



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

August 16, 2022

To: Gregg Camfield, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost

From: Divisional Council (DivCo)

Re: Pre-proposal for a Gallo School of Management

Dear EVC/Provost Camfield,

Divisional Council received feedback from several Senate Committees, the SSHA Executive Committee, numerous departments, and individual faculty from across the campus regarding the pre-proposal for the establishment of a Gallo School of Management at UC Merced. The Council met twice to discuss options, and at this time chooses to neither endorse nor object to the pre-proposal as currently written.

Faculty feedback on the Gallo School pre-proposal highlighted substantive issues around the structure, identity and resources of the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) that go far beyond the scope of what the Gallo School proposers should be expected to address. In the absence of a broader campus consensus about the future structure and resourcing of SSHA and other existing Schools, Divisional Council is concerned about the prospects for successfully advancing any new school proposals through the systemwide approval process. In order to both address the need for a dispassionate assessment of the merits of the Gallo pre-proposal itself and the need to broker that broader consensus on the structure and resourcing of our campus, Divisional Council negotiated with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to secure an objective third-party review of the Gallo pre-proposal, while declining to either endorse or reject the Gallo pre-proposal at this time. Simultaneously, we are writing to you as our campus leadership to request that the Administration take an active role in addressing the concerns of faculty who are not in departments planning to move to the Gallo School or another new School (such as a potential School of Public Health).

We recognize and appreciate your aggressive moves to stabilize and rebuild our capacity to service the campus' research and teaching missions by authorizing a large number of new and rehire staff FTE, while dedicating significant resources to improving the new Oracle financial system and to streamline and expedite procedures for purchasing. These efforts will take time to come to fruition however, and faculty have legitimate concerns as they struggle to administer their grants and deliver instruction. It also seems evident, apart from more recent issues arising from high staff turnover and the Oracle implementation, that SSHA services have not been equitably supported. On top of this, the potential migration of a significant number of students, and also faculty with successful track records in obtaining external research sponsorship, highlights the potential vulnerability of some programs in SSHA to impacts on their instructional budget as the campus transitions to a new instructional budget model. We believe it is

imperative that the campus Administration make concrete commitments on mutually agreed metrics of service quality over specified time frames, as well as commitments on minimum staffing levels for each school, and help to lead a structured, facilitated dialogue on a vision for the future structure and identity of SSHA that includes a commitment to its financial sustainability.

The departments developing the Gallo pre-proposal have worked hard and in good faith to develop a proposal that they think furthers the missions of the campus while also honoring commitments to the Gallo donors. Many of the issues that are highlighted in the feedback from the broader faculty go well beyond the scope of the proposal however, and indicate that the campus' academic and strategic planning process, as well as the resource allocations, staffing and service models needed to support the objectives of those plans, have not kept pace with the needs of our growing campus. Faculty in SSHA—as well as the campus community more broadly—have legitimate concerns about the future allocation of resources, the provision of support services, and the identity, focus and future growth prospects for SSHA or its replacement(s), and how these will align with plans for new Schools such as in the Gallo pre-proposal or a potential School of Public Health. Divisional Council and the Senate faculty more broadly stand ready to engage in the necessary dialogue to support equitable, balanced growth across the campus to meet our 2030 objectives.

Given the resource constraints UC Merced has faced since its founding, it is regrettable that we have not been able to make full use of the Gallo gift and matching funds for the last two decades. Unlocking these funds and successfully meeting our commitments to the donors could help the campus meet its objectives while reassuring future donors that UC Merced is a reliable partner. Charting a path forward requires strong leadership from our Deans and Administration, transparency about funding and priorities, and clear resource commitments to support the development of all our Schools.

Cc: Divisional Council
Chancellor Muñoz
Associate Chancellor and Sr. Advisor Putney
Sr. Advisor and Chief of Staff Richards
Assistant EVC/Provost Martin (Assessment and Planning)
Assistant EVC/Provost Butler (Finance and Administration)

Enclosures (provided as Box links):

- [Gallo Pre-proposal](#) (PDF is bookmarked)
- [Results of Faculty Poll](#)
- [Appendix A](#) - Highlights of Faculty Concerns
- [Appendix B](#) – Individual and Faculty Groups' Comments
- [Appendix C](#) – Senate Committees and SSHA Executive Committee Comments