

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING**

July 17, 2008

The Committee on Long Range Planning met on the above date at University Center, Santa Barbara Campus.

Members present: Regents Blum, Hotchkis, Kozberg, Reiss, Schilling, Scorza, Shewmake, and Yudof; Advisory members Brown and Nunn Gorman, Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen

In attendance: Regents Cole, De La Peña, Garamendi, Hopkinson, Island, Lansing, Pattiz, Ruiz, Varner, and Wachter, Regents-designate Bernal and Stovitz, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Hume, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Dooley, Foley, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Kang, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Grey, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 11:10 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 18, 2008 were approved.

**2. TOWARDS A UC ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK**

President Yudof explained that his proposed accountability framework for the University will be a routine publication setting forth measures of performance in the areas of access and affordability, student success, research impact and funding, and diversity. This would be an annual report to the Regents, with accountability metrics for the ten campuses and the Office of the President. It is hoped that the first report will be provided in September.

President Yudof outlined major reasons for this initiative. The first is transparency and public accountability. Information on enrollments, graduation rates, and other topics of interest should be publicly available on UC websites. The second purpose is to provide the Regents with data for the strategic planning process, data that is necessary for establishing reasonable measures for the University's goals. Third, this information will assist with the budget process and the establishment of budget priorities. The fourth reason concerns the University's institutional accountability – the report would demonstrate how well the University is serving its students and other constituents.

President Yudof discussed the motivation for this initiative, which is what he described as a strong accountability revolution in the U.S. He cited the Enron case, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, the subprime mortgage crisis, and recent actions by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The public, including taxpayers, the Legislature, parents, students, and employees, have a right to know what is happening in institutions, both private and public. President Yudof stated that he welcomes this trend and finds it to be a healthy phenomenon. He also noted a growing demand for customer information. The University should have measures of how well it serves the public and its various constituent groups.

Concerns about accountability are reflected in the Spellings Commission report of 2006 and in the Voluntary System of Accountability adopted by some universities, with metrics similar to those that will be presented in September. In Europe, the Bologna Process seeks accountability in higher education, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development has developed accountability measures for the delivery of higher education services internationally.

President Yudof stressed that the development of accountability measures for higher education is not a new concept, is practiced elsewhere, is not a threat to faculty, and that California is in fact late in responding to the accountability movement. He described his initiative as “statistical accountability.” He noted that student assessment is an important related issue, and more controversial. It is currently being examined by two committees in the Academic Senate. Accrediting organizations are increasingly causing difficulties for universities in the re-accreditation process if they do not have in place a student learning assessment, which would require some type of testing of a random sample of students. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) recently sent letters to two chancellors, noting that WASC would be seeking a learning assessment on those campuses.

While the University issues many reports, on crime rates, health, safety, privacy measures, accreditation, and other topics, the process is unorganized and does not occur regularly. The University needs standard definitions of data. This effort can build on work already done by Office of the President staff and will not require an extensive bureaucracy.

President Yudof stressed that the University should be a leader, not a follower, and that UC is now viewed nationally as a non-participant in accountability. It is important to start the process of reporting, with responses by the Regents and other constituencies. President Yudof anticipated that the process would gradually improve over time. He stated that he wished to focus the Regents’ attention on serious policy issues. He envisioned that the Regents would receive a general report once annually, and sub-reports during the course of the year, showing progress, for example, in fundraising, diversity, and other areas. Regents would respond to these individual sub-reports, which would serve as catalysts for serious policy discussions of the future of UC. President Yudof also emphasized that this reporting must be normalized, with metrics and benchmarks comparing UC to other institutions. He hoped that this proposed reporting process would

make Regents' requests for information less ad hoc; the University would have a schedule for reporting on class size, faculty compensation, diversity, and other issues. This process would be annual and longitudinal, with a long-term perspective of the University's progress over years.

The responsibility for this initiative will lie with a unit headed by Vice Provost Greenstein. President Yudof stated that he would work directly with this unit, and stressed that the University must have a group in charge of accountability and strategic planning. This will not be a large office. It will be staffed through savings from other parts of the Office of the President.

President Yudof concluded his discussion with two observations. He noted the uniqueness of every campus. This accountability reporting would include institution-specific profiles allowing campuses to showcase and describe their special characteristics, which might not be captured in standard data sets. He emphasized the qualitative, cultural dimension of education which cannot be stated in figures. However, the University cannot claim to be so special that it is not accountable, unlike government bodies, prisons, public schools, corporations, or other entities. The University needs to measure what it can, while remaining aware of qualitative factors that cannot be measured. The first report is planned for presentation to the Regents in September.

Committee Chair Kozberg expressed the sense of excitement felt by the Regents about this endeavor. She asked if the California State University (CSU) has pursued this approach. President Yudof responded that CSU is ahead of UC on this issue. He indicated that Chancellor Reed has been a national leader in accountability. While UC should not emulate CSU in every detail, he expressed his wish that UC move closer to the CSU position. He also noted that UC and CSU could cooperate effectively in sharing data on graduation rates and the transfer function, to the benefit of students.

Regent Garamendi expressed support for President Yudof's proposal, which he deemed an extremely important direction.

Committee Chair Kozberg asked about the current status of student assessment and how it will be integrated into a wider context, noting WASC's interest in this issue. Faculty Representative Brown recalled that last year the Academic Planning Council, a joint endeavor of the administration and the Academic Senate, through its task force on student outcomes, agreed to form two working groups to develop a UC approach to measurement of student learning outcomes and graduation outcomes. These outcomes are essential indicators of the University's impact. In criticizing current test-based approaches, the Council found that where criticisms are legitimate, it is not prudent for UC to criticize these approaches without offering an alternative. Faculty members and administrators have been identified to serve on the working groups, and should begin their work this summer. Professor Brown anticipated a deadline for initial reports in mid-winter. He affirmed that the working groups would be happy to combine their work with the proposed accountability framework. He emphasized the importance of follow-up and of strategic direction.

Committee Chair Kozberg looked forward to the report from the working groups and to receiving information on how WASC will approach this issue. She expressed the hope that, following the last WASC report, the University would make progress rather than fall behind.

Regent Scorza asked how the proposed accountability framework is related to the long range development plan of two years ago. President Yudof stated that he has not reviewed that report. He will ask Office of the President staff to review the report for measurements and variables. He explained that the accountability framework is concerned with metrics; it is not a strategic plan. He noted that an advantage of a robust accountability system is that any previous report or document can be reviewed for a determination of how much progress has been made in different areas.

Committee Chair Kozberg recalled that many Regents reviewed the “Power and Promise of Ten” report and suggested that it could be used as a guide. She informed the Committee that the accountability framework will be on the September agenda and asked Regents to communicate any issues they felt should be addressed immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff