The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING**
November 13, 2007

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

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

In attendance: Regent Johnson, Regents-designate Cole, Scorza, and Shewmake, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Hume, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice President Sakaki, Chancellors Blumenthal and Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 1:20 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 September 18, 2007 were approved.

2. **REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY PLANNING PRIORITIES**

The President recommended that The Regents adopt the attached priority initiatives as a means of achieving the vision for the University. That vision was developed by the Long Range Guidance Team and discussed by the Committee at its meeting in September 2007.

Provost Hume recalled that the priorities have been assembled from three sources – Regents' budget priorities, the report of the Long Range Guidance Team, and the priorities emerging from the Provost's systemwide academic planning and budget processes – and reviewed once by the Long Range Planning Committee. Estimated costs have been prepared for each of the priorities alongside a justification for their presence and rank order.

Provost Hume noted the document asserts that all of the eleven priorities are important, but it recognizes that the University cannot achieve them all simultaneously. The suggested sequencing was guided by the Committee's sense of urgency and desire for action. He believed that the sequencing was in balance with the State budget proposal for 2008-2009. That budget requests, among other things, the funding that the University needs for its highest priorities: competitive compensation for faculty and staff, an initiative to bring to bear the University's unique capacity for research and innovation to address the challenge in K-12 education, and graduate student support. A State budget deficit of between $8 billion and $12 billion is projected for next year, which will make even these requests

difficult to meet. In addition to the requests for State revenue, he proposed that the University move forward immediately with various restructuring initiatives.

Provost Hume reported that development of the document was guided by the overriding issues of communication and openness. He believed that the Committee's attention to the planning priorities was consistent with the open planning processes that have been conducted on the campuses with respect to academic planning, enrollment growth in the health sciences, issues related to enrollment growth of graduate and professional schools, and enrollment at the undergraduate and graduate levels out to 2020.

Provost Hume reported that, at its October meeting, the Committee discussed the need to communicate its activities through dialogue with faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Ways to improve the University's capacity to present itself to the people of California were suggested. The Committee turned its attention to issues of funding and requested that the administration develop cost estimates. He requested that the Regents evaluate the various means by which the University can get those funds, how much should come from the State, how much from debt-financing serviced by research revenues, and how much from philanthropic revenues. Work on this capital portion of the planning is ongoing.

Provost Hume reported that the Committee had highlighted the ongoing evaluation and assessment in order to develop better benchmarking over time to see how well the University is achieving the goals set by the planning process. He noted that endorsement of the goals will aid the administration and the campuses with their planning processes.

Regent Preuss observed that the priorities could be divided between strategical and tactical areas. Some priorities fit both categories. He believed that it was important to place the strategic goal of maintaining the quality of the University's education and research in a position of prominence, as that is the basis on which the State provides financial support.

Regent Hopkinson commented on the individual items listed. She believed that making faculty salaries competitive and ensuring that staff salaries remain competitive are not at the level of the strategies to which Regent Preuss referred and should not be listed prominently. She observed that increasing the diversity of the University's students, faculty, and staff was not the University's objective, but that, rather, it was to serve the population of the state of California and thus did not qualify as a strategy. She was hopeful that there would be sufficient time to review and revise the document further before asking the Regents to adopt it. She noted that, although in recent history specific practices have received legitimate criticism, the implication that the University's credibility required restoration was misleading. With respect to restructuring the University's administrative and business practices, she noted that there has been no conclusion as to whether the Office of the President's staff should be reduced. Noting that the campuses have various objectives, she expressed concern about the statement that the number of graduate students should be increased until they reach at least 20 percent of the total UC student body. With respect to ensuring the continued quality and relevance of the UC education, she recalled that the

benchmark level of a 17.6-to-one ratio of faculty to students had been established previously as an interim goal and not a long-range one. She advocated revising the list of planning priorities substantially.

Provost Hume explained that the list on the attachment was not prioritized according to importance but according to which could be achieved first.

Regent Allen raised the issue of sustainability, which had not been included in the list. He believed it speaks to some of the University's fundamental relationships with the state. It was incorporated into the UC 2025 report. He suggested making the point that the University is innovative in its incorporation of green techniques into its practices. He noted that the University's strides to support student mental health was an issue that could merit at least a line in the document.

Regent Johnson suggested expanding on and strengthening the statement concerning the University's goal to contribute lasting solutions to California's K-12 educational crises to reflect some of the strong initiatives being undertaken by the campuses.

Regent-designate Scorza noted the lack of a time line for accomplishing the goals. He suggested linking the document more closely to the University's long-range development plan to 2025.

Committee Chair Schilling observed that some of the timing for implementation of the goals will depend on the State's financial situation over time. Regent-designate Scorza believed that, rather than developing a plan based on State budgets, the University should set out its vision for the next twenty years, determine what steps must be taken to achieve it, and then ask the State to provide the necessary funds. Regent Preuss agreed with this sentiment, as did Regent Hopkinson. Committee Chair Schilling agreed, also, but she recalled that the University has not been effective in convincing the public of its worth. She reported that a new marketing campaign is being designed. Regent Hopkinson pointed out that previous such efforts had fallen short. She suggested targeting the message carefully this time.

Faculty Representative Croughan believed that the approach being taken currently was in line with Regent-designate Scorza's suggestion. It was her view that the planning priorities document was appropriately short, concise, and easy to understand.

Regent Brewer noted that some items that were in the long-range guidance report had been left out. She observed that, as much of what is being suggested will be carried out by the campuses, the Chancellors should be deeply involved in the development of priorities. Provost Hume agreed that this would be helpful, particularly in that this planning effort is the first that attempts to develop a comprehensive picture.

Regent-designate Scorza agreed that there should be a targeted promotional campaign, but he pointed out that there are students, faculty, and staff who will plead their collective cases

in Sacramento. Developing stronger relationships with those in the State government will be essential in getting more support for the University.

Staff Advisor Brewer noted that the planning document speaks of ensuring that staff salaries remain competitive, which is misleading in that they are not currently competitive. In response to a question about the timing of the process, Provost Hume informed her that many steps have been taken already to implement some of the strategies. The University is committed to the open, transparent budget process, for instance. The first step to make faculty salaries competitive has been taken. Restructuring the Office of the President is under way. He believed there was value in articulating the goals, the various mechanisms to reach them, and the priorities among them.

Regent Preuss suggested that it would make Provost Hume's next steps more productive to focus on what the Committee wants to achieve. He stressed the importance of coming up with tactical priorities that will move the process forward and maintain the institution's direction. Committee Chair Schilling suggested analyzing annually what has been tried and has failed, and what has been successful. Regent Johnson supported this suggestion. President Dynes emphasized that the administration has been moving forward in line with observations and recommendations made by the Long Range Guidance Team.

Regent Preuss believed that the statement on which everything else should be based is that the University of California is a necessary resource for the economic and cultural health of the state. What follows should be an exposition supporting that statement, then information about what is needed and how goals will be implemented.

Committee Chair Schilling summarized the Committee's sentiments, saying that in its next iteration the document should have a strategic beginning that is supported by the "whats" and the "whys" and augmented by a time line and some benchmarks. The planning priorities should be divided into strategic and tactical approaches rather than what can and cannot be accomplished.

Provost Hume stated that he valued the positive comments he had received and that he would work to reorder or re-articulate the planning priorities in ways that would be responsive to the views that had been expressed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff