UC**RIVERSIDE**
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting
8/19/2020 1-3 pm, Zoom
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Present: **UCR**: Tom Smith, Jason Stajich, Christiane Weirauch, Crystal Petrini, Nichi Yes, Yat Sun Poon, Xiaoping Hu, Timothy Lyons, Bruce Link, Xuan Liu, Christian Shelton, Rebekah Richert, Gabriela Canalizo, Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Kathryn Uhrich, Chris Lynch, Juliet McMullin, Rodolfo Torres, Peter Hayashida, Ken Baerenklau, Julia McLean **AKA Strategy:** Tony Knerr, Belinda Li, John Braunstein

Absent: Eddie Comeaux, Brian Haynes, Luis Huerta

Agenda in Brief

1:00 Welcome & Meeting Goals *(Tom Smith)*
1:05 Breakout Groups
    1:05 Orientation *(AKA Strategy)*
    1:15 Breakout Group Discussions (40 mins)
1:55 Reports from Breakout Groups & Discussion
    2:00 Group #1
    2:10 Group #2
    2:20 Group #3
    2:30 Group #4
    2:40 Additional Discussion
2:55 Final Comments and Adjournment

Meeting Minutes

Welcome *(Tom Smith)*

    Summer is a valuable time so thank you for taking time out of this hot summer day to join us for this meeting and thank you for your continuing working group work. The document everyone received before this meeting was our attempt to take the framework from last time, put some meat on it, and give clearer descriptions of the strategies and initiatives that could play out in the strategic plan.

    This is a draft. We have tried to build some coherence between everything we've gotten out of your working groups. We may still be overpromising on some things and under-promising on others, we'll look to you to help us fill those things out. We didn't want to wait any longer before getting input from you, even though what we've shared is a little messy.

    Working on this draft in parallel to the working group reports means that there are likely things coming out of your reports that we've missed. We are not intentionally ignoring things so please let us know if we've missed something. Yat Sun and Becca, and Bruce and Gabi, thank you for providing strong first drafts of your working group documents. Those documents have helped us dig deeper and get farther along in our draft. We look forward to seeing everyone else's drafts as they progress.

    We'll spend most of this meeting in smaller groups discussing this draft but we will come back together for a larger group discussion.

Orientation for Breakout Groups *(AKA Strategy)*

Questions for Breakout Groups *(John Braunstein)*

    I'd like to tell you about the two ways we'd like your perspectives on this document.

    In Section A, we'd like your opinions on the document as a whole. If you were asked what UCR's priorities are and you stood up and described the four strategic goals laid out here – would that cut it?

    In Section B, each group has been assigned one of the goals. The initiatives in the goal are examples but they have been drawn for the working groups. Do they add up to achieving the

overarching goal? You'll notice we have purposely excluded the chairs and vice chairs from the goal most closely related to their committees. Today, we want you to look at this work from the perspective of someone outside of the working group.

Finally, notice that there are thoughtful questions in the margins of the draft. I would suggest as part of your breakout group's response, particularly for the "B" questions, you might look at some of these questions and answer whatever you are able to. If you have further thoughts on those questions and comments, you're welcome to shoot those back to Ken and Tom in an email.

Breakout Group Logistics *(Belinda Li)*

Everyone will be placed into their pre-assigned breakout groups (described in the meeting materials). Each group needs to assign three roles: facilitator, note taker, and a presenter. The note-taker can use whatever they'd like to take notes. You have 40 minutes in your group to discuss, try to save 5-10 minutes at the end to organize your groups and decide what you will share with the group. What you share should highlight the points that your group identifies as the most important and should include areas of agreement and any strongly held differing opinions.

Breakout Group Reports and Discussion

The Steering Committee breaks into four groups for 40 minutes of small group discussion. Groups are organized around the four strategic goals in the draft:

Goal #1: A Rigorous, Engaging and Empowering Learning Environment

Goal #2: Distinctive and World-class Research and Scholarship

Goal #3: A Welcoming and Inclusive Community

Goal #4: An Exemplary Model for Advancing the Public Good

Upon return, each group has 5 minutes to present key-takeaways from their group's discussion and 5 minutes for discussion with the rest of the steering committee.

Group #1 Presentation & Discussion

Section A: Reflections on the entire draft (all four strategic goals)

- Should Goal #2, about world-class research, be the opening of the strategic plan?
  - Move current Goal #1 about learning environment down.
- The document should put a higher emphasis on quality of education
- Clarify the term co-creation of knowledge and fill that with more guidance.
  - What does it mean for students to co-create knowledge?
- Resilience to disruption should be expanded to all aspects of campus (not just the learning enterprise)
- The emphasis in this draft is still strongly on undergraduate education and research; the graduate students come in a lot of flavors, so how much detail should there be on these.
- Be clearer on the undergraduate experience. What does it meant to "embed research and experiential learning" into the curriculum?
- Major gap: quality of education emphasis

Section B: Reflections on the Goal #1 - *A Rigorous, Engaging and Empowering Learning Environment*

- More emphasis on graduate students in this goal
  - Better emphasis on the global scale of what we're trying to do
- Explain how we might expose undergraduate students to global issues
- Should the general education part of the plan be removed? We have no idea what general education might look like 20-35 years from now.
- The draft explains that we are trying to get away from the 1:1 emphasis apprenticeship model. How does that counter the toxic environment that is described? Is this document even well-suited to address the toxic nature of graduate student mentorship?
- Peer mentoring is a great idea but we felt it did not get the attention, outline, or definition it needed in this document.
- Again, the resilience piece should be expanded beyond the learning institution

Group #1 Discussion

- What metrics are there to gauge the success of education?
  - What about capturing the actual success of our students after graduation?
- It sounds like we want to make this big place feel small but do we have any creative ideas about how to make that happen?
- Emphasizing the peer-to-peer mentoring can help create that kind of community
- The USE group is also talking about creating many different kinds of advising circles which would create a more holistic approach (job placement, academic advising, etc.)
  - Have we thought about expanding learning communities beyond the first-year students? The learning communities could go through senior year and even into graduate school? Its not 1:1 but it is a small group which makes it get closer to personalized education
  - USE supports this and would like to see it expand to transfer students (it is already strong in freshmen in CNAS and BCOE) and we would like to see it developed. In some of our document we even say tat faculty and staff should partner more in the learning communities.

Group #2 Presentation & Discussion

Section A: Reflections on the entire draft (all four strategic goals)

- Our group thought the draft was generally good and that it was clear there was a strong effort by many people going into this document.
- One thing missing is a reflection of the current moment. Things have changed so dramatically in the past few months and education will remain changed moving forward. The document feels very much like a plan written before COVID and we think there is room for adjustment.
- UCR's identity could also be bolstered throughout the draft; articulate who we are and why we are special.

Section B: Reflections on the Goal #2 -*Distinctive and World-class Research and Scholarship*

- AAU strategy: how much should we emphasize AAU? Some of us thought that we'd like to have such a strong statement of excellence in the document but others thought it wasn't the way to go. Instead, they recommended that we could state the specifics of what AAU membership might indicate and describe the areas UCR wants to grow in.

- o We liked the idea of naming our AAU-style metrics "Inclusive Excellence" – something that was excellent in our own UCR way.
- Regarding Strategy 2.2: Invest in selected areas of research that harness our collective strengths
  - o How are we going to do those things? What are the strategies that would achieve those and does that need to be reflected more in the document?
  - o Should anyone be included on the list? How will people feel if they're not? Would it be too broad if no one is included on the list, only issues?
  - o Perhaps that strategy could have more about what kind of a context and environment we could create at UCR that would allow world-class research.
    - o Example: Creating the interdisciplinary context that is needed for better research
    - o What networks can we build to create that kind of connectivity at UCR?

Group #2 Discussion

- The RSD group has discussed the AAU quite a bit and we are in general consensus with your comments. Our idea has been to not use AAU as the goal, but as a guiding principle.
  - o We like the idea of the connectivity and integrating that into the interdisciplinary work that we're going to push in the document. I'd like to hear more discussion around that principle of connectivity.
    - For example, the Health Disparities Centers grant brought people together from CHASS, Biomedicine, and more. Those types of grants and centers help us learn each other's languages and solve joint problems.
    - That center creates the connectivity that is need to solve these larger problems! And we can only be competitive in the grant if we find this connectivity. Individual units can help achieve this connectivity.
- We have to get people to know each other enough and give them incentives to work together. Then, it will snowball into more grants and solving larger problems. We need to be clearer about the extent to which we already do this on campus, where, and how to amplify and expand it.
- The document is missing the translational element of research. UCR needs to put more effort into moving research from the lab into the communities and industries that need it.

