




## PLANNING & BUDGET

March 9, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Christian Shelton, Chair   
Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: Revised proposal for a new Master's degree in Supply Chain and Logistics Management

The Committee on Planning & Budget discussed the revised proposal for a new Master's degree in Supply Chain and Logistics Management at their February 27, 2018 meeting.

This revised proposal is much improved from the previous version; the committee thanks SoBA for addressing our previous concerns.

P&B had two remaining concerns. First, the proposed degree would be more expensive than other surveyed degrees. In particular, according to the proposal, USC charges approximately \$46K, while the proposed UCR degree would take seven additional courses (over the same period of time) and cost \$64K. MIT's degree is priced similarly to UCR's, but takes six months fewer. The proposal does state that UCR's degree costs less per course, and the proposal does make a case that there is market demand for such degrees in general. However, it is not obvious if the market will support the degree at UCR, when compared with a less expensive and less intensive degree from elsewhere. While the committee commended the increased rigor of the degree compared to alternatives, the committee would have liked to see a direct market demand survey to judge the economic feasibility.

The committee also noted that a marketing budget had been removed from the proposal; yet this might be necessary given other universities' offerings.

Second, and more minor, some of the text could be reworked to be more recent or accurate:

- The information on page 20 appears to be out-of-date. It mentions \$25,000 for marketing. It also states that the program "can leverage the staff support of the existing MBA and other Masters programs" which is not allowed without compensation. This wording should be removed or clarified.

- On page 1 "Management" (in the title) is misspelled.

- Page 5 has some outdated numbers, including the McKinsey & Company study and the "Big Data market" information at the end of the third full paragraph.

Overall, the committee appreciated the improvements in the proposal since the last revision, and voted 8-1-0 in favor of moving the proposal forward, but would encourage changes to address the points above.