

September 8, 2008

**BARBARA HORWITZ, INTERIM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST**

Dear Barbara:

I am writing in response to your November 2007 request to provide a five-year academic plan for the School of Education (SOE). Though you have asked that the plan include two different planning scenarios (steady state and modest growth), the SOE is in the unusual position of having received campus resources (budget, faculty FTE, space, and so forth) in anticipation of its planned growth and impact in our region. Thus, the plan we are submitting – along with the five-year enrollment plan that you have also requested (dated September 2, 2008, and sent to you under separate cover) – elaborates upon SOE planning priorities, programmatic needs, faculty workload projections, and resource challenges and opportunities. Our planning effort has included extensive consultation during the 07-08 year with SOE faculty, including the School's Faculty Executive Committee.

As you are aware, the School of Education (SOE) is about to begin its seventh year, and has enjoyed remarkable growth and strong achievements. The SOE is both a professional school that offers teaching credentials and the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), and a graduate-level research institution that offers both Masters and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees. We also have a strong, and growing, undergraduate program, including a minor. The different audiences we must serve put a large instructional burden on our faculty, both ladder and non-ladder. In addition, engagement with public education is essential to our mission – and success – a fact that also puts service burdens on faculty and staff beyond what might be considered normal for most academic units. Finally, we have made great strides in developing a strong research component and have been quite successful in attracting federal, state, and foundation support for our scholarly work. Our endowment has grown from virtually nothing 7 years ago to nearly \$2M today.

As a faculty and staff, we are working to refine our Vision and Mission for the SOE. Currently they read as follows:

VISION: Working for the individual fulfillment of all learners through public education.

MISSION: Marshal the knowledge and resources of the world's top public university to effect and support change in schools. We train and mentor high quality teachers who serve as advocates for all learners. We engage in research and policy analysis focused on student outcomes. We forge partnerships and collaborations that make a difference in students' lives today and tomorrow, and we offer interdisciplinary programs that position our graduates to provide leadership and insight into the greatest challenges facing educators around the world.

The SOE reflects in microcosm the University's tri-partite mission of discovery, learning, and engagement; but it does so in several distinctive ways. For example, to fulfill its *professional* responsibilities, the School must find ways of integrating its instructional activities with forms of research and public service that have the potential to help improve schools. As another example, to ensure that School contributions are sensitive to the changing complexities of education in California and the nation, the School needs to support long-term partnerships with practicing educators, state agencies, other institutions of higher education and individual elementary and secondary schools. Because the School prepares professionals in education, it also has a special responsibility to model, in its own programs, forms of pedagogy and assessment that are well informed by educational theory, research, and inquiry.

The faculty of the SOE has adopted three broad-based principles to guide its ongoing academic planning.

First, to preserve and enhance its role as an institution that values innovative approaches in connecting educational research to practice, the School must continue to support the full range of its essential academic and professional outreach programs. Given its institutional mission and resources, these programs currently include graduate study, professional preparation of teachers and school leaders, undergraduate education, and cooperative research and multi-faceted services for schools, community colleges, and other educational institutions. Integration of these program functions is essential to the integrity of the School and to its prospects for success.

Second, to function as a truly campus-wide enterprise, the School must work to coordinate its own programs with resources and initiatives of other units on the Davis campus. This can occur naturally for some programs, for example ethnic studies units and other departments in the social sciences where faculty are often engaged in exploring the impacts of culture, ethnicity, race, class, and the like on educational practices. The extraordinary science resources of the Davis campus provide great opportunities for the School to further strengthen and broaden its own programs in science, mathematics, and agricultural education. The School is also committed to the growing emphasis on the campus on the mind sciences, and forging explicit connections with the M.I.N.D. Institute.

Finally, the School must be engaged in a continuing appraisal of its permanent financial resources and seek to balance ongoing programmatic needs with the flexibility to initiate new programs as warranted by demand, faculty interest, and conformity with the School's mission. The School will also explore additional sources of revenue to support its academic, scholarly, and outreach objectives.

