

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING**

January 15, 2008

The Committee on Long Range Planning met on the above date at Covell Commons, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Allen, Bugay, Dynes, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Preuss, and Schilling; Advisory member Brown

In attendance: Regent Varner, Regents-designate Scorza and Shewmake, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Hume, Executive Vice President Lapp, Vice President Sakaki, Chancellors Fox and Yang, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 2:05 p.m. with Committee Chair Schilling presiding.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2007 were approved.

**2. PLANNING PRIORITIES**

The President recommended adoption of the attached priority initiatives ([Attachment 1](#)) as a means of achieving the vision for the University.

The vision for the University was developed by the Long Range Guidance Team and discussed by the Committee at its meetings in September, October, and November 2007. The attached planning priorities have been assembled from the Regents' budget priorities, the report of the Long Range Guidance Team, and the Provost's systemwide academic planning and budget processes and have been reviewed by the Committee on Long Range Planning.

Provost Hume, with Vice Provost Greenstein, provided an update on the latest developments in planning. He distributed copies of a one-page synopsis ([Attachment 2](#)) of the University's long range planning priorities, sequenced to identify areas requiring discussion of essential strategic tradeoffs.

Provost Hume recalled that the goal was to identify and prioritize actions and initiatives that the University should pursue over the longer term to realize the vision articulated by the President's Long Range Guidance Team. The initiatives come from three sources. First, the Regents worked to identify budget priorities when the State faced its last fiscal crisis in 2003, and that was the basis of the benchmarking exercise done since that time. The second

was the work of the Long Range Guidance Team which President Dynes convened nearly three years ago to identify the major issues. The third was the campus academic planning process which former Provost Greenwood initiated to address graduate program profile development but which was redirected toward an ongoing review of campus plans.

The initiatives have been described in detail in the planning priorities document, with estimated costs where possible. These will continue to be refined as the focus is refined.

Provost Hume suggested that the Committee identify as a specific priority the need to support the Merced campus. He believed the University's commitment to its success should be documented in support of the "power of ten" vision.

Provost Hume reported that the initiatives could be grouped as follows: those that have been or should be integrated into the University's routine business practices; those which require partnerships; and those requiring UC leadership. Each initiative is broken into three categories: academic quality, administrative and infrastructural effectiveness, and service to California.

In the category "Initiatives for adoption into routine University business," priorities under the first heading of Attachment 2 are (1) competitive faculty and staff salaries, and (2) surveying students' interests and monitoring educational outcomes. Under the second heading are (1) open budget process; (2) inclusive and open academic planning process; and (3) streamline routine administrative processes. Under the third heading are (1) implement recommendations of Diversity Study Group; (2) adopt green building and sustainable business practices; and (3) ensure UC Merced's continued success.

All initiatives in the second category, "Initiatives requiring partnership and large-scale investment," are under the heading "Service to California." They include (1) lasting solutions for K-12; (2) telemedicine/health access; and (3) grow academic preparation programs.

Under "Initiatives requiring UC leadership and large-scale investment," the third category, are, in the "Academic quality" column, (1) enhance graduate student financial aid packages; (2) competitive student-faculty ratio; and (3) academic infrastructure, including libraries and instructional equipment, research grid, and academic buildings. Under "Administrative and infrastructural effectiveness" are (1) upgrade and extend physical infrastructure; (2) upgrade IT infrastructure – network and next generation data center; and (3) common administrative systems of support. Under "Service to California" are (1) improve financial aid for undergraduates; (2) train more healthcare professionals; and (3) invest in R&D addressing environmental challenges.

Provost Hume believed that the Committee should focus on making decisions with respect to the third category, "Initiatives requiring UC leadership and large-scale investment." Those decisions will have a lasting impact on the quality and character of the University.

Future presentations could provide the Committee members with a deeper understanding of the individual issues. He stated that, with the concurrence of the Committee, he intended to distribute the planning document to the Chancellors and the Academic Senate, recognizing that it will change when more in-depth discussions have occurred.

