

UCEP GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING PROPOSED SCHOOLS June 2023

UCEP will arrange for at least one internal reviewer to review materials submitted by the Office of the President. The reviewer should comment primarily on the academic aspects of the proposed school with attention to undergraduate students. The Compendium Review Criteria are provided below in italics with a link to the full document. Guidance for UCEP review is included following the relevant Compendium text.

Establishment of New Schools and Colleges from the [UC Compendium \(2014, pp. 18-19\)](#)

Categories of Review

Every proposal and corresponding Senate review should address each of the following categories of review defined in the [UC Compendium](#):

- 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.*

UCEP Required Submission of Materials

Submitted materials should include both the formal proposal and all memos from relevant administrators, and faculty and student committees at the UC campus and UCOP levels. All proposals and memos from previous Senate reviews of the proposed school must be included as well.

Criteria for Review by UCEP

The following are a set of questions and criteria UCEP reviewers might consider as they review proposed schools.

A. Rigor

A1. Is the proposed degree program of high academic rigor? Is the proposed undergraduate curriculum of sufficient quality, depth, and breadth? Are GE/breadth requirements appropriately integrated into the course of study? Has the proposed school considered how its course offerings for students whose majors are not part of the school will be served by its formation (has the school identified service courses that will attract students in a broad range of majors)? Has there been adequate attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the selection and organization of courses? Will all students graduate with the knowledge and skills needed to successfully pursue a career or graduate degree?

A2. Are online courses identified and integrated into the courses of study in ways that support their academic rigor? Is there an online component to the various courses of study and has that component been effectively integrated into them? What percentage of required courses for each course of study are online? For these online courses, what percentage of each course will include synchronous and/or asynchronous components? Have campus resources to assist faculty in developing and evaluating these courses been identified? Have campus resources to assist students in enrolling in and completing online courses been identified?

- A3. Is the advising and mentoring system robust?** Will undergraduates be adequately supported in understanding the purpose and scope of the new school? Will undergraduates be able to make sufficient progress toward their degree?
- A4. Is there evidence of adequate consultation with faculty, administrators, and committees from this and other UC campuses?** Have other faculty, administrators, and UC-systemwide committees been consulted in the design of the new school? Has their input been adequately integrated into the proposed structure and programs of the school? In particular, how have stakeholders from other units that could be impacted by the proposed school been consulted and how has their feedback been integrated into the school's proposed design?
- A5. Is there evidence of adequate consultation with students at this campus?** Have students been consulted in the design of the new school? Has their input been adequately integrated into the proposed structure and programs of the school? Will students benefit from the creation of this school in concrete ways? In particular, how will students' access to buildings, interactions with faculty, and enrollment in courses be both positively and negatively impacted?
- A6. Are there mechanisms in place to identify and correct potential pitfalls with the proposed school?** What are potential pitfalls to the new proposed school? How does the school plan to correct these pitfalls?
- A7. Is there a process to review and revise the proposed school moving forward?** Does the proposal include a process for regular and timely reviews of the proposed school moving forward?

B. Financial Viability

- B1. Are full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty committed to teaching in the new school?** Have adequate provisions been made to ensure the school will be permanently staffed so as to fulfill the requirements of this proposal? Does the proposed school build on and enhance existing faculty's strengths? Will the faculty be able to adequately serve the undergraduates who enroll in the school? Will faculty's potentially increased teaching load and/or administrative responsibilities by participating in the new school lead to decreased engagement with undergraduates in other dimensions (e.g., negatively influence their ability to include undergraduates in their research)?
- B2. Is the proposed administrative structure of the new school adequate?** Who will be responsible for administrative oversight, curriculum development/approval, and staffing? Will the proposed school sit squarely within a single department, division, or college or will it be interdepartmental? How well will the proposed structure serve undergraduate students?
- B3. Will the school negatively impact existing schools on the campus?** Is there any danger that other schools at either or both the undergraduate and graduate levels might suffer because of faculty teaching in and/or moving to the proposed school? Will other schools be negatively affected by the number of staff, physical space, and amount of other resources needed for the new school? Will there be *competing demands* with other programs and offerings?

C. Need

C1. Is a compelling case made for a distinct need for the new school or college within the UC system? Does the proposal demonstrate that there is sufficient need at the societal, UC system, university, and student level for the new school? Does the proposal demonstrate that a sufficient need exists at the university level for the establishment of a new school rather than another administrative structure, such as a department? Is the proposed school's mission and rationale compelling? Does the proposed school's projected enrollment of undergraduates over time support its establishment?

D. Fit

D1. Does the proposal 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? Does the proposal include a description and comparison of similar schools at other UC campuses and competing universities? What is the *value added* both to the campus and to the UC system of this new school?