

Some Notes on the Gallo School Pre-proposal Review

Paul P. Maglio

The campus reviews of the pre-proposal are rather extensive and unwieldy, and may be somewhat difficult to follow. Nevertheless, I think some things are clear:

Central Concerns

Two key areas of concern in the reviews were resource needs (and competition for resources) and intellectual territory (and competition for use of specific words/topics and on disciplinary rather than interdisciplinary perspectives).

To address this, we will continue to work closely with the Provost's office to clarify the campus's commitment to providing resources (and timing) for the proposed Gallo School. We need to demonstrate that we are not "playing a zero-sum game" - the Provost will need to help us clearly articulate this.

Regarding intellectual territory, no doubt we will need to describe more comprehensively how our connection to campus pillars of strength is appropriate. It is not reasonable and not in the campus's interests to maintain that cross-cutting terms - labels like "sustainability", "data science", or "social justice" - are owned by particular departments or existing schools.

Review Process

As this was the first new School proposal on the campus, policies surrounding review were not clear. Specifically, the Senate and the Schools established inconsistent and opaque review processes that did not allow the proposal team (and faculty in proposed Gallo departments) to participate effectively.

To address this, we will help the Senate establish clear and consistent campus-wide processes for review that does not consider actions by anyone associated with the plan as necessarily conflicted and actions by those not associated with the plan as necessarily not conflicted. We are all in the same boat. It will be important for the Senate to drive a re-review process centrally, consistently, and openly - allowing all stakeholders opportunity for input in a collegial and effective environment.

We hope we can work well with the Senate to improve the processes for the next round of review.

COVID Context

The COVID situation created a very challenging political environment, predisposing individuals (with little time to read and review our materials appropriately) toward emotional and negative reactions.

Obviously, COVID has made our job more difficult. Remote operations have made a normal political process based on both organized and casual interactions very difficult. And COVID has created a brittle and less than supportive climate in general.

We believe that much of the political work will need to be done **after** we return to more normal campus operations (presumably in Fall).