Regent Hopkinson emphasized the importance of the topic and opined that extensive discussion about it would be necessary. She referred to page two of [Attachment 1](#), the “Draft Statement of University of California Planning Priorities,” Initiative 3, “Grow instructional budgets to achieve a student-faculty ratio that is competitive with peer institutions” under the heading “Nineteen Priority Initiatives,” which she believed was insufficiently focused. She recalled that the 17:6 ratio, which in fact was never achieved, was meant to be a stopgap, not an ultimate goal. She suggested that the initiative state a short-term goal of 17:6 but a long-term goal of some lower figure. She commented that Initiative 8, “Ensure campuses’ academic plans and investment priorities are developed in full view of one another and drawn upon to inform the University’s priorities and budget decisions,” was too general a statement. She believed it should be stated that academic plans are needed that focus on the strengths and goals of each campus, in an open manner, and describe how that should be achieved.

Regent Preuss expressed his satisfaction with Initiative 8 as worded.

Regent-designate Scorza noted that the University does not take into consideration lecturers and visiting professors when determining student-faculty ratio. The actual student-teacher ratio is approximately 14:4. He believed that the planning document should bring together the three major initiative groups to which Provost Hume referred, outline goals, and set objectives. The current document ([Attachment 2](#)) contains a mixture of goals and objectives. If the desire is to help the State achieve educational equity and close the achievement gap, the educational imperative should be launched, but part of the vision of the University is to help solve K-12 educational issues. He stated that he found it difficult to approach long-range planning absent clearly stated goals and objectives.

Committee Chair Schilling recalled that when the planning process began, it was decided to accept the vision statement that was the product of the Long-Range Guidance Team and, because of the urgency of identifying the tasks and strategies needed, move forward. She believed the Committee should focus on what can be achieved immediately.

Regent Hopkinson stated that Strategy 2 of Goal 1, “Expand the proportion of graduate students,” the corresponding initiative of which was to enhance their financial aid packages, required a stated goal for the ratio of graduate students. If such things are not articulated, the document will not provide the tools needed to move to the next stage. Regent Preuss noted that page 7 of the document did provide further detail. He stated that he had found the one-page handout ([Attachment 2](#)), with its three categories, to be clear and helpful, and he was doubtful that expanding it was the right way to proceed.

Vice Provost Greenstein commented that the one-page handout represented an effort to identify the issues which required further analysis. Picking as an example the student-faculty ratio, he believed the discussion should focus on what it would cost to reduce that ratio, how the quality of the University's education would be affected, and what impact that would have on, for example, the number of graduate students and the demands on faculty. He noted that an attempt was made in the handout to synthesize the larger document by identifying three main areas on which to focus, and then, through discussion of the third category, "Initiatives requiring UC leadership and large-scale investment," focus on those issues that were essential and seek the guidance of the Committee. If, for instance, the Committee agreed that addressing the student-faculty ratio was essential, further analysis could be developed with respect to that issue in order to determine ways of reaching a stated goal. If the issues listed in the third table begin to be addressed in detail, discussion will surface that will help identify priorities more specifically. [Attachment 2](#), section 3 lists areas in which the University has some control over its future through its decisions, and investments that have not yet been addressed.

Committee Chair Schilling suggested attempting to provide the administration with direction as to which issues within Table 3 should be tackled first. She noted the interconnectedness of the issues in all three columns of the table. Vice Provost Greenstein believed section 3 represented a starting point for discussion, because it listed those issues to which no commitment has yet been made.

Regent-designate Scorza suggested beginning by focusing on the issue of upgrading infrastructure processes such as data collection and support. This could lead to a better understanding of how best to address a competitive student-faculty ratio and where funds come from, which would be in line with the restructuring efforts.

Regent Hopkinson was unwilling to commit to the priorities as stated, absent further detail as to, for instance, their costs. She suggested, for example, analyzing the need to have more graduate students, ascertain what those needs are on the campuses, the goals for those campuses, how much it would cost at each campus, and what the impact would be on the State's educational system and the University. Provost Hume agreed that it would be valuable to return with answers as to the costs, benefits, and tradeoffs of pursuing a particular priority.

Regent Bugay suggested picking one issue, perhaps the student-faculty ratio, and agreeing on some specifics. Committee Chair Schilling stressed the importance of input from the faculty concerning the optimal student-faculty ratio. She noted that there could be various ways of lowering the ratio to whatever level was determined to be acceptable. Faculty Representative Brown stated that he had been hopeful that the information provided would introduce to the Regents the kinds of deliberations that were needed but that there would be input from the administration and faculty that could provide organization and specificity to the effort, which would inform the Regents as they thought about priorities.

