

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MEETING AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

September 30 – October 1, 2004

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at 850 Willow Creek Road, Lake Arrowhead, CA.

Attendance: Regents Anderson, Blum, Dynes, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Lee, Montoya, Novack, Ornellas, Parsky, Pattiz, Preuss, Ruiz, Sayles (14)

In attendance: Regents-designate Juline, Rominger, and Rosenthal; Faculty Representatives Blumenthal and Brunk, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix; Consultants Nostaja and Eaton

The meeting convened at 9:00 p.m. with Chairman Parsky presiding.

1. LONG RANGE PLANNING OVERVIEW

Chairman Parsky welcomed the participants and noted that the purpose of the retreat was to provide an opportunity to Regents, outside the regular meetings, to consider the long-term future of the University of California.

President Dynes asked participants to approach discussions from the perspective of the following considerations:

How do we define success ten to fifteen years out?
How do we get there?
What will it cost and how do we fund it?

Mr. Scott Nostaja, President and CEO of AVCOR Consulting, acknowledged that this is a unique time in the University's history. There are many new senior people, the State of California has a new Governor, there is a new compact between the Governor's Office and the University, and there is a new economic reality. Mr. Nostaja described the exercises the Regents would undertake on Friday, noting particularly the session on identifying the University's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). For the evening session he asked each participant, "Looking back from ten years out, what would you regret not having done?" The individual answers fell into the following general areas of concern:

Not maintaining leading position and advancing quality on all fronts
Not improving advocacy programs
Not improving operating efficiencies
Not implementing a sustainable financial model
Not maintaining UC as the institution of choice
Not maintaining UC as the State's financial engine.

The Board recessed at 9:30 p.m and reconvened on Friday, October 1 at 8:45 a.m.

Regents Moores and O'Connell joined the meeting on Friday.

2. **SWOT ANALYSIS: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS FOR LONG RANGE PLAN AND CONTINUED LONG RANGE PLANNING DISCUSSION**

Consultants Nostaja and Eaton conducted the SWOT exercise. Lists of items identified by individual Regents as strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are **attached**. Mr. Nostaja then led the participants in selecting weaknesses to be addressed immediately as well as opportunities. The most serious weaknesses were identified as:

- Lack of a strategic vision
- Lack of efficiencies
- Lack of independent, dependable financial resources
- Lack of clearly defined, appropriate roles of Regents, UCOP, and campuses

The most significant opportunities were described as:

- “Big Science” and the collaborations it offers
- Ways in which UC can appropriately have an impact on K-12 education
- Public communication and advocacy
- Revenue enhancement
- An international strategy

There followed a discussion of the University’s goals and tactics. It was generally agreed that the goals of the administration and the board should be aligned and that both should be engaged in order to meet the University’s strategic goals. Accomplishing this will involve addressing issues of communication, leadership, and use of board committees, for example. Further, it will require the development and maintenance of information guidelines with tools such as templates, matrices, and indicators.

Chairman Parsky summarized the work and suggested that the tactics should be re-evaluated, the role of the Regents should be updated, and mechanisms appropriate for fulfilling that role should be identified and established. President Dynes concurred and noted that he and the Chairman would assemble a small working group to digest the recommendations and concerns expressed at the retreat and lay out a specific plan for proceeding. Additionally, the plan will identify the implementation cost, how to fund the implementation, and the proper structure to accomplish the goals. The group will include Regents, chancellors, and a faculty representative.

Mr. Parsky recalled that the purpose of the retreat had been to engage Regents in talking about the University outside the immediacy of regular meetings. In doing so, it is apparent that the appropriate role for the Regents should be considered and that the role of the board should be assessed in terms of the long-range health of the University. For this effort to be effective, there may need to be a series of similar sessions during the year and, in a reasonable period of time, another retreat.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary