

Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting

01/26/2021 1-3 pm, Zoom

Meeting Minutes

Attendance

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

Absent: Eddie Comeaux

Agenda in Brief

Meeting Goals (*Interim Provost Tom Smith*)

Welcome (*Chancellor Kim Wilcox*)

Reactions to the Dec 16th Response Summary

Next Steps & Campus Consultation

Final Questions & Comments

Steering Committee Endorsement

Closing (*Interim Provost Tom Smith*)

Closing (*Chancellor Kim Wilcox*)

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Goals (*Interim Provost Tom Smith*)

The goal of this meeting is to leave with unanimous concurrence on the draft document. We will discuss the edits that we made in response to the December 16th meeting comments and hear any other thoughts. If there are any issues, it is our intention, to the best of our ability, to work out solutions in this meeting. Our next step is to take this document to campus and it is important for us to convey that this group supports the document we are putting forward.

Over the past month or so, we have addressed those December comments and we have had Johnny Cruz's team do some editing. They worked on changing the tone and the narrative of the document and we hope there is significant improvement there, but we don't think that the content and substance have changed much.

Welcome (*Chancellor Kim Wilcox*)

It is good to see everyone again and thank you all for your work. I had a chance to read the draft and I was impressed. I have been a part of many strategic plans, even written a few myself, and I know that it is difficult to write something with enough detail that it is legitimate and with enough generality that there is room to run. Also, you have to write it in a way that everyone is able to see themselves in it. It is a tough needle to thread and I'm proud of how you have done it here.

This strategic plan provides a vision. A non-UCR person could read this document and get a sense of UCR and what we want to get done. One of my important first impressions of this document is that, more than any other such plan that I have seen, it reflects our institutional values. It talks a lot about our commitment to each other, our community, and the bigger world in a way that is defining to UCR. It is a value-forward message that is content driven; not an easy thing to achieve.

I also like the implementation piece because it provides some framework and specificity to the plan. If we are going to make this happen we can't have one committee, one person, or one department be responsible. We have to inspire general ownership across campus and throughout the university and I believe that this implementation plan is aligned with that effort.

For all of the bright, dedicated minds working on this to get to a document at this stage is a nontrivial task and I didn't want to muddy it with a lot of comments and suggestions, so I just want to say thank you.

And, one last comment. The last strategic plan, UCR 2020, got a lot of press in particular because of a sound bite which was that we aspired to have an AAU profile. It was a good sound bite but this new document's narrative and goals demonstrate that we have moved on. We have our bona fides and we know where we want to go here. I think in 5, 6, or 10 years people will look back on this document and they will talk about its important role in legitimizing values that we have talked about for a long time and it is a legacy you all can be proud of.

Reactions to the December 18th Response Summary

Sustainability in Hiring

- Issue with asking candidates about sustainability in interviews/hiring process, etc. There are some faculty working on sustainability but not all staff and faculty have ties to the subject. Seems too specific for the breadth of the positions we fill on campus and for the role of this document.
 - (Discussion Point) The idea is: as much as diversity is part of faculty hiring so will be sustainability, such as a sustainability statement in hiring. That way it is taken into consideration in hiring and can permeate the hiring discussions allowing people to understand how sustainability comes into play across many roles.
 - (Discussion Point) Won't this feel forced? It is not related to some roles.
 - (Reply) Similar concerns when we incorporated diversity statements.
 - (Discussion Point) Reading through the document with an eye on sustainability, I read it as environmental sustainability, but this is talking about five different types of sustainability. Institutional sustainability requires resources, it could be money or personnel, etc. We have more flexibility if we incorporate the broader sustainability. But, if the intent was for us to focus on environmental sustainability that will require funding.
 - (Discussion Point) The WG viewed this goal as pertaining to broader sustainability but that may not be how it ended up in the document. I am open to expanding that text but the idea of a statement of contribution or embedding sustainability into hiring as we did diversity is a fundamental idea of SIO&F's work.
 - (Example) My college brings in a lot of external research funds which is financially sustainable, is that what you mean?
 - a. (Response) Yes, that works and is a good example.

Resolved – We can adjust that language.

Goals as Part of Leadership Performance Appraisals

- (Page 20) "Each year deans, directors, and vice chancellors will assess and report..." Issue with reports being a part of performance appraisal.

- This line is open to interpretation and I’m confused about what standards deans/directors will be held to? For which areas? Will our budgets and distributions be held to this? There is good intention here but if we are going to do this then we need more detail.
(Tabled and then circled back to later)
- (Continued) Annual reports will detail each college’s and department’s progress toward their goals and that progress will have an impact on the budgets – i.e. units should be allocating their money to support those goals. There should be a structure for the colleges to support those goals.
- Many are hypersensitive to the immediate budgetary constraints and are worried about needing to prioritize the immediate needs of students and faculty while juggling performance appraisals based on assigning money to these new goals. However, if we assume that budget flexibility is restored and think about this as a longer-term document and plan, this item makes more sense and the issue is resolved.

Resolved – Change request rescinded.

Path-breaking Research

- Great revisions and especially pleased with how the tech and education accessibility section was expanded.
- The language of path-breaking research, especially since it is a front-and-center point, is maligned with the tone of the rest of the document. We talk about building things, and then this is breaking.
 - We might reframe that into a more proactive, positive statement.

Resolved – We can adjust that language.

Interdepartmental Programs on Equal Footing

- The statement, “Creating stable foundations for interdepartmental graduate programs...” is problematic because of “place them on equal footing with departmental programs”
 - (Reply) This is just a statement about interdepartmental majors and how faculty should have access to the same resources to teach those courses as departmental students and faculty. The intent of it is that if we can’t give interdepartmental programs the same consideration, then we shouldn’t be serving interdepartmental faculty and students.