In keeping with its Land Grant heritage - and the University's tripartite mission for discovery, learning, and engagement - the Davis campus must play a leadership role in helping to improve the learning conditions in the state's PreK-12 schools and community colleges and the connections between primary, secondary, and tertiary education. This role must be multi-faceted and draw on the full resources of the Davis campus. Partnering with others both on and off-campus we have created a public charter middle/high school in West Sacramento and an early childhood education center/preschool in the Oak Park neighborhood of Sacramento. Both school settings further our mission of research and service.

Similarly, the SOE must give serious attention to the preparation of new teachers, as well as educational leaders for change, new educational researchers, and teacher educators. Attention must also be given to developing new educational curricula and program interventions, new assessment strategies, innovative research in high-need areas, and new forms of institutional collaboration.

At a minimum, the SOE must be engaged in the following, high priority activities:

- The preparation of the future professoriate for the field of education.
- The preparation of new teacher education faculty.
- The training of educational researchers.
- The preparation and credentialing of new teachers.
- The preparation of educational leaders for educational institutions.
- The continuing professional development of teachers and other professional educators.
- The education of UC Davis undergraduates (through our undergraduate program and minor) to become informed advocates for powerful learning communities in schools and beyond, and to develop an understanding of the issues, challenges, and opportunities of public and private education.
- The evaluation, and dissemination of innovative educational programs and models, including models of preparing educational professionals.
- The analysis of existing public educational policy and the examination of new, research-based policy measures.
- The use of research and theory to define and frame educational problems so they may be addressed appropriately and effectively.
- The creation of innovative learning environments.

Growth Scenario

Without question, the SOE has been on a strong growth trajectory. Over the last seven years we have grown from 11 ladder faculty in 2001 to 23.5 today (including three retirements and three other separations), with open provisions allowing us to grow to 29.5 faculty, and a commitment from the University to add five additional FTE (thus, a total of 34.5 FTE) upon establishing – and meeting – campus-approved enrollment targets. We anticipate one retirement in the coming year and 2 – 3 additional retirements in the 3 - 5 year timeframe. Over the years we have worked with the provost and with the Office of Resource Management and Planning to develop a core budget and staffing ratio for the School. And, of course, we are scheduled to occupy AOB IV once the Graduate School of Management vacates it for new quarters.

We have added a large number of new students in our credential and graduate programs during this last seven years, and are actively pursuing strategies to increase our undergraduate teaching by ladder faculty. However, the overall student-faculty ratio (SFR) for ladder faculty is lower than is satisfactory. We are taking a number of measures to correct this, as discussed in greater detail in the five-year enrollment plan we have also submitted to your office. Also in that enrollment plan document is a discussion of methods that we plan to use to increase the SFR within our credential program. It is also clear that the School of Education's future is bound up with more undergraduate teaching by Senate faculty – a move the SOE faculty have embraced.

Current, and projected, SOE program enrollments are in Table 1 (below). Workload (SFR) projections are detailed in Table 2, and form a key metric to evaluate our success toward our growth objectives. All other details of program curricular changes to reflect both the intellectual interests of the faculty, the emerging directions of the education sub-fields within the SOE, and the needs for growth in student enrollments are contained in the September 2, 2008 enrollment plan document.

Table 1: Enrollment Summary

	Actual			Projected					% Change 5 years
	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	
Ph.D	68	84	83	88	98	112	133	133	+60%
JDPEL	11	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
CANDEL	20	33	50	64	67	72	72	72	+44%
M.A.	9	12	12	14	20	22	25	25	+108%
MAPT	--	--	4	7	11	15	17	17	325%
M.A./Cred ential	106	106	111	132	132	138	150	150	+35%
Subtotal Graduate	214	248	271	305	328	359	397	397	+47%
Credential	126	137	133	150	155	160	165	170	+28%
TOTAL	340	385	404	455	483	519	562	567	+40%
Undergrad FTES	160.97	160.52	168.44	175	185	195	205	215	+28%
Net UG FTES	136.08	130.21	143.8	145	154	163	172	181	+26%

Table 2: Workload (SFR) Projections

	Actual			Projected				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Ladder Faculty SFR	6.52	6.95	7.27	8.50	9.03	9.47	10	11.4
Non Ladder SFR	17.49	21.12	18.77	16.77	16	16	16	16

