



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)

Erith Jaffe-Berg, Chair
erithj@ucr.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

February 15, 2023

UC MERCED DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

Dear Merced Divisional Council,

As requested, CCGA has conducted an informal review of UC Merced's proposed Ernest & Julio Gallo School of Management.

Attached is the Lead Reviewer's report, which fully describes the committee's findings about the proposal.

After careful consideration and a vote, CCGA believes that UC Merced should move forward with a formal pre-proposal for this School. However, there are important issues to be resolved both at the campus level and as part of the system-wide review, and the committee strongly recommends that the questions and concerns raised in the Lead Reviewer's report be taken into account in the development of a formal pre-proposal. As the Lead Reviewer states, the approval of the Gallo School is not certain, and there are significant issues to address before pursuing a formal pre-proposal. One of the main concerns expressed by UCM faculty is that the creation of the Gallo School could potentially harm the School of Social Science, Humanities, and the Arts (SSHA) by removing key departments and faculty from the School. The CCGA emphasizes that a resolution of this issue will be essential for developing a successful pre-proposal.

There are potential benefits to further pursuing this proposal, and the CCGA encourages the proposers to work with all campus constituents to address the concerns raised before pursuing the next step in this consultative process.

Thank you for consulting with CCGA.

Sincerely,

Erith Jaffe-Berg
CCGA Chair

c: Susan Cochran, Academic Senate Chair
James Steintrager, Academic Senate Vice Chair
CCGA Members
Fatima Paul, UCM Senate Executive Director

Melanie Snyder, UCM Senate Analyst
Sang Lee, UCM Senate Analyst



To: Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
From: Andrew T. Fisher, Lead Reviewer (UCSC GC Chair)
Date: 2/3/23
Re: Review/report on pre-proposal for creation of the Ernest & Julio Gallo School of Management at UC Merced

Summary

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) recommends that UC Merced (UCM) proponents of establishing the Ernest & Julio Gallo School of Management (Gallo School) at UC Merced proceed with a formal pre-proposal. There are important issues to be resolved both at the campus level and as part of system-wide review, and preparation and review of a pre-proposal will help with resolving these and pointing to a path forward. CCGA notes that approval of formation of the Gallo School is not certain; we view this as a high-risk/high-reward proposition. Nevertheless, there is enough potential benefit for UCM and the UC system to justify moving to the next step in this consultative process.

Background

CCGA is reviewing an *informal* pre-proposal from UCM to create the Ernest & Julio Gallo School of Management. The new school would combine four existing UCM departments: Cognitive and Information Sciences (CIS), Economics and Business Management (EBM), Management of Complex Systems (MCS), and Political Science (POLI), and would initially offer six majors, five minors, and nine graduate programs.

The document under review by CCGA is a *revised and informal* pre-proposal (dated March 2022), which was crafted in response to reviews of an initial, *informal* pre-proposal. The Gallo School is intended to "...understand and improve the management of resources and institutions in nature and society." The Gallo School will seek to "combine ... cognition, decision-making, economics, policy, and management with technology and engineering, with information and data science, with environmental and sustainability science, and with equity and social justice..." and to "... [focus] on management of resources and institutions in nature and society in the Central Valley through both deep disciplinary and broad cross-disciplinary education and research."

It is emphasized that, although the four key departments that would form the Gallo School are varied in terms of disciplinary focus, they use "... similar methods, including observation, experimentation, conceptual models and qualitative analytics, large-scale data analytics, and computational modeling and simulation." The Gallo School is proposed to offer a mix of academic and professional degree programs, and will be a "non-traditional management school that is unique, valuable, forward-looking, and self-sustaining." In addition, it is proposed that the Gallo School will "...increase disciplinary diversity of educational programs and demonstrate ... clear commitment to promoting sustainable growth, equity and social justice, and faculty diversity."

