

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING

September 18, 2007

The Committee on Long Range Planning met on the above date at Mondavi Center, Davis campus.

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

In attendance: Regents Allen, Garamendi, and Johnson, Regents-designate Scorza and Shewmake, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Hume, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice Presidents Foley and Sakaki, Chancellor Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Smith

The meeting convened at 1:10 p.m. with Committee Chair Schilling presiding.

DISCUSSION OF PRIOR PLANNING EFFORTS AND COMMITTEE AGENDA

It was recalled that The Regents established the Committee on Long Range Planning to:

- “(a) Consist of Regent members, who will regularly consult with an Advisory Board representing a broader range of constituents, including members of the Long Range Guidance Team, chancellors, vice chancellors, faculty members, deans, students, alumni, and other administrative leaders.*
- (b) Consider and recommend to the Board on all matters that assist the University in planning for the future in ways that will aid in developing the institution and in enhancing its strengths, with the intention of maintaining the University’s world-class mission of research, teaching, and community service.*
- (c) Consider and recommend to the Board on the role and process through which the Committee and its Advisory Board suggest action items that would positively affect the future of the University.”*

At this first meeting, Committee members sought to focus on orienting the Committee’s work, its aims and processes, as well as its goals for the fiscal year ending in June 2008.

To help inform that discussion, on August 9, 2007, the Committee’s Co-Chairs circulated to members a list of questions for their consideration. The Co-Chairs also circulated a list of links to selected background planning and related documents. The Office of the

President prepared a summary of these documents to suggest how their substance might inform the Committee's deliberations.

Committee Chair Schilling welcomed Mr. Jim Hollingshead and Mr. Michael Dalby from Monitor Group, who assisted the Committee with the discussion.

Committee Chair Schilling observed that one of the strengths of the University is its ability to produce abundant information, but difficulty lies in translating the information into action. She called on Provost Hume to provide a summary of the report of the Long Range Guidance Team, which serves as a useful starting point for the Committee due to its synthesis of a wide range of information and list of University initiatives that strive to meet California's most pressing needs. She asked Committee members to consider prioritizing and augmenting the list of initiatives, and that delivery and opportunity costs be determined for each.

Provost Hume provided a formal hand-over of the work of the Long Range Guidance Team by introducing the report, discussing its development, and commending it to The Regents. He recalled that President Dynes convened the team in 2005 to envision the University in 2025 in light of the needs of the state and how the University should be prepared to contribute to meeting those needs. The title of the report, "UC 2025: The Power and the Promise of Ten," envisions that the University, comprised of ten distinctive campuses with unique profiles of academic strength, has the potential to work as a system to meet any challenge from the state. The work of the team was not to produce a strategic or business plan, but rather to provide a vision for the future of the University.

Regent Brewer underscored the importance of having a shared vision for the University's future direction. Regent Hopkinson suggested that the vision put forth in the Guidance Team report should be reexamined and rearticulated in relation to other efforts at the University, such as the Monitor Group study.

Regent Garamendi reasoned that it is unnecessary for the Committee to do further work on the vision, particularly given his concern for the passage of time. He opined that the work of the Committee on Long Range Planning is the most important that The Regents has to accomplish. He expressed concern over the level of funding that the University receives from the State, arguing that the University needs to make a cogent argument to the Legislature in the near future as to why it requires more funding. Regent Garamendi commended the vision put forth in the Guidance Team report, and urged the Committee to move from the vision to a strategic plan that articulates how the University will accomplish its vision and identifies the necessary funding for its initiatives.

Mr. Hume agreed that the Long Range Guidance Team devoted much work to articulating a vision consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education, rooted in the history of the University as a land-grant institution and concerned about service to the people of California. He reiterated that the next step is to assess how to assemble resources to achieve the vision.

Regent Brewer expressed concern over whether the vision put forth in the Guidance Team report is a shared one. Regent Hopkinson explained that the Long Range Guidance Team was a large, multidisciplinary, and inclusive group that consulted very broadly. She expressed her concern that the Committee may significantly alter the vision without similar cross-fertilization.

Regent Kozberg asserted the importance of having a broader vision of higher education in this work. It is important for the University to respect and acknowledge what each of its partners – the community colleges, private universities, and the State college system – does. If the larger vision for higher education is built, each component will benefit. She reminded the Committee of the plan to make next year the Year of Education, and stressed the importance of having an articulate plan in place for it. She noted that, in the private world, strategic plans are much shorter than five or ten years.

Regent Preuss suggested that the Committee use the vision put forth in the Guidance Team report as a working document and test whether it is sellable to the people of California and fundable by the Legislature. He asserted that discussions with the Legislature must include a statement of the University's pivotal role in the success of the state, that its vision is to continue contributing to that success, and that the University requires funding from and collaboration with the State in order to continue its work. Regent Preuss cautioned against producing another report that may or may not be read. He asked for discussion regarding the product of the Committee, stating the importance of devising serious, out-of-the-box recommendations to the Board that have the potential to change the University in a positive direction.

Committee Chair Schilling agreed that the next step is to augment the vision with numbers in order to sell the University's case to constituents. She strongly agreed with the importance of devising an action plan for which the Committee will take ownership and ensure execution.

Regent Brewer expressed her excitement about the work of the Committee given its potential to merge with other current work, including the infrastructure study, the Task Force to Evaluate University Funding Options led by Regents Moores and Gould, and other studies. She expressed her confidence that the Committee is well positioned to ensure that a plan reaches an implementation and funding stage.

Regarding what has been lacking in the University's long-range planning to date, Faculty Representative Croughan quoted the Academic Council in stating that the University "has not had a grand vision of where UC wants to go in its development and service to the state, nation, and the world ... [no] strategic plan articulating how that grand vision could or should be achieved, ... no link between the strategic plan and the financing plan for the University, ... and that this plan should reinvigorate the State and private support for UC."

Regent-designate Scorza suggested that the University's long-range vision should be based on immediate needs, and that the two should not be separated. He stressed the

importance of prioritizing some of the initiatives and devising a plan to achieve them within one or two years, at the same time that the University is planning for the next 20 years.

Committee Chair Schilling reviewed the list put forth in the Long Range Guidance Team report of University initiatives that seek to address California's needs:

- K-12 education
- Health care
- Science and technology innovation
- Graduate education
- Undergraduate education
- Affordable higher education
- Research
- Sustainable resources
- Global reach
- Efficient systemwide business practices for UC
- Arts and culture

She asked Committee members if there was a need to augment the list or to prioritize it. Regent Hopkinson suggested that the initiatives be ranked in order of importance.

Regent Kozberg raised the issue of interdisciplinary collaborations. Mr. Hume noted that, presently, collaboration between disciplines is the very nature of the academic endeavor, and so is not required as a separate initiative. President Dynes spoke of the continued challenge of cross-campus collaboration, which would maximize using the University as a system.

Regent Allen conveyed the importance of attending to the demographic challenges faced by the state, and finding ways for the University to respond to California's multicultural future. This imperative may not need to be addressed as a separate issue, but instead should infuse itself in the different initiatives.

Regent Bugay noted the importance of the Master Plan for Higher Education, given its prominence in the University's purpose and how the University is situated within the hierarchy of education in California. He suggested that the Master Plan may serve as a starting point for the Committee's discussions, and would reaffirm the fundamental reasons why the University exists and where it is going. Regent Bugay also noted that absent from the list of University initiatives was philanthropy.

Regent Preuss noted that the Guidance Team report provides a large amount of information that is both static and dynamic. He asked for more dynamic information on the quality of the University over time.

Regent Hopkinson expressed reservations about prematurely embarking on an action plan based on the vision, without identifying the necessary, intermediary steps. She also

stressed the importance of articulating the roles of the constituencies at the University, including the Regents, the Office of the President, the campuses, faculty, and others. She expressed concern over how those constituencies will be involved in the work of the Committee, given the constraints on time required to include them in a substantial way.

Committee Chair Schilling suggested that constituents be included in any subcommittees that may form and emphasized the importance of having a broad spectrum of stakeholders involved in the process, particularly in light of the goal to sell the plan to the people of California.

Regent Garamendi underscored that each of the initiatives listed in the Guidance Team report requires a specification of numbers, dollars, and time required to accomplish it. This information would form the basis of a strategic plan, which will be crucial to making the point that in order to supply what is necessary for the future of the state, the University requires more funding. He stressed the urgency of putting forth a rational, solid argument in a strategic plan within two months time. Regent Garamendi noted that the University has likely created centers of excellence on each of the initiatives listed, and in turn could provide input enumerating the needs for each initiative. He urged calling upon the collective intelligence at the University to deliver the information needed to develop a strategic plan in the near term. Regent Garamendi stated his interest in hearing from the deans regarding the needs associated with each initiative.

Faculty Representative Croughan reminded the Committee that the Academic Senate's futures report covers a great deal of the monetary issues.

Committee Chair Schilling agreed with Regent Garamendi's comments, but maintained that the list of initiatives should be prioritized. She also wanted to ensure that there was no risk in taking the list of initiatives presented in the Guidance Team report, along with numbers attached to each initiative, as the short and long term goals of the Committee.

Regent Hopkinson agreed that Mr. Hume could assemble the information quickly, but argued that consensus needs to be achieved before he does so. She urged a logical process whereby input is solicited before the information is synthesized. She cautioned that while one purpose of the work is to have a shorter term plan to sell to the Legislature, the larger objective is to have a longer term plan for the University.

Committee Chair Schilling supported a parallel process whereby both objectives could be achieved. Numbers are likely readily available for many of the needs listed; those should be compiled for the next budget cycle, realizing that other initiatives may not have numbers readily available. She agreed on the urgency of the situation.

Mr. Hume explained that, based on the information gathered through the systemwide academic planning process, there is a strong strategy in place for what the University will solicit from the State based on the University's priorities.

Regent Garamendi questioned the adequacy of the University's proposed budget, recalling that the University has suffered a one-third reduction in funding from the State since 1990. He argued that the budget is abysmally lower than what is necessary to meet the needs identified in the Guidance Team report, and urged the Regents to set a goal worth attaining.

Mr. Hume explained that a thorough process of consultation has taken place with the campuses, and that his office is refining the growth trajectories of the campuses this year. Based on the systemwide planning processes that are currently in progress, Mr. Hume assured the Committee that the University can develop a stronger, more aggressive ask from the Legislature this year, and develop an even more refined one next year.

Regent Bugay recounted that a theme which emerged at a statewide alumni group meeting on advocacy was the notion of imagining a day without UC, and suggested using this theme to build the argument to the State.

Chairman Blum observed that there has been broad and supportive reaction to the Monitor Group report, Provost Hume's vision, and his own paper calling for the University to be strategically dynamic. He reiterated the fact that the University is poorly run, and stated the difficulty of requesting more funding from the Legislature when the University is wasteful. Chairman Blum stressed that the University must also look at other options for funding its needs aside from putting together a large ask from the Legislature, including outreach to alumni and more efficient running of the University. He stressed the importance of knowing the gap required to fund the University's needs.

Regent Allen observed that while it is important for the University to show it is committed to reform, it is also important to put forth a strong face to the Legislature by emphasizing the achievements and value of the University and aggressively countering unfavorable media reports. He cautioned against playing into the sentiment that the University is not strong. Chairman Blum agreed that part of what the University needs to do is outreach to alumni and the press. He argued that the compensation issue was overblown and that the University should have responded in the appropriate media cycle.

Committee Chair Schilling asked for more clarity on the timing of the Committee's objectives. Mr. Hollingshead recalled the objective that the longer term strategic plan be prepared for the end of the fiscal year, which would be June 2008, and the more urgent plan for the Legislature be prepared sooner, perhaps within six weeks. Mr. Hume responded that, based on the framework put forth by the Committee, elements of the framework can be discussed each time the Committee meets. Committee Chair Schilling reiterated the need to discuss how other stakeholders will be involved in the process.

Committee Chair Schilling also reasserted her interest in prioritizing the needs in terms of urgency, reasoning that in any given year sufficient time and energy may exist to address only two or three issues. She reminded the Committee that this work is a continuous project for each identified need.

Mr. Hume supported prioritization, in that it ties in with his role as Provost relative to the academic planning council, campuses, and Regents. He suggested that such prioritizing happen at the next Committee meeting, and requested input as to which elements the Regents do not want Mr. Hume's office to focus on, given that much of what has been requested is already a part of active processes, including enrollment growth out to 2020, health science growth, and graduate student growth. Mr. Hume suggested that this information can be brought to the Regents for review and endorsement, and the Regents can then advise as to which elements should be put aside in favor of others. He noted that planning for K-12 is set to commence; if the Regents want Mr. Hume's office to prioritize another initiative, he should be advised so.

Regent Hopkinson requested that, at the next Committee meeting, Mr. Hume provide a recommendation for priorities based on both importance and opportunity in light of work that is close to completion. Regent Preuss added that Mr. Hume should advise the Committee on popular issues that may provide an advantage when presenting the University's plan to the Legislature. Regent Bugay also requested that the priorities not be limited to the list of initiatives, with the suggestion that philanthropy and other outreach be included.

Chairman Blum stated that, in his mind, the number one priority is to understand the needs to be fulfilled and the costs to do so, particularly in light of the fact that the University's advocacy program is being expanded. He concurred that Mr. Hume's role is to inform the Regents of the gaps in this information and offer recommendations regarding issues on which to focus.

The Committee members agreed that the Committee should meet once a month by scheduling teleconference meetings in between Board meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff