

## III.B. Schools and Colleges

### III.B.1. Establishment of New Schools and Colleges

The establishment of new schools or colleges represents a significant outlay of resources, and should be given careful consideration by campus administration, Divisional and systemwide Academic Senates, system-level administration, and ultimately, the Regents. In the face of limited state support for new endeavors, rigor in the reviews of proposed new schools and colleges is very important.

Establishing a new school or college is a two-step process and takes at least two years to complete. At least one year before submitting a full proposal, proponents of the new school must submit a pre-proposal first to the Divisional Academic Senate, and, if approved, subsequently to the systemwide Academic Senate and to system-level Administration.<sup>6</sup> Upon receipt by the systemwide Senate, the pre-proposal is reviewed by CCGA, UCEP, and the University Committee on Planning Budget (UCPB) as well as by any other systemwide standing committee selected by the Academic Council Chair. After campus proponents receive comments from both the systemwide Senate and system-level administration, the campus may prepare a full proposal. A full proposal is reviewed first by the Divisional Academic Senate and next (simultaneously) by systemwide Senate committees (CCGA, UCEP, UCPB, and any other chosen by the Academic Council Chair).

Approval of a new school or college requires favorable review by the systemwide Senate, review by designated state officials, approval recommendation by the President to the Board of Regents, and approval by the Board of Regents. If a campus fails to establish a new school or college within seven years of the date of Regental approval, it must submit a post-proposal. The post-proposal updates the original proposal and must provide a clear, compelling justification for the school or college in the context of a budgetary and curricular environment that may have changed since initial Regental approval.

#### Categories of Review

Every proposal and corresponding Senate review should address each of the following categories of review:

- A. **Academic Rigor:** The academic rigor of the proposed academic unit is of utmost importance. Equal weight should be placed on the academic merits of the program as on its financial aspects.
- B. **Financial Viability:** The proposal should stress the financial stability of the new school or college and should provide multi-year budgets with contingency plans in the event that proposed funding falls through. A detailed budget, including revenue sources, start-up costs, build-out costs, steady-state funding expectations, personnel costs, and capital costs/space needs must be provided. Failure to provide a detailed presentation and discussion of the budget will constitute cause for proposal rejection.
  - i. **FTE Requirements:** The proposal should clearly indicate the number of full-

time equivalent (FTE) faculty for each stage of development. This information should include the number of faculty FTEs needed at start-up, various stages of build-out, and steady-state. The balance between full-time faculty at various ranks and lecturers/other temporary or part-time teaching help also should be provided. The school's financial plan should detail how FTEs will be funded, including whether any faculty will be shared with other units. The need for FTEs in particular specialties should be articulated. The proposal should highlight both the amount of time and the resources needed to hire new FTEs.

- ii. **Capital Requirements:** All capital requirements must be carefully detailed and analyzed.
- iii. **Sources of Revenue:** All sources of revenue must be detailed, including state and philanthropic support. A development plan should be submitted as well.

**C. Need for the Program:** The proposal must clearly state and make the case for a distinct need for the new school or college within the UC system. Specifically, it should demonstrate: 1) a clear societal need for professionals, researchers, faculty, or academics in the field; 2) student demand for the new school or college; and 3) why societal need and student demand are not fully met by existing UC units and programs. In addition, the proposal should: i) define how the school or college will address this unmet need/demand; ii) articulate how it would attract qualified, fully-

competitive students; and iii) provide projections of employment opportunities for graduates of the new school or college. If UC already has a school or college of the same type as proposed, the proposal should include clear analysis of how the new entity would assume a necessary and perhaps even unique role in the University's systemwide academic program. Comparisons with existing UC units or other schools/colleges of the desired rank/academic distinction should be included.

**D. Fit within the UC system and within the segments:** The proposal should clearly articulate the fit of the school or college within the UC system as well as other public and private higher education segments in California. The proposal should stress how the new entity will fit within the overall academic profile of the campus—how it will enhance existing programs and how those programs will enhance the quality and development of the new school or college. The capital plan also should demonstrate how the proposal fits with the campus academic and strategic plans.

#### Overview of the Pre-Proposal

The Compendium requires a pre-proposal at least one year before the full proposal. The pre-proposal is separate from any documents that accompany the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*, and should address the categories of review noted above. Even though it will be shorter than the full proposal, it must contain sufficient detail to allow the Divisional and systemwide Senates to complete an initial evaluation of the proposed academic unit.

#### Details of the Pre-Proposal Process

1. If the proposed new school or college has not been listed on the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*, it should be added to the planning lists and a description drafted and

transmitted to the Provost at the time the campus begins to review the pre-proposal.

2. At least one year before a proposal for a new school or college is approved on the campus, a pre-proposal is submitted to the local Divisional Academic Senate. If the Divisional Senate approves the pre-proposal, the Chancellor submits it to the Provost, who forwards it to both Academic Affairs and the systemwide Academic Senate.
3. CCGA, UCEP, UCPB, and any other relevant committees selected by the Council Chair provide to the Academic Council formal comments on the pre-proposal.
4. UCOP Academic Affairs provides comments to the proponents of the new school or college with a copy to the Academic Council Chair. In addition and upon request, UCOP will provide the pre-proposal upon request to state officials and agency staff (e.g., Governor, Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst).
5. Academic Council's comments along with a cover letter from the Academic Council Chair will be sent to the proponents of the school or college with copies to the Provost and the Divisional Senate Chair.