Regent Preuss expressed a different view of the report. He noted that the document stated that the Regents considered it a priority to improve the student-faculty ratio, which implies that the current student-faculty ratio is unacceptable and that a determination needs to be made as to how much it should be improved and how that can be accomplished. Once there is agreement on the list of what should be bettered, it will be possible to decide how urgent each one is relative to the others and which should be tackled first.

Regent Bugay noted that there are fiscal realities tied to every priority. He maintained, however, that setting specific goals, for instance with respect to the student-faculty ratio, even if that were just a working figure, would be productive and allow the discussion to advance. Regent Preuss agreed that specifics were needed, but he viewed the report as being acceptable and helpful as a priority list of those initiatives that require refinement.

Faculty Representative Croughan suggested moving forward by determining what is known from the experience of other universities – the degree of their satisfaction with their standards, how far the University is from those marks, and what it would cost to meet those standards. She also suggested distinguishing among the priorities by noting how long each had been in existence without being addressed and advancing the most long-standing. She advocated adding the perspective of students, faculty, and staff to that of the administration. She believed that gathering the data and input to set the priorities could be achieved relatively quickly.

Regent Allen commented that the document was an affirmation of priorities that took nearly six months to develop. He believed that it should be viewed as a strategic plan for the future that, if approved, could provide a basis for further action. Committee Chair Schilling recalled that the genesis of this exercise was to identify the most crucial goals and determine an aggressive approach to reaching them. Regent Hopkinson noted that there is breathing room to approach the task methodically, given that there will be no funding available at least within the next six months to support any single initiative. She believed it was the sense of the Committee that the administration should use the handout as a basis for developing the articulated strategies, costs, and time frames necessary for the Regents to be able to make any decision. Committee Chair Schilling believed that it was also necessary to identify the immediate danger points, such as the threat of running out of data capacity.

Regent Preuss commented that he had viewed the list as a good compilation of what was important to the University. He was unclear as to what required refinement.

Regent Kozberg believed that it would be a good use of the Committee's time to determine whether anything had been missed that should be on the planning priority list. Provost Hume suggested sending the list out for general review in order to answer that question and also focusing on two or three things in the third group shown in [Attachment 2](#) that would help the Regents in their thinking and that might turn into critical situations. He believed it would be helpful to develop a better understanding of the impacts of a declining faculty-

student ratio on the quality of the institution, the undergraduate experience, and research. This would provide a frame of reference within which tradeoffs could be assessed.

Regent Preuss stressed that, although it may not be possible expeditiously to carry out the commitments delineated under “Initiatives for adoption into routine University business,” those commitments should remain in focus.

Regent Hopkinson was hopeful that the issue of enhancing graduate student financial aid packages could be broadened to include the possibility of increasing graduate student ratios.

In response to a question asked by Regent Allen, Provost Hume confirmed that focusing the Committee’s attention initially on a few items did not mean that other items would be abandoned.

Committee Chair Schilling described the University as being in a crisis mode, in that some of the problems that the initiatives are intended to address could quickly become intractable. She advocated addressing those immediately. She pointed out, for example, that decreasing the student-faculty ratio will not help if the institution runs out of data capacity. The cost of increasing that capacity, if it is chosen as a top priority, however, will make it financially impossible to address some other problems.

Regent Bugay suggested that philanthropy be added to the list. He believed that philanthropy was destined to become an ever more critical part of the University’s financing and should be part of a long-term planning process.

Regent Kozberg believed that in talking about benefits to California, the economic development issues related to technology and cutting-edge industries should be included. The requirements of the state with respect to the availability of engineers and computer scientists and the promotion of healthcare can be met through its universities.

Provost Hume remained unclear about the next steps. He asked the Committee to identify two or three areas upon which to focus first. Committee Chair Schilling believed he should focus on the graduate student issue and determining the ideal student-faculty ratio. He agreed to consult with the faculty concerning the student-faculty ratio and graduate student ratio, and to keep an eye on those areas that could possibly develop into crises in the near future.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff