University of California, Riverside
Strategic Planning Steering Committee

February 13, 2020
9:00AM – 11:00AM
Hinderaker B154

Agenda

9:00AM	Welcome and Goals for the Meeting	*Tom Smith*
9:05AM	Approval of January 14th Meeting Minutes *(Attachment I)*	*Tom Smith*

9:05AM · Approval of January 14th Meeting Minutes *(Attachment I)* · *Tom Smith*

9:10AM · Some Preliminary Visioning *(Attachment II)* · *Working Group Chairs & Co-chairs* / *AKA moderating*

(Each working group will have 10 minutes for presentation followed by ten minutes of dialogue with the steering committee. Attachment II describes focus of presentations)

9:10-9:30	*Thriving Campus Community*
9:30-9:50	*Research and Scholarly Distinction*
9:50-10:10	*Sustainable Infrastructure, Operations & Finances*
10:10-10:20	*Unparalleled Student Experience*
10:20-10:40	*Contributions to the Public Good*

10:40AM · Emerging Common Themes and Cross-Cutting Issues · *AKA moderating*

10:50AM · Status of Community Forums and Other Next Steps *(Attachment III)* · *Tom Smith & Ken Baerenklau*

11:00AM · Adjournment · *Tom Smith*

Attachments

I. Minutes of January 14th 2020 Steering Committee Meeting

II. Guidance on Working Group Reports for February 13th Steering Committee Meeting (January 23, 2020) (Previously circulated to Steering Committee by email)

III. Working Group Deliverables and Time Table (January 23, 2020) (Previously circulated to Steering Committee by email)

AKA | STRATEGY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UCRIVERSIDE

Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting
1/14/2020 1-3 pm, Hinderaker B154
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Present: **UCR:** Tom Smith, Dylan Rodríguez, Christiane Weirauch, Crystal Petrini, Peter Hayashida, Brian Haynes, Chris Lynch, Milly Peña, Yat Sun Poon, Rebekah Richert, Xiaoping Hu, Timothy Lyons, Bruce Link, Gabriela Canalizo, Xuan Liu, Eddie Comeaux, Christian Shelton, Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Kathryn Uhrich, Ken Baerenklau, Julia McLean
AKA Strategy: Tony Knerr*, John Braunstein, Belinda Li
telepresence

Absent: **UCR:** Julian Gonzalez, John Haberstroh, Rodolfo Torres

Agenda in Brief

1:00 Welcome & Meeting Goals *(Tom Smith)*

1:05 Approval of October Minutes

1:10 Reports from Working Groups
Sustainable Infra, Operations & Finance
Research and Scholarly Distinction
Unparalleled Student Experience
Contributions to the Public Good
Thriving Campus Community

2:40 Describe Potential UCR Community Forums on Working Group Topics

3:00 Final Words and Adjournment

Meeting Minutes

Welcome

Tom reviews the agenda. Today, the Steering Committee would like to know what content the groups are wrestling with and what their plans are to collect additional data.

Approval of November Minutes

The November 18th minutes are unanimously approved after a few attendance and spelling corrections.

Reports from Working Groups

Sustainable Infrastructure, Operations, and Finance (SIO&F)

Presentation: Christian Shelton (Chair) Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera (Vice Chair)

SIO&F has created four subgroups: physical planning, processes and operations, environmental impacts and budgets/financial. Each subgroup has met a few times and they are all still in the process of meeting with campus.

Processes and Operations: Extensive consultations and discussions have taken place; notes from these meetings will be on the shared drive. They are hearing suggestions to invest in resources like technology training and improving business administration and operations systems. This also illustrates how operations coincides with other working groups.

Budget/Finances: A spreadsheet summarized the work this subgroup has done to visualize how much more money and space UCR would need to grow at the expected ratios.

Environmental Impacts: Their work is being parsed into a number of dimensions (geographic, categories of impacts, and type of impacts). Categories of impacts might be justice, agriculture, food, etc., whereas types of impacts describe the mode, such as research or policy.

Discussion:

Question: Will SIO&F run scenarios to see how many staff/faculty members are needed to support the planned growth? **Response:** The handout estimates the cost of 1% growth in various categories.