Each academic (and non-academic) program within the SOE has developed an academic/outreach plan that answers the following set of questions:

1. What is the mission of the program?
2. What is the intellectual core of the program?
3. How does the program identify and address critical needs of society, the State of California, and public schools in general?
4. How will the program articulate with other faculty and academic programs in the school, and faculty or programs elsewhere on campus?
5. How will the program connect with other units within the SOE to make significant contributions to practice and policy?
6. How will the program be distinctive, innovative, and of high quality?
7. What evidence or outcomes will be used to assess the quality of program offerings and scholarship?
8. What new initiatives and faculty expertise should the program have in place in the next five years?
9. What areas do not need to be continued, or will probably not be developed, in the near future?
10. What resource challenges and opportunities do you foresee for your program?

Challenges and Opportunities

Through this year-long, school-wide planning process, we have identified the following challenges and opportunities that have implications for our future resource needs:

Student Support: As with many graduate programs on campus, student support is not at the level we would like it to be. Although the large majority of our MA/Credential students are employed as classroom teachers during their enrollment in the MA portion of their program, GSR, fellowship, and TA support are important to those students who are not employed. MA students compete with doctoral students for GSR and TA opportunities, and there are not sufficient opportunities for either program. In contrast to campus units that offer large undergraduate majors, the School of Education offers a relatively small undergraduate minor; hence, TA opportunities in Education are relatively limited.

As typical of a professional school, many of our PhD students are older than beginning PhD students in other fields, are more established in their careers, and have broader family responsibilities. This combination of factors often results in greater financial pressures and needs for our students, and makes it more difficult for the SOE to find the necessary financial support for them while they are enrolled with us. Block grant, GSR, and TA funds to support the recruitment and retention of these students will have to increase. As our faculty numbers have grown, so has our extramural research funding that will provide GSR opportunities.

This will continue. Similarly, as our undergraduate program grows, we will be able to offer more TA opportunities for graduate students. We also anticipate creating structured research apprenticeship opportunities (with stipends) with leading policymaking organizations; our proximity to Sacramento makes this a particularly distinctive element of, and opportunity for, parts of our doctoral program. Finally, student support is among the highest of our fundraising priorities, for which we have enjoyed modest success to date.

Staff Support: The need for staff support for a variety of purposes is common to all areas, academic and non-academic, within the School. However, over the last year, and continuing, we have added some critical staff positions, particularly in our business office and development. We have highly competent new employees in academic personnel, instructional support, contracts and grants, events management, and space planning. In general, many of the support shortcomings of the past are on their way to being rectified. More will need to be done in the future, as our budget allows.

Faculty Growth: All of our programmatic emphasis areas but one report the need for additional faculty hires to advance, and round out, their programs, attract graduate students, participate in the expansion of our undergraduate program, and address broad educational needs of both California and the nation. There is general agreement, however, that, given anticipated retirements and the eventual release of all positions committed to the SOE, we have enough capacity in the next five years to do necessary faculty hiring. We are not requesting additional FTE at this point.

Space: We anticipate moving into AOB IV in the early part of 2010, once the GSM's new quarters are completed. We do also anticipate, however, that the SOE will have partially outgrown even the additional space provided by the AOB IV facility when we move. This shortage is due, of course, to our ongoing growth in faculty, students, and research (including the requirement for space for restricted data and computer software). We hope to continue to occupy additional temporary space on campus until we can raise the necessary funds to build a satellite facility on the AOB IV site. This is an active part of our development plan.

In closing, the School of Education is a vibrant unit on the Davis campus. We recognize and, of course, share the difficulties that current economic and budget conditions have created for the academic enterprise. The SOE's challenge – and it is a good and desirable one – is to achieve the promise that the campus held for us when we were created, and for which resources were committed. I look forward to discussing this plan with you, the Senate, and others in the coming months.

Sincerely,

Harold G. Levine
Dean—School of Education

/lkb

c: AVC Ratliff
FEC Chair Carter Ching
Associate Dean Heckman