Materials and Reviews

CCGA and external reviewers looked at three main document packages:

- Pre-proposal revision, March 2022, with appendices and cover memo from Paul Maglio
- Compiled individual and faculty group comments
- Compiled comments from Senate committees and School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
- Response from the Gallo School Planning Team to comments from last round of reviews

Reviews were solicited over a two-month period from eleven academics from within and outside the UC System. Those who agreed to review were provided with links for the main proposal document (83 pages), which was to be the focus of review, and to the proposal appendices and responses from last round of review. Some potential reviewers asked for time to check the documents before they would agree to review them.

Most of those asked declined to provide a review, but four individuals eventually agreed. However, only two of these turned in reviews as of this date. The others were prompted multiple times but have not submitted their comments. CCGA decided that two reviews would be enough for this *informal* assessment, and it was best to provide feedback now rather than waiting and/or soliciting more reviews.

Reviewers have expertise in key areas, one from within UC and one from outside the system:

Reviewer 1 – inside UC system

Professor of Environmental Studies and former chair of Engineering department

University of California, Santa Cruz

MBA, PhD (Energy and Resources)

Expertise in fresh water policy, renewable energy policy, political economy

Reviewer 2 – outside UC system

Professor and Administrator with O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Indiana University

PhD (Economics)

Expertise in tax policy, healthcare, income inequity

Following instructions in the "UC Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes," reviewers were asked to comment particularly on three main topics (leaving financial assessment to UCPB):

(a) Academic rigor

(b) Need for the program

(c) Fit within the UC system and/or other programs

In addition, reviewers were asked to focus specifically on graduate programs, curriculum, and degrees.

The two reviewers were broadly supportive of formation of the Gallo School, with comments such as these:

Rev1

- "The School has proposed an important and compelling theme ...which is to understand and improve the management of resources and institutions in nature and society, with a specific interest in understanding and designing complex human-natural systems."
- "The program fits within the UC system because it draws upon cutting-edge research ... to develop insights for system management, and translates those insights into curriculum for undergraduate and graduate programs."
- "...goals and themes of the Gallo School are worthy ones and should be pursued to the extent possible.."

Rev2

- " Overall, I view the structure and programs of the proposed Gallo School to be generally reasonable and well thought out..."
- "...the school will fit well within both the UC system and higher education writ large."
- "I have no question about the academic rigor of any of [the] programs. In addition, the sizes of the programs all seem reasonable and the placements of students are good, suggesting that there is both student demand and a societal need for these programs."

Both reviewers praised the mix of departments and programs, and saw synergies and opportunities in bringing them together under a single school. Still, there were concerns expressed about particular aspects of the Gallo School vision, structure, and degrees to be offered.

Rev1 noted that only one of the existing PhD programs (MCS) is currently well-aligned with the stated goals for the school. The other PhD programs are described in the pre-proposal as "distinct," but at present are relatively traditional and disciplinary in nature. Rev1 suggests that "The Gallo School creates an opportunity to expand on the MCS/MIST Ph.D. program, and to build new avenues through the existing PhD programs that are consistent with the themes of the School. There could be two kinds of PhDs that would be distinctive to the School. One would be the flagship MCS/MIST PhD...[and the other]...could emerge from the three more disciplinary PhD programs...[based on] pathways involving coursework, QE, committee composition, and dissertation requirements that connect them with the goals of the School."

Rev1 also notes that "[t]he proposed one-year Master's in Data Science and Analytics ...may be overpromising what the students can learn in one year." He also suggests that "[t]he Gallo School should consider offering an MBA consistent with its theme, and expresses enthusiasm for envisioned Master of Parks and Land Management and Master of Engineering Management degrees.

Rev2 is satisfied that the academic graduate degrees programs are reasonable in scope, size, and rigor, but has some concerns about professional degrees. He suspects that the market for the Master of Management (MM) degree may be limited, in part because of the cross-sector design. Rev2 notes that it is more common for management programs to have separate degrees for those with interests in private sector and public sector career paths (MBA versus MPA/MPP), and in

his school there are specific tracks that focus on specific market sectors (e.g., Nonprofits, Local Government, etc.). Thus it might be that the MM degree program could be strengthened with development of similar, sector-based tracks, or perhaps it is worth considering an MPA/MPP degree program.