Group #3 Presentation & Discussion

Section A: Reflections on the entire draft (all four strategic goals)

- It is difficult to understand the connection between the strategic plan and resource prioritization.
- There is a need for specificity in some of the overarching goals and at the level of assessment and implementation in some of the parts.
  - o For example, world class research - what prescriptions are we going to use to assess and how will we prioritize that?
    - If this document will not identify those areas, it should describe what will.
- We were hoping for more ways on how to drill down to things that could be assessed and measured and some accountability for how that could be done.
  - For example, if we are going to expand DEI, how can we assess that it happened in a way that was useful?

- There was some duplication in some of the areas for example – student support needs/basic needs – could be centralized more.
- In crafting a vision statement for the plan, here are themes we noticed:
  o Inclusivity, equity
  o World-class, leadership
  o Inter- or cross-disciplinary (research, and with community)

Section B: Reflections on the Goal #3 *-A Welcoming and Inclusive Community*

- Specificity needed here, too. If document says "provide innovative ways…" but doesn't define them, will be impossible to know if we've achieved it
  o There are aspirational aspects to this document but no specific or clear way forward.
- Strategy 3.4 which talks about blending the barriers between UCR and the community, overlaps with Contributions to the public good, should it be moved back to Goal #4?
- Strategy 3.3 which talks about communication: How do we strike the balance between too much and not enough communication? Sometimes there are things that are happening on campus or at UC that we just don't hear about. How can we be more effective and how are others doing this? Can we learn from them?
- Even though this plan is being laid out for decades of use, we'd like to have some sort of check in process outlines. How do initiatives get added to this and how do we remove outdated things or breathe new life into parts along the way?
  o Maybe we need to review this periodically. Trying not to – trying not to ossify us into one strategic plan and not have a plan for revisiting it. How does NASA do this? They have high specificity strategic plans and make plans to revisit them to make them contemporary.

Group #3 Discussion

- Expanding access to affordable student housing and other initiatives are key resources issues for both undergraduate and graduate students. From as USE perspective, I really like these being in the document.
  o Seconded by CPG group, they heard a lot about affordable housing in their interviews.
- How specific should this strategic plan be versus how specific should the colleges' and departments' plans be?
  o Group #3 talked about this from many sides and they don't have an answer specifically but the direction might be that colleges should delineate the specificity.
  o This strategic plan will direct where we are going to invest resources (PBA office has been saying this). So, for example, if we are going to have the medical school triple in size, I would have trouble finding where in this document it instructs that kind of investment, but this is where I would expect to find that kind of direction.
  o We might be being a bit cowardly here by not getting specific with these difficult decisions. Again, thinking about the NASA plans, the very specific roadmap is needed if we are going to achieve greatness, even at the risk of offending people.
  o Counterpoint, we do not need to prescribe which areas get investment and which won't. We can't predict the future of investment areas, anyway. What we can do is create a research and scholarly environment that is conducive to innovation and

discovery. That environment will lead us forward as an institution and areas of justified investment will make themselves clear.

- o The plan should not ever say where we would no invest.
- o We should be focusing less on what we already invest in or do well or are interested in and turn our focus to what the nation demands. Where do we have a chance for success in areas that are in demand?
- o Is having this kind of specificity moved out of this plan and into the plans of colleges and other university departments punting the responsibility? Or is it returning this document to its more philosophical purpose?

Group #4 Presentation & Discussion

Section A: Reflections on the entire draft (all four strategic goals)

- The role of sustainability in the document is not clear. There is very little related to it and it should be present in every goal that we have.
  - o Somewhere in the document, or as an attachment, we need to describe what kind of operations can enable the goal and what the revenue sources the goal will need.
- The document should be more specific about how UCR will achieve these potential initiatives and strategies otherwise it won't be feasible.
- There is still too much focus on undergraduates throughout the document. We need to stress graduate education and research.
- The document needs more emphasis on state, nation, and global issues.
- The campus has current strengths the document doesn't prescribe how to move these strengths forward – what we do best and differently and to put the resources on it.

Section B: Reflections on the Goal #3 -A Welcoming and Inclusive Community

- We need to think more about translating UCR's research to contribute to the community and public good and we need partnerships with industry.
- Regarding education pipelines, this document is missing connections to K-12 and connections to non-traditional populations (high schoolers) but education is changing and education should be featured throughout lifespan, so how do we reach and cater to and create a pipeline for learners of different ages.
- Who is contributing to the public good should be more defined. Is it UCR as an institution? Our students? Our graduates and alumni? Our faculty and staff?
  - o It could be an identity of our alumni that they think similarly about the public good.