Question: Will the modeled 1% growth generate TAs? **Response:** Student growth will generate TA growth, at the cost of $20,000 per TA (in today's dollars, not including tuition).

Question: SIO&F is collecting data on UCRs current state; is that data helping to determine how the institutional infrastructure should grow? **Response:** The majority of SIO&F sub-groups are thinking like other working groups but the budget subgroup is moving between strategic and tactical planning. They need to better understand the numbers to answer other groups' queries but will continue to pull those conversations together.

Question: How can UCR advocate for more UC system monies? Can a strategy be included in this group's efforts? **Response:** They will consider and try to integrate a strategy on this topic.

Discussion Point: Next time, the steering committee would love to hear more on budgeting principles that may help direct and envision how the strategic plan might advise UCR to make budgeting decisions.

Research and Scholarly Distinction (RSD)

Presentation: Xiaoping Hu (Chair) Timothy Lyons (Vice Chair)

RSD made a survey for graduate assistants, staff, and faculty. They spent time discussing what to ask in these surveys and tailored them to each audience. The surveys ask, "Where do you think UCR is today in research and scholarship?" and "Where do you think we should be?" Other takeaways from RSD's work:

- Increasing the number of graduate students could improve important university ranking factors such as number of publications, research proposals, and graduates in academic positions. It could also help increase UCR's system budget allocation.
- RSD is talking to administrators and getting feedback on how F&A is distributed. This Steering Committee might not identify strategic areas for investment, but should include a method for identifying those areas.
- Hiring good people: If UCR hires and maintains a good staff/faculty, it can achieve and impact a lot more. RSD asked chairs for feedback on retention and hiring obstacles.

In general, RSD conversations are oscillating between aspiration and pragmatism, they don't want to think too narrowly as they move forward. They have been approached by departments to attend faculty and department meetings so they can listen and speak. They are starting to see patterns in their meetings and are getting a sense for campuses challenges and ideas of solutions that will work. RSD is considering a town hall but would also like to acknowledge the data points not being collected: impressions from UCR personnel who have left. RSD is also considering contacting former UCR leaders such as Tim White and Cindy Larive. Overall, they are still data-gathering and casting a big net.

Discussion:

Question: Can RSD look at what MS programs can add to RSD? That would work well with USE goals. **Response:** RSD is looking at the graduate student environment and will share responses.

Discussion Point: SIO&F has questions about research infrastructure. RSD and SIO&F should share budget information to address core facilities in the budget modelling.

Discussion Point: When it comes to criteria for strategic investment it is more important to discover how UCR makes those decisions rather than what specific areas UCR needs to invest in. RSD agrees the plan should include a way for UCR to identify new areas, make decisions, and adjust course as needed.

Discussion Point: Regarding the suggestion for research to benefit the public, committees should interrogate the term "public". The strategic plan should challenge UCR to embrace critical consideration of "publics" as part of UCR's mission and service.

Unparalleled Student Experience (USE)

Presentation: Yat Sun Poon (Chair) Rebekah Richert (Vice Chair)

USE has identified a few subcommittees including separate committees for undergraduate and graduate student experience. Graduate experience began meeting this morning. Undergraduate experience is working with Jennifer Brown and Undergraduate Education to develop focus groups for soliciting input from students and setting up meetings with the General Education review committee.

USE surveyed their committee (14 responses) asking about guiding principles and innovations at graduate and undergraduate levels which would make UCR Unparalleled. Reported themes include:

- Student-focused preparation: Ensure students are prepared for their chosen-career path
- Diversity: A diverse curricula and student body
- Whole-student approach: Healthy students psychologically, physically, financially, socially, etc.
- Mentorship: Students' ability to receive and provide mentorship
- Meaningful intellectual contribution: Equitable access to authentic knowledge creation, artistic expression, and technological innovation
- Community Engagement: service learning, internships, etc.
- **Financial Impact**: All initiatives should consider minimal student debt
- **Access**: All students, regardless of background, should have access to all of campus
  - Example: Extending operating hours of on-campus units and programming such as libraries, labs, counseling offices, registration, food services, etc.
  - **Fairness and Equity**: Students can have the equal access to opportunities, but that doesn't mean they are equitable*.* UCR must make sure the principle of equity is framing decisions. Equity is the starting point/baseline of the **access** conversation.

Discussion:

Discussion Point: How many students at UCR get to participate in meaningful intellectual contribution? Also, can USE define what a Student-Centered Research University would mean for UCR? It could be a great organizing idea but the Steering Committee needs fully unpack and comprehend that label.

Discussion Point: The educational experience UCR provides must pave the way from degree to career.

Discussion Point: There are a lot of tensions and intersections between working groups. Infrastructure and student experiences appear abstracted from each other but must come together to address the equity theme. Systems, process, people, and physical structure all play a role in equity. For example, faculty are committed to giving the best undergraduate experience possible but only might end up compromising research (RSD) to do so.

Discussion Point: Community engagement - USE often discusses preparing students for lives of meaningful contribution, showing students how their work in the classroom is related to day-to-day

local and global problems, and offering the chance to engage in community-based research. Challenges include that UCR must be mindful of equitable access and not require engagement across the board. Also, communities want consistent, sustainable, long-term commitments. How will UCR balance that need for stability with the seasonal nature of students' participation?

Discussion Point: USE should get student reactions to themes from their internal survey.

Discussion Point: Will USE address peer-to-peer experiences? Not just mentorships. Also, UCR doesn't need to provide the same things to graduate students that it does for undergraduates and vice-versa.

Discussion Point: To define research experiences, USE and other committees might ask themselves, "What is the outcome for the student?" **Response:** Having students understand the landscape of research in their field and the research in their academic department here at UCR is a great start.

Contributions to the Public Good (CPG)

Presentation: Bruce Link (Chair) Gabriela Canalizo (Vice Chair)

CPG started by asking "What is the public good" and set up domains where UCR might conceptualize itself on how to affect the public good. Three ways of bringing information to their committee:

- Best practices elsewhere: Which universities are already doing this well? This consideration has been extremely helpful.
- Scan of existing UCR Public Good Contributions: CPG started documenting (handout) things on campus they know about. Can the Steering Committee review the list and give feedback?
    - o UCR is doing quite a bit but needs to make the work more known.
    - o CPG would like to define how UCR does Public Good. How UCR does Public Good differently because of the communities it serves and is embedded in. The identity can be big and broad enough to encompass everyone, but still signal to the world that UCR will build infrastructure to do "public good" well.

CPG will interview people (13 interviews so far) and share the information on the shared drive. CPG has a journalist on their committee so they are following recommendations to keep their interviews open-ended and are being careful not to guide conversations. Their simple questions include, "What are the needs from where you sit?", "What do you think is important?" and "How can UCR help?"

Discussion:

Discussion Point: USE and CPG overlap as students perform many of the public good contributions and access/affordability is a concern for both groups. Can part of UCR's public good efforts be taking good care of its students? Perhaps financial incentives for contribution to UCRs community is one way to exemplify both values. CPG anticipates a lot of cross-work.

Discussion Point: Educators may have untrue assumptions about what a student experience looks like in various communities. UCR should be careful to not build things no one wants or needs. Sometimes students need completely new experiences. UCR needs to include students in this decision-making.

Discussion Point: The term public good must be subjected to rigorous and ongoing scrutiny, especially since many people do not identify as part of the public. **Response:** CPG will be attentive to that and solicit and incorporate as much feedback from UCR's many publics as they can.

A Thriving Campus Community (TCC)

Presentation: Xuan Liu (Chair) Eddie Comeaux (Vice Chair)

The culture of UCR impacts a sense of community. To better understand the culture among campus groups, TCC cross-collected survey information and requested stakeholder presentations. They reviewed the faculty welfare survey, met with Staff Assembly about the two recent staff climate surveys, and invited faculty, staff, students, and various campus offices present about their experiences. Graduate, undergraduate, and international students gave TCC presentations (materials are in the Shared Drive). They learned a lot:

- Students: Overall, doing well (2/3 are happy) but there are areas for improvement: career transition resources, reorganization of student offices and centers, concerns about police and campus safety, graduate funding, parking, and mental health (especially for international students).
- Staff: A few concerns they learned about: administration should play an important role in this campus culture, abuse of power issue, retaliation culture affecting staff performance, understaffing's adverse effects.
- Faculty: Thoughts and concerns include: achieving proportional growth, quality vs. quantity, administrative review, diversity and equity, and graduate student funding.