Rev2 is also surprised that, given the diverse nature of the departments in the new school, there are not plans to develop cross-department programs. This is similar to Rev1's concern that the PhD programs in EBM, CIS, and POLI don't appear to be especially novel or aligned with overall priorities and vision for school. Rev2 wonders if there should be a PhD program in Public Policy, drawing from faculty and curriculum in multiple departments.

Additional Considerations

In addition to these two reviews from outside of CCGA, the committee examined the comments from individual and faculty groups, and from senate committees and the School of Social Science, Humanities, and Arts (SSHA), as well as responses from the Gallo School Planning Team (with questions and criticisms grouped and responded to by topic). Among these concerns, perhaps the most significant is the question of whether it makes sense to form a new school rather than an institute or ORU or interdisciplinary program. One issue is the nature of the gift that helped to stimulate this planning process, which is specifically designated as being for formation of a School of Management. Proponents also argue that the creation of a new school will help to develop innovative programs that span disciplines, and to raise the profile of the venture. There is concern expressed by UCM colleagues that creation of the Gallo School would harm the rest of the SSHA because it would remove key departments and faculty, and a majority of faculty polled who are in SSHA and not part of the Gallo School have an unfavorable opinion of creating the Gallo School. Proponents note that the revised pre-proposal includes some years of budgetary transfer to help ease impacts, but it is not clear how this would address shifts in intellectual resources from SSHA to the Gallo School. These are issues best resolved at the campus level – this will be essential for developing a successful pre-proposal.

There are also concerns about creating a "non-traditional" management school, and with the eclectic mix of programs and disciplines that would be linked within the new school. The proponents argue that these are virtues of the enterprise, rather than problems to be solved, but critics raise questions about why some departments were included and not others, and whether the Gallo School would have the depth and breadth of expertise needed to achieve stated goals. There may be no optimal mix of departments in a venture like this one, and a case can be made in support of departments that decide to unite towards achieving ambitious goals. Rather than finding the perfect mix of programs or individuals, it may make sense to proceed with the development, and consider changes to departmental makeup of the school in the future.

CCGA Recommendation

The external reviews were largely positive, and CCGA considers the overall concept to be viable as a high-risk/high-reward enterprise. Bringing diverse, existing departments together to form a new school could result in innovation that stimulates new ways of solving societal problems, attracts outstanding students and faculty, and helps to garner resources. Alternatively (or at the same time), this venture could divert energy and funds and cause disruption for other

departments and programs. Proponents make the case that the Gallo School would be something new for UCM and the UC system, and this offers an opportunity worth considering carefully.

These and other issues should be explored and solutions offered as part of a formal pre-proposal to create the Gallo School, and CCGA encourages moving forward with the next step in this process. Some of the complaints about the *informal* pre-proposal note a lack of specificity; this can be addressed with a formal pre-proposal, as can engagement more broadly with the UCM community. The formal pre-proposal should address important questions raised by the reviewers, including the decision to not offer an MBA, whether the MM degree is too general, what kind of interdisciplinary PhD degrees could be offered, and if an MPA/MPP degree might be of value. It would also help to explain how inter-department collaboration on graduate degrees and curriculum could help to create value that goes above and beyond that provided by the four departments as they currently operate. The pre-proposal will benefit from a clearer explanation of specific ways in which innovation will flow from creation of the new school. A strong case needs to be made that the benefits of creating a new school are greater than the sum of the four founding departments, and will exceed costs and disruptions that would be associated with relocating departments from existing schools. Overall, CCGA considers this to be a high-risk/high reward opportunity, and encourages proponents to address key criticisms, resolve campus issues, and present a more detailed and nuanced plan for advancing the Gallo School concept. Whether or not this proceeds will depend on what proponents submit and how this fares through a more extensive review process.