal does not make clear what is the path by which to develop a full-fledged management school based on research.

6. The section on economic context and the UC system is long on the importance of a UC management presence in Silicon Valley but short on the specific contributions of UCSC. This section much speak more directly to the emerging framework for the leadership role of UCSC in a region that has been up to now dominated by the presence of UCB and Berkeley.

7. We take it that the listing of current campus faculty is intended to give an impression of the potential support for a management school. More importantly, the proposal should provide an idea of the faculty of a “full-fledged management school,” the one that will take “significant new hiring.” To return to our tired analogy, current campus faculty seems to be ornaments rather than core elements. What would the faculty look like in regard to the core curriculum, and how would that faculty contribute to the research mission?

8. On the administrative structure that is outlined here: the intent of the external advisory committee is unclear. Is this a planning committee? If so, management school expertise among the members may be thin.

9. Student demand has not yet been persuasively established. The aim is to draw on local need for trained managerial personnel in Silicon Valley companies. While the local focus gives a distinctive brand to the proposed school, the proposed enrollment trajectory (Table # 6) is extremely ambitious, and it is not clear that local demand will meet those targets.

10. The proposal incorporates some references to the value of diversity but does not address the specific problem of diversity in business schools. The recent Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity (September 2007) demonstrates that, in comparison to national averages, enrollment of both minorities and women is strikingly low at UC business schools. How will the proposed SOM address this problem?

11. The funding streams for the proposed SOM raise specific questions about the overall resource plan. First, the plan for funding through student FTE (Table #6) is ambitious in terms of over all numbers and rates of growth. These projections should be assessed in light of comparison data from the recently established management schools in the UC (UCSD Rady School and the UCB-Columbia joint MBA), particularly in the context of targeted versus actual enrollments.

12. On the physical plant in Silicon Valley: the proposal does not directly address the issue of financing a building in Silicon Valley, which will be necessary to accommodate the school, as envisioned in the enrollment plans. We suggest that the phrase on page

two, “resource friendly,” be scrapped. A school in Silicon Valley will be easy on campus physical resources, but given the budget projections it may not be “friendly” overall to campus resources.

13. We understand the desire to soft-sell the need for external financing, given the uncertainty of landing a major gift. Given likely expenses, especially building expenses, advocacy of “modest external financial support” seems unrealistic, and may be asking too much of the campus community. Launching a SOM is a high-cost endeavor, and this reality should be recognized throughout the process, with full-scale efforts to obtain external funding. The next stage of this proposal must be more direct about the potential and plans for external funding. Scenarios for gifts and for capital funds in particular are essential to determining the potential risks and overall costs of the proposed SOM. We take progress on external funding as some indication of the external merit of the idea.

14. We agree with the notion that initial campus commitment may be important in attracting external funding. There needs to be a discussion of the size of the initial campus financial commitment, in terms of money and FTEs. In this regard, the very limited discussion of connections to the Santa Cruz campus is curious: if significant campus resources are required, what are the benefits to campus?

15. Some questions were raised about the potential for connections to undergraduate programs on campus. More specificity on how graduate management education might benefit undergraduate programs on this campus (Economics as well as departments in Engineering) would be welcome.

16. It would be very helpful to develop a conditional (rather than absolute or calendar-based) timeline of progress on this project, with observable metrics and decision points.

In conclusion, we consider the following questions critical for the next step in the process:

- (1) What is the added value of the program to the campus? What does the campus gain (a) intellectually and (b) financially?
- (2) What financial commitment for the *campus* is entailed by the proposal? How many FTE would be required?
- (3) What are the trade-offs? Is there a cost to existing or anticipated graduate programs and if so what is the cost?
- (4) What are specific sources of external funding and what contacts have been made?
- (5) Who are the core faculty at UCSC that will launch and staff the school? Identify the program’s core leadership.

- (6) Are there faculty specializations needed to launch the program that do not exist on campus?
- (7) What is the competition within and outside of UC and how will it affect the likely success or possible failure of the program?
- (8) What are the overall risks and benefits of the proposed school?

CPB concludes that on the basis of intellectual conceptualization alone, the SOM pre-proposal has made a highly compelling case for itself. The justification for a management link to expertise at UCSC is more tenuous. Most pressing, however, is the risk represented by the level of investment necessary to start and maintain the SOM. Without the demonstration of a major donation in the multi-million dollar range, CPB would not be able to recommend that the Senate endorse the proposal.

**Report on the Pre-Proposal for a School of Public Health  
Committee on Planning and Budget  
March 2008**

The pre-proposal for the School of Public Health was a pleasure to read, but we think it can be made stronger. The thoroughness and clarity of the time line and the enumeration of the met and unmet needs for the school were very impressive. It seems that the accreditation process was quite helpful both in terms of making it clear which programs and classes are needed, and in explaining the time line for fulfilling these necessities. In general, this report's weaknesses weren't in the details, but in the big picture.

What is the vision for the school of public health at UCSC? What makes it different than existing schools? The report talks about leveraging our strengths but somehow stops short of explaining the guiding mission for the school. We had the impression that the authors had a clear vision of the UCSC niche that they didn't completely communicate in the proposal.

Another aspect of this big picture would answer the question of why the program for a Masters in Public Health (for which an argument is clearly made) should be launched from a School of Public Health: what would be different about the program if there was a school? Finally, it is critical that the proposal identify a clear leader or set of leaders who will take charge of pushing this vision forward.

We get the impression that the authors could make the case for the benefits of launching the program from a school, but they didn't do so because of their adherence to a balanced tone. If the authors want to stick to the impartial presentation, they could give a thorough discussion of the pros and cons of launching the program without the school, but we recommend adding a little passion for the project to the report. The only point in the existing report that spoke of the authors' enthusiasm for the proposed school was in the closing statement. If the authors have more enthusiasm for the project, it would be nice to see evidence of it (as we have in the other pre-proposals).

As a minor quibble, we understand that the existing health sciences major is very different from the proposed Masters in Public Health, but the existence of the program seems like an elephant in the room if it is not mentioned at all: it would help to explain why undergraduates will or won't be involved and if there are any tie-ins to the existing undergraduate health major (and the rationale for either case).

Another topic on which the report is silent is possible external funding for a school of public health. It seems that the authors might know something of the availability of grant or gift money in support of research and training in the health sciences, and a brief summary of that knowledge would be helpful to the average reader. Do the authors know anything about potential fund raising for a School of Public Health? They may not, but if they do, it would help to have it stated in the report. Do the authors have any opinions about the possibility of creating soft-money positions to lower the number of needed hard-money FTE?

Several other senate committees note that many successful schools of public health have access to a nearby school of medicine. Is the proposed school designed to fit a niche that does not require a school of medicine? If not, what steps should be taken to improve the probability of success without needing a school of medicine?

In summary, it was a good pre-proposal that we think could be improved without a significant change in content or approach. We hope that the proposers will be able to address the above comments, as well as the general questions numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 on CPB's question list.