Through presentations, TCC identified common areas such as graduate student support and the role administration can play in creating a positive campus environment. They are on track to have a first draft of their report before March and will upload recommendations on the above concerns to the Shared Drive.

Discussion:

Question: Does TCC's research and information tell UCR how to grow? **Response:** Culture supports academic excellence and increases a sense of community. These results will help shape broader recommendations, TCC is still working on putting it all together.

Question: What would be a characteristic of a Thriving Campus Community? Maybe another way to think about this is, "What underlying needs are not being met?" Then, strategic planning can address those needs in a broader sense.

Question: Can TCC include in their research opinions of people who have left? There might be more insight from those who did not consider UCR a thriving campus. VPAP Ameae Walker has data on that.

Question: Recently, UC Berkeley defined a healthy campus climate in their own strategic plan: A healthy campus climate is one that makes faculty, staff and students feel safe, welcome, and included. What are some tangible items that can be implemented to get us to where UCR wants to be?

Question: Two other areas that need to be weaved into this conversation are (1) emerging technology and (2) athletics (or other programs). What types of extra-curricular opportunities require students to attend off-campus? Are these equitable?

Question: Community is often talked about as the Inland Empire or Riverside. Couldn't UCR participate in the global community? **Response:** Visualize communities as concentric circles. UCR can simultaneously participate in local communities and global communities.

Discussion Point: Happiness and enjoyment do not equal engagement. Consider whether UCR wants members reporting satisfaction or engaging on campus and how those might be captured differently.

Discussion Point: UCR's strategic plan will serve as scaffolding for internal storytelling and advance external agendas. What messages will UCR derive from this plan? How will UCR communicate the strategic plan in meaningful ways for a variety of stakeholders? The strategic plan does not need to be a marketing plan but this committee should consider how these plans translate into a series of messages. Also, consider the nuanced way people now receive communication, the translation that often needs to happen between mediums, and a global competition for attention. There are multiple intersections for donors, legislators, grant-making agencies, internal and external campuses to care about UCRs attempt to take on real-world problems. How does UCRs strategic plan differentiate from others?

Description and Discussion of Community Forums

One area where the Steering Committee can assist working groups is in hosting town halls and forums. Forums will be open to faculty, staff, and students and can be made open to off-campus stakeholders. The idea is to have audiences participate in discussion at tables staffed by working group members. Forums would give working groups a chance to obtain feedback and input on their decided topic(s) of discussion. Is there any interest? **General Response:** This would be great but the groups do not yet know what topics. Let them all check in with their committees and get back.

Other Considerations:

- Is there a way to schedule something online? **Response:** Not sure, but will research.
- Could there be two forums: one relatively soon as an opportunity to collect information and one later in the Spring Quarter to get feedback? **Response:** Yes, if there is interest.
- What are the best strategies to maximize student involvement? **Response:** Perhaps meeting students where they are (i.e., at student group meetings such as ASUCR) would be more effective.
- The format of the forum can be different depending on the working group, if needed.

Final Words and Adjournment (*Tom Smith)*

The Steering Committee has put a lot of information sources and materials in the Shared Drive, to give planning members access to more big ideas of what goes into strategic planning in higher education. If anyone has something to share, please add it to the Information and Resources folder.

It is clear that all of the working groups have a good grip on their work and the committee seems on pace for each group to have a solid report by June. AKA provided a calendar grid that will be revised and redistributed; working groups and leaders are invited to give feedback to that calendar and timeline if needed.

UCR Strategic Planning:
Working Group Presentations for
February 13, 2020 Steering Committee Meeting

It was clear from the reports in the January meeting that the working groups are well into gathering data and information and are beginning to explore the implications of what they are learning. In preparation for the February steering committee meeting, we want to encourage the working groups to do some relatively higher-level visioning, focusing on the UCR we want to have by our centennial, though the particular lens of their respective topics.

We know that some of you may feel it is still too early for such visioning, but keep in mind this will be an iterative process. We don't expect you to arrive at a final vision now, but we do hope you can start hypothesizing about its possible elements so that the other steering committee members might react to and build upon your thinking.

For our February meeting, please prepare a brief description—using full paragraphs or bullet points—of your group's vision for UCR. That is, how would you describe the kind of "thriving campus community," or "research and scholarly distinction," or "contributions to the public good" (and so on) that you would most like to see by 2054? What are some specific characteristics? The attachment to this document provides a few examples of visions that illustrate how other institutions attempted to describe their futures.

This exercise asks the working groups to think big, creatively, transformatively, maybe even slightly outlandishly about UCR's future. View this as an opportunity to imagine the UCR you'd be proudest of, the University at which you'd most like to work. Again, this does not mean you are committing to this vision for the rest of your group's work or its final report. You will probably revise it several times as you learn more from your analyses and begin to devise specific recommendations.

We know that 2054 is far off. Who knows what the equivalent game-changer to the iPhone or A.I. will be 34 years from now—or if UCR's campus will have a beautiful ocean view as a result of rising seas. It's hard to predict disruption, and no one expects you to incorporate time travel or flying cars into your vision for the University. But if 2054 is still too much to wrap your head around, try looking ten or fifteen years into the future instead, a time that should be easier to imagine. Whatever time frame you choose, try to free yourself to think beyond present-day constraints and challenges that would have to be addressed to achieve your vision.

The hope is that this exercise will get you at least part way toward an inspiring vision. And having one in mind—as a sort of a touchstone—will help ensure that the strategic priorities, overarching goals, and specific recommendations your working group develops directly support that vision rather than address merely tactical concerns.

At the steering committee meeting:
Each of the working groups will have 20 minutes to share its work with the steering committee. This will be divided roughly into ten minutes of presentation by the chair and vice-chair and ten minutes for open discussion with the full steering committee.

1. Read your vision aloud. Tell the group a little about how you arrived at it and the elements you most wanted to emphasize. Feel free to share any differences of opinion or points of debate your group had in preparing the vision.

2. In light of the vision, describe your group's early thinking on emerging themes, priorities, high-level goals or preliminary recommendations.

3. Provide a very brief update on the status of your group's analytic work and research (e.g., interviews, focus groups, peer comparisons), including any plans you have to participate in a campus forum as described by the Associate Provost at our January meeting.

Deliverables: If at all possible, please upload the vision your group has prepared to the steering committee shared drive in advance of the meeting (no later than 2 days beforehand), as well as any other ideas emerging from your group about strategic priorities, high-level goals or preliminary recommendations. Don't be concerned about format; it's the content that matters.

Attachment: Examples of Visioning

The visions below represent two very different institutions as well as two different altitudes. The first, from the college of education of a large private research university, is a statement supporting one of its four strategic goals—to become an innovator in lifelong and life-wide education.[1] In it, the college conveys vividly the characteristics that would make it such an innovator. The second vision statement is from Florida State University's current strategic plan, *The Future is Florida State*, and represents a vision for the University as a whole. While the unit of analysis (i.e., an entire institution as opposed to one facet of an academic college of a major university) is higher, the effort to describe an exciting future for the University and the characteristics that will make it so is evident.

A. Small College of Education at a Large Private University

Priority 3: An Innovator in Lifelong and Life-Wide Learning

As lifespans continue to increase and more people seek education outside traditional modes of delivery, lifelong and life-wide education will become increasingly important, requiring attention to more than formal preK-16 schooling. Our focus must be on a much longer "education pipeline," one that includes family needs and interactions from birth to preschool, ongoing professional development for job and career success, and avocational and personal exploration following retirement. Of equal importance is where and how people learn "life-wide"; that is, across a range of formal and informal experiences in a variety of settings, including home, museums and other cultural spaces, athletics, political involvement, workplaces, among others.

The College of Education will link its expertise with that of the University's other colleges, centers and offices to make ourselves a resource for the study and practice of teaching and learning in lifelong and life-wide contexts and the application of technology to enhance and expand opportunities in both areas.

Let's briefly parse this example. What will be the characteristics of a college of education that's an innovator in lifelong and life-wide learning a decade from now? This college believed that such an institution would be characterized by its focus on:

- A much longer "education pipeline" than just the preK-16 years.

- Education during the years before formal schooling begins, professional development for career success, and personal and recreational exploration (particularly in the retirement years).

- Formal and informal settings other than what we think of as schools, colleges, and universities.

- Engaging other parts of the university, and their expertise, in this effort.

- Applying technology as an enabler.

---

[1] We have not identified the institution by name because the text is drawn from a strategic plan of several years ago that is no longer on the college's website.

Of course, this section of the college's strategic plan then went on to identify **what** it would do to achieve this vision, describing specific initiatives with respect to online learning, collaborations with other colleges, new kinds of academic credentials, partnerships with companies and community organizations, and the like. But the vision isn't concerned with those details. Rather it paints a creative, vivid, and inspiring picture of what the college will be like when it becomes an innovator in lifelong and life-wide learning.

B. The Future is Florida State: Florida State University Strategic Plan, 2017-2022

Vision Statement

Florida State University will be among the nation's most entrepreneurial and innovative universities, transforming the lives of our students and shaping the future of our state and society through exceptional teaching, research, creative activity, and service. We will amplify these efforts through our distinctive climate—one that places a premium on interdisciplinary inquiry and draws from the rich intellectual and personal diversity of our students, faculty, staff, and alumni. These three forces—entrepreneurship, interdisciplinarity, and diversity—deepen FSU's impact and result in a powerful return to our students and the people of Florida for their continued support and trust.

These are just two examples. Don't feel you have to echo their style, syntax, or other language choices. Ask yourself, what will UCR be known for, what will it look and feel like, what behaviors you will see on campus, and what will be the culture here when the University truly makes meaningful contributions to the public good, offers an unparalleled student experience, or successfully addresses the other areas of focus in UCR's strategic planning process. For additional inspiration, you can also review the reference materials we circulated via email on December 20 and posted to the shared drive.

University of California, Riverside Strategic Planning
Working Groups Deliverables and Timetable
October 2019-June 2020
(Working Document. Subject to Revision)

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables
Oct. 16, 2019 Steering Committee (SC) Meeting	Discuss initial plans and needs with the Steering Committee (SC)
Nov. 18th SC Meeting	Brief oral report to Steering Committee: 1. What has your working group accomplished to date with respect to: • Defining focus (e.g., identifying key issues, developing guiding questions, and otherwise delimiting focus) • Organizing for the effort (e.g., assigning responsibilities, devising a plan of attack, scheduling future meetings) • Identifying sources of information and knowledgeable individuals and groups 2. What are your working group's immediate next steps? Next meeting? 3. Has your group reached any early hypotheses that it hopes to explore and test? 4. How can the steering committee, other working groups, and/or AKA best assist you? *Deliverables:* Please prepare a brief list of information sources you've identified, including individuals or groups you plan to speak with, and send this to Shannon Timmons at provostadmin@ucr.edu *no later than noon on Monday November 18.* [As Provost Smith will describe in the meeting of November 18th, we will be setting up a shared Google drive to which you will be able to upload such documents for future meetings.]

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables
Early December	• Schedule regular working group meetings through June. (Recommend at least one full group meeting per month and the establishment of subgroups for specific subtopics and tasks—the subgroups to pursue their work and convene as needed between full working group sessions.) • Prepare a set of "guiding questions" that define your group's focus and a few early hypotheses you hope to test. • Examine relevant sections of UCR 2020 and the October 2019 progress report from the Provost. Identify successes, springboards for future initiatives, and gaps that remain important to address. • Identify current campus efforts relevant to your group's focus and their results to date, including efforts by other strategic planning working groups. • Gather and begin review and analysis of data, documents, reports, and the like to help answer questions and test hypotheses. (This may include literature reviews, names of peer or other institutions for comparisons, and sources of best practice information.) • Identify relevant issues for your group to explore with respect to (a) research and creative activity and (b) diversity, equity, and inclusion—the two cross-cutting values already identified. *Deliverables:* Please post to the steering committee shared Google drive a schedule of your full group's meetings and the guiding questions and any early hypotheses you've developed.
Mid-December 2019 to Early-January 2020	• Undertake 2054 visioning exercise: What would be the characteristics of a "thriving campus community," "unparalleled student experience," "[valued] contributions to the public good," and so on, by UCR's centennial? What of these characteristics would be attainable in the next five years? 10 years? • Continue information gathering and analysis, increasing focus on external sources, comparisons, and conversations with individuals and groups on and off campus. • Periodically step back from your analyses and ask: What light does this shed on our guiding questions or early hypotheses? What conclusions does it suggest? How does it redirect us? What's exciting? What pitfalls exist?