Group #4 Discussion

- There will be a section in the document that describes the resources needed to enable these changes but it would be a good exercise to read through each goal and identify the potential revenues sources.
- Similarly, if we want to change the style of advising for graduate students, what other policy or cultural changes need to happen so that it doesn't just become a one-time initiative? The best way to be sustainable is to think about how are we going to pay for these plans and how we will support them so that they will live on and things don't just revert back to business as usual.

- Question to CPG: Is contributing to the public good defined with UCR as an institution doing the contributing or will our students and our alumni help to advance the public good after they leave UCR?
  - Answer – All of the above. CPG has had these talks in their group and are trying to enhance each one in their most recent report. They've also had discussions on exactly what the "public good" means and a section of their write up will explore that.
- The prototypical mission of a research university is "research & service" and so this is the service part that we need to fulfill, ideally, largely, with our research.
  - We don't want to be accused of "Drive by scholarship". Other institutions interact with their communities in ways that don't benefit their communities. For example, they have hoards of interns that don't stick around for jobs, their scholarship studies their population but their discoveries don't make it to them, etc. We need to be by the people for the people.

Additional Discussion

- Regarding specificity: Is there an operational plan that is specific enough to help us make decisions of funding or exclusion? Its not clear year how we will bridge between the abstract of the current document and the concrete of how we would like to use it.
  - We want enough specificity in this document to guide thinking about where we want to go as a university, but this is not an implementation plan and should not state how we are accomplishing our goals in detail. I would expect that to be a process that follows-on from this process.
  - However, if we are too general in this plan, then it is harder for anyone to come up with those implementation plans that we need to accomplish these goals. We can't write a commitment in this plan that will be irrelevant in two years, but we need to be specific enough that our document must recognizing the broader ideas that will to move us to the direction we need to be in 2054.
- The implementation is difficult but we need to get it right. For example, if we got $10 million dollars without restriction, shouldn't this document be the one to help advise us on how to invest it? Or, on the other hand and what might be more relevant to current circumstances, in the time of diminishing resources, shouldn't we be able to look to this document to inform what we should be focusing on and protecting?
  - In that sense, is there too much going on in this document to be useful?
    - No, it seems to be largely at the correct level. The proposed initiatives are proposed and there are some things that I'd like to see dig down a bit deeper. In general, there are some things that are too broad and some that are too specific which makes me think it might be at the right, general, level if we do that correcting.
- At the general level, especially with interdisciplinary research, there are a lot of good resources and it's nice to see a document that pushes for standards to enable graduate students as researchers. However, it requires a lot for students to be able to identify and use these resources. To some degree, the current system penalizes public service. So, we need to make sure that we are not just promoting public service and providing resources, we need to address the culture around it and ensure the resources are being put right directly in front of our

students, and opportunities are right at their fingertips and rewarded, to make sure they make the most of what we can offer.

- The Matthew Affect (the rich get richer, and the poor get poorer). We need to be careful how we prescribe investing in our priorities so as to not ascribe success or failure to certain areas. Instead, we need to provide an environment and context in which excellence can express itself instead of picking out winners and losers.
    - o We need to identify where to make investments, those who are successful have done this. We need to build the university by making one world-class department at a time. But that doesn't mean that we don't need a blanket mediocrity and some being really happy and others being not.
    - o We do not need to identify where to make investments, it's not necessarily true that all those who are successful have done this. We need to create platform in which people are able to hand-build excellence and some will be more successful than others but our job is to create an equal platform for that excellence to occur. It's not going to work by having someone who cannot see the future hand-picking winners and losers.
    - o We need to define what we would like our future to be like. I like some of the things that are mentioned; some of it is too broad and some we need to focus in on. Either way, investments cannot be made based on who has already been funded or who has already been successful. These decisions must be made based on where we, as a university, would like to make a difference in the future. We need to think about doing things differently and doing different things.

Final Comments and Adjournment (Tom Smith)

Thank you everyone for the great feedback on the document and on the specific goals. We want this to be a document that the campus owns so we are grateful to your efforts making it be as great as it can be. A reminder to send in your breakout group notes and to submit any additional feedback you have, including any responses to the questions and comments in the margins on the draft. Also, please feel free to share your working group report drafts with us whenever you are able.