

July 3, 2017

**Michelle Yetman**

Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, Graduate School of Management

**RE:** Proposed B.S. in Business Administration

Dear Michelle:

The proposal for a B.S. in Business Administration was forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Nine committees responded: Undergraduate Council (UGC), Planning and Budget (CPB), Graduate Council, and the Faculty Executive Committees (FECs) of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Engineering, the College of Letters and Science, the School of Law, and the School of Medicine.

In accordance with Undergraduate Council, the Davis Division does not approve the proposal at this time. While there is interest in and support for having a business major at UC Davis, the most serious concerns about this proposal, as UGC explains in depth, relate to “the resources that would be required to implement the very ambitious program...including financial costs and needs for classroom space and TAs.” UGC also expressed secondary concerns about cannibalization, potential major impaction, the designation of the major as a B.S. versus a B.A., the large number of upper division units proposed (64), and the academic, interdisciplinary value of the proposed major to undergraduate students.

The Davis Division agrees with the two requirements UGC set forth for any revised proposals: “1) documented evidence of support from the administration, and concurrence from CPB, that the proposal is fiscally responsible and sustainable and will not have any negative financial impacts on other academic units on campus; and 2) documented evidence that concerns about potential negative programmatic effects on other units offering related academic programs have been satisfactorily addressed.” The Davis Division will not review any future proposals that do not address these two components.

I know this is disappointing for those who have worked diligently on a substantial proposal and who are eager to more fully participate in undergraduate teaching. It is worth noting that some of the concerns are due to shifting budgetary and growth situations that emerged after the submission of the proposal but while it was under consideration, which complicates the proposal’s use of earlier growth projections (i.e. the 2020 Initiative as originally conceived). One primary issue is the Regents’ recent decision to limit the enrollment of non-resident/international students to 18% on the Davis campus, which will place severe constraints on economically responsible growth.

Given the real potential for subdued growth in our undergraduate population, chances are increased that any new major projecting a large growth trajectory would redirect students from other majors. In the economics of the current budget model, this would create problems for any major so affected. In addition, while it may be reasonable to assume 30% enrollment of non-resident students in a typical business major, given the Regents’ cap on UC Davis, non-resident students would come from a fixed pool that would effectively shift them from other parts of campus. And though there will continue to be a period of FTE growth, given the slowdown of the next cycle of HIP hiring as a part of the 2017-2018 budget framework, the projected growth in faculty FTE in GSM over the time scale delineated in the proposal seems untenable, especially since the formulaic structure of the budget model is already so contested by various constituencies.

As another important note, the campus recently undertook a substantial exercise to evaluate its upper division major requirements at the request of the Office of the President as a part of the Budget Framework Initiative with Governor Brown. Majors were expected to provide significant justification for any upper division requirements beyond 45 units, to ensure that all course requirements continue to be relevant and to remove any impediments to timely degree completion. While the Graduate School of Management did not engage in this process, any new proposals it puts forth should take into account this context in addition to the financial concerns above.

While this outcome will certainly be frustrating to those who see the absence of a traditional business major as lost potential, whether for the absence of a more comprehensive curriculum or the loss of visibility to potential students and donors, the reality is that the discussion regarding a more visible business major has been a long, contentious conversation on this campus. While the major as presented fits the expectations of traditional business majors, if we ever move forward with a new proposal we should look carefully at breaking down departmental silos so as to imagine a more nimble, interdisciplinary degree for the 21<sup>st</sup> century—something unique that reflects the values and strengths of UC Davis.

Again, I want to thank the Graduate School of Management for its continued interest in teaching undergraduate students. In addition, I would like to note that I, in my capacity as vice chair, have led this consultation for the Davis Division because of Chair Goodhue's affiliation with the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

If you have any questions, please reach out to me at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Jon D. Rossini  
Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Associate Professor, Theatre and Dance

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

- c: H. Rao Unnava, Dean, Graduate School of Management
- Brad M. Barber, Associate Dean and Gallagher Professor of Finance, Graduate School of Management
- James Kelly, Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration, Graduate School of Management
- Charles Gabriel Coleman, Assistant Director, Academic Operations and Planning, Graduate School of Management
- Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate