

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Professional Schools at UCSC in the context of Growth & Enrollment Management

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Professional schools at UCSC: a brief history

The deep past

The campus has debated the question of whether and how to develop one or more professional schools at UCSC since well before the establishment of the Baskin School of Engineering in 1997. Indeed, the possibility of professional schools was present in the original 1962 Provisional Academic Plan for the campus. In the latest phase of this discussion, the campus has considered the option of professional schools in the context of rapid enrollment growth (“Tidal Wave II”) and its consequences, positive and negative, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Seeking to ensure that growth is coherently planned as well as systematically monitored (a position not against growth *per se* but for *smart* growth), the Academic Senate has endorsed the principle of conditions for growth (see [Campus Enrollment Growth and Infrastructure, January 2003, AS/SCP/1373](#)). The ultimate objective was to make future growth *conditional* on whether it would improve the campus. Of the conditions put in place, the campus has most vigorously pursued the goal of increasing graduate rather than undergraduate growth. This goal reflected a very rapid increase in freshman enrollments over a relatively short period of time to which the campus responded by working to increase the percentage of graduate enrollments (from 8.7 percent in 2003, the year when these conditions were put in place, to at least 15 percent).

The recent past

Most recently, at the Academic Senate meeting of May 30, 2007, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) recommended that the campus focus on developing metrics to assess the quality of undergraduate education and to address whether and to what extent educational quality is being maintained and improved, through two key measures: enrollment management and instructional capacity. ([Conditions & Strategies for Growth, May 2007, AS/SCP/1531](#)). As reported at the meeting, we need to make widely available data, gathered by program, department and division, in order to develop the precise mix of graduate students and programs (Ph.D. and M.A. /M.S., academic and professional) that will work best for the campus. A related, enrollment-management issue is that of graduate support in the form of increased Teaching Assistantships in order to protect the quality of undergraduate education while enhancing the graduate presence. Finally, given the overall trend of slower, more limited growth in UC enrollment as well as the local fact that UCSC has not met its enrollment targets for the past three years, we note that the increase to 15 percent graduate enrollment will not be on top of increases in freshman enrollment but rather in lieu of it.

Simultaneously, CPB was asked by the Administration to participate in campus planning for professional schools, which had, up to that point, largely taken place on an ad hoc basis (with a proposed School of Management receiving the greatest level of support

from the Administration and several other smaller efforts provided more limited support). CPB agreed, intending to ensure that any and all faculty interest in professional education would be considered on a level playing field with a comprehensive and transparent review process.

The present

Why professional schools now? We posed this question in an Academic Senate forum on professional schools in the fall (October 10, 2007) and offered a few preliminary responses. Professional schools are:

- A means of increasing graduate growth outside traditional academic M.A. /M.S. and Ph.D. programs.

In the last five years of focus on graduate growth, we have seen the number of new graduate programs increase, but neither the total number of graduate students nor the rate at which graduate programs have been brought online has kept pace with increases in undergraduate numbers. Professional schools provide access to another, different pool of students, in addition to those who enroll in academic programs.

- A means of linking undergraduate and graduate programs (in targeted areas such as Public Health and Business Economics).
- A means of building on and enhancing areas of campus strength.
- A means of meeting state needs for well-trained professionals in a variety of areas currently not covered by UCSC.
- A means of developing community ties around the region (including Monterey Bay area institutions and Silicon Valley).
- A means of responding to the systemwide priority of strengthening graduate education at UC ([see 2020 Enrollment Projections](#)).

At the October Senate forum, which was held in response to requests of both committees and members of the Senate and the Administration, presentations were made by several faculty groups, who described proposals at very different stages of development. A formal call was issued for pre-proposals from all faculty groups interested in developing professional schools. CPB established a timeline for the review of the pre-proposals and a set of criteria for evaluating them (see [CPB Guidelines/Principles/Criteria for review of professional school pre-proposals, December 19, 2007](#)).

Four pre-proposals were submitted at the beginning of this quarter for Schools of Education, Environment, Management, and Public Health. The CPB review process was designed to recognize the evident variability in the development of the proposals, their unevenness in funding and administrative support as well as in their stage of development. CPB will assess each proposal individually rather than competitively. Timelines for the development of the proposals will reflect their different stages of development as well as their potential benefits and risks. CPB's recommendations are advisory only; our assumption is that armed with this information, the faculty proposers will decide whether and how to move forward with their proposals.

The future

CPB is currently completing the review process, and the pre-proposals have been circulated to all Senate committees for comment. By the end of this quarter, our goal is to assess the viability and desirability of each proposal, to outline a timeline for next steps (short and long term) and the resources needed to support them. We are focusing on the risks and opportunities of the proposals we received, considering them individually and in the context of campus planning as a whole. The professional school option(s) cannot be a mere add-on, but rather must reflect and be incorporated into the overall direction of research and instruction at UCSC.

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

February 22, 2008