AKA | STRATEGY

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables
Early to Mid-January 2020 **Jan. 14th** **SC meeting**	• Continue analyses. Begin conversations with other groups on and off campus if you have not already. • Conduct at least one meeting of your full group to share results of analyses and their implications (e.g., conclusions, goals, recommendations they suggest) • Prepare a brief document—based on the meeting above and/or the work of subgroups—summarizing the key ideas from group's thinking on its topic. *Deliverables:* Present a 10-minute update at January 14th meeting, summarizing what your group has learned to date. This might include: • Observations or conclusions based on the group's initial interviews, analyses, or research • Hypotheses you hope to explore with further work • Simply the results of discussions within your group Feel free to also use this time to: • Identify questions or themes your group has discussed that relate to any of the other working groups • Ask for guidance, support, or feedback from the steering committee. • Describe your group's immediate next steps **Following the meeting:** • Please post any documentation used in your presentation on the SC shared drive, in your group's folder. • Follow up with the Ken Baerenklau in the Provost's Office to discuss if, how and when your group would be interested in the Community Forum opportunity discussed in the meeting.

AKA | STRATEGY

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables
Mid-January to Mid-February **Feb. 13th SC meeting**	• Meet as a full working group to prepare a brief statement of your group's vision for UCR. Using full paragraphs or bullet points, describe the kind of "thriving UCR campus community," or "research and scholarly distinction at UCR," or "UCR contributions to the public good" (and so on) that you would most like to see by 2054? What are your aspirations for it? What are the characteristics of it that you most want to emphasize? • In light of the vision you've created, describe your group's early thinking on emerging themes, priorities, high-level goals or preliminary recommendations. • *Write it down*: Summarize this discussion in succinct written form, and upload it to the SC shared drive. (You may also want to print copies out to share at the February 13th Steering Committee meeting.) • Use this vision as a touchstone to help ensure that the priorities, overarching goals, and specific recommendations directly support that vision rather than address merely tactical concerns. • Continue analyses as needed *Deliverables:* Each of the working groups will have 20 minutes to share its work with the steering committee. This will be divided roughly into ten minutes of presentation by the chair and vice-chair and ten minutes for open discussion with the full steering committee. • Read your vision aloud. Tell the group a little about how you arrived at it and the elements you most wanted to emphasize. Feel free to share any differences of opinion or points of debate your group had in preparing the vision. • In light of the vision, describe your group's early thinking on emerging themes, priorities, high-level goals or preliminary recommendations. • Provide a very brief update on the status of your group's analytic work and research (e.g., interviews, focus groups, peer comparisons), including any plans you have to participate in a campus forum as described by the Associate Provost at our January meeting. • Please upload the vision your group has prepared to the steering committee shared drive in advance of the meeting (no later than 2 days beforehand), as well as any other ideas emerging from your group about strategic priorities, high-level goals or preliminary recommendations

AKA | STRATEGY

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables

Mid-February to Mid-March
 	
March 12th
SC meeting
	• Draft a preliminary framework/outline of your group's report—a document that illustrates its anticipated organization and potential content with headings, bullet points, and brief text.
	
	• "Content" at this juncture might mean:
	  o Key findings from your analyses (e.g., first-year students generally feel more comfortable with peer advisors but don't find them knowledgeable about academic requirements and coursework);
	  o Implications/possibilities that you've teased out of these findings (e.g., UCR can make good use of peer advisors with first-year students for advising on the transition to college but will have to figure out how to use peers as a bridge to the University's academic advisors for structured curriculum/course advising);
	  o Your initial "vision" of what UCR might look like five to ten years from now with respect to your topic;
	  o High-level goals and recommendations; and
	  o Examples of specific initiatives and activities that would help achieve the vision you've identified.
	
	Deliverables:
	• Upload your framework/outline to the steering committee shared drive ***no later than noon on Tuesday, March 10th***
	
	• Lead a 10-20 minute presentation and discussion of your framework with the steering committee. This might include:
	  o Quick description of analyses, research, discussions & other work of the group to date that got you to this point;
	  o Key points of your framework (assume the committee has looked at your framework on the shared drive in advance);
	  o Questions, concerns, points of contention on which you'd like the steering committee's responses;
	  o Thoughts on the cross-cutting values: "research & creative activity" and "diversity, equity, and inclusion"; and/or
	  o Mention of any work conducted with other working groups or key relationships with them that you've identified
	
	Following the meeting: Summarize in written form any decisions or conclusions made in light of discussion with the steering committee and any revisions you wish to make to your framework document. ***Upload this to the SC shared drive.***

AKA | STRATEGY

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables

Mid-March to Mid-April
 	
Mid-April
SC meeting
	• Fine tune the organization of your group's report based on steering committee feedback and further discussion in your group
	
	• Begin drafting detailed content for a first draft of your report.
	   ○ This will most likely be done by subgroups into which your group organized itself.
	   ○ Focus on generating relevant content rather than determining where in your final report it should go or creating a cohesive report
	   ○ At this point, your draft will likely have gaps, sections needing further refinement, items on which your group has not reached consensus, and areas where you feel input from the steering committee is needed. In short, a first draft
	
	• Meet regularly to review content with your group (and possibly with selected stakeholders outside the group) for feedback and further input
	
	• Reach consensus on a first draft to share with the steering committee
	
	Deliverables:
	• Upload your first draft to the steering committee shared drive ***no later than three days before the April meeting***
	
	• Lead a 30-minute presentation and discussion of your first draft with the steering committee (supported by whatever media you wish—handouts, slides, etc.)
	
	N.B.: We expect that by this point more time will be required for each working group to present its report and discuss it with the steering committee. As we get closer to April, we will decide whether to extend the meeting time, have the working groups present over two meetings, or use some other approach.

Mid-April to Mid-May **Mid-May** **SC meeting**	Continue development of draft reports as in prior step. Remaining working groups will present their draft reports at May meeting. The groups that reported in April will give brief updates.

AKA｜STRATEGY

Timeframe	Milestones/Deliverables

Mid-May to Mid-June	• Prepare iterative drafts of report for discussion by your working group, focusing in particular on prioritizing your recommendations.
	
	• Obtain input and feedback from other working groups and stakeholders, as needed.
	
	• As the goals and recommendations of your report take clearer shape, begin to identify ideas for qualitative and quantitative metrics to measure progress toward each goal.
	
	• Prepare penultimate report through continued discussion and revision with the working group and consultation as needed with members of the steering committee, other working groups, and AKA Strategy.
	
	• To guide the steering committee in developing the strategic plan and preparing for implementation, take some time to identify in your report:
	
	   a. Low-hanging fruit—things that could be accomplished relatively quickly, might begin even before the strategic plan is complete, and would generate excitement and momentum in the UCR community;
	
	   b. Rough time frames for implementing key initiatives recommended in your report (in terms such as: six months; two years; "underway two years from now but probably completed over a much longer time frame," etc.);
	
	   c. Prioritization of your group's recommendations, or important considerations with respect to their sequencing;
	
	   d. *Very preliminary* parameters of required resources for recommended initiatives—including *types* of resources (financial, human, infrastructure, etc.) and rough levels (along the lines of "high, medium, low").
	
	Deliverables:
	• Upload your penultimate draft to the steering committee shared drive *no later than five days before the June meeting*
	
	• Lead a 30-minute presentation and discussion of your draft with the steering committee, leaving time for discussion and feedback

Mid-June to June 30th	Finalize written report and deliver to Provost's Office by June 30th.

(note: "**Mid-June SC meeting**" label appears in the Timeframe column aligned with the Deliverables section)

AKA | STRATEGY