Comment resolved with the clarification of interdepartmental programs.

Removal of the Vignettes & Call Out Boxes

- The summary of changes was helpful and I liked the removal of the vignettes and replaced with boxes that pulled out big picture visions. The pulled concepts were important, for example the AAU box was done well and reflective of its importance.

Living Healthier and Longer – Social Determinants of Health Disease

- Alternate wording suggestion for Living Healthier and Longer Section:

“Addressing the most pressing challenges in neuroscience, cognition, aging, mental health, substance abuse, nutrition, and the social determinants of health disease. Developing and harnessing new biomedical technologies to discover, develop, and deploy new therapeutics.”

Resolved, that wording can be adopted.

Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship Programs & Funding for Graduate Students

- On page 9 the document calls for UCR to increase postdoctoral fellowship programs. I would like to urge the document to include something like: "By X year, UCR will have 5 years of guaranteed funding for all PhD students," or something to that effect. This bullet point on postdocs doesn't say anything about graduate or prospective graduate students.
- (Discussion Point) That is the direction most universities are going and we are comfortable with that as a goal but let's turn to the deans.
- (Discussion Point) Why should it come from the colleges/deans and not the Provost/Chancellor?
 - (Comment) Agreed, ensuring 5 years of funding cannot be a college-only commitment. What about Graduate Division support?
- (Discussion Point) It is easy for Provost/Chancellor to make a statement that UCR will have 5 years of funding for each graduate student and our offices could put in bridge programs and small amounts of funding to help out, but the departments would be the ones making the commitment to provide the GSRs and TAs or to not admit more students than they can afford to fund for 5 years.
- (Discussion Point) It would come down to restricting the number of PhD students and mean telling faculty that they can't bring in as many first-year fellowships as they can find. They would be required to find those students funding first. To enforce that, I would need a campus commitment.

Resolved, Ken will work on wording with John after the meeting and will update this section.

International Profile

- Can we feature the desired international profile of UCR more prominently? The current document focuses more on whether or not we have international students/or faculty rather than our reputation internationally.

Resolved, we will look over that section and upgrade the language to an international level.

Retiring Older Systems

- (Page 19) Where the document talks about retiring older systems in a timely manner can we add a note about retiring them also in an orderly or coordinated manner?

Resolved, yes, we can add that language.

Access & Technology

- The document talks about using technology to improve and expand access. How can we acknowledge that access embodies a variety of different students that need very different accommodation? Also acknowledge that technology does not always solve access problems, it sometimes complicates access as we have seen with video.

Resolved, we will expand that section to make that acknowledgement.

Prioritization of a Master's Programs

- Throughout this process I have had an issue with the prioritization of MS degrees. This document does a much better job than previous versions at prioritizing PhD programs. Thank you.

Next Steps & Campus Consultation

Our next steps are to make the adjustments we discussed today and then share this penultimate draft with campus and our community partners. We are looking for feedback and we understand that anytime a document goes out for broad input, we will see many, many new ideas. However, this document has already have well over a hundred people already contribute, so we will be judicious about making any major changes.

If we come out on the other side of campus consultation and there are only minor changes, then this is our last Steering Committee meeting.

If there are significant issues or major changes that need input from multiple voices on this committee, we will convene for one more meeting in mid-March.

Our consultation schedule:

- February 1st Share the Penultimate Draft with Community & Campus Partners
- February 8th Campus Leadership Meeting
- February 9th Campus Community Forum #1
- February 10th Campus Community Forum #2
- February 16th Staff Assembly Consultation
- February 16th ASUCR Consultation
- February 17th Dean's Meeting
- February 19th Junior Faculty Consultation
- February 23rd Faculty Senate Consultation

Are there any groups missing from this list?

- Perhaps sharing with the Chamber of Commerce and the Riverside business community?
 - Share the draft or the final plan?
 - The draft would likely be preferred so that they could give input/comments.
- Extension? Are they included in the dean's meeting?
 - Yes.
- Alumni Association?
 - The Alumni Board Association will be engaged at their meeting in May. There should be nothing in this plan which will take them by surprise and they will likely use this as scaffolding and language for their own process.

Final Questions & Comments:

- I want to get my college and departments together. What is the timeline? Do I need to do this in February?
 - Our goal is to have all feedback in by March 1 so that we can begin synthesizing and assessing what changes may or may not be needed.
- I strongly recommend structuring the forums to incorporate smaller breakout groups with leaders and note-takers as that has been a successful approach in the past and ensures all voices can contribute.
- When do we aim to release the final product?

- Launch to campus in early Spring Quarter. Late March or early April.

Steering Committee Endorsement

I hope that this document is something you are really proud of and believe firmly will set a pathway for UCR's bright future. In the coming weeks the Provost's Office and the Chancellor's Office will share and promote this document but, truly, you all are its biggest ambassadors. If you are not excited about this plan and proud to share it with your colleagues, then no one should be.

Before we go public next week, I would like to see if we have enthusiastic concurrence on this draft. Understanding that the changes discussed today will be adopted, could you please raise your hand if you endorse this version of the strategic plan: *ALL HANDS RAISED*.

Closing (*Tom Smith*)

Thank you everyone for all the time you have put into this document, into being a part of this Steering Committee, and for all of your effort in the Working Groups.

This is a great document for the aspirations of UCR in the next year and over the decades to come. As we've mentioned, there will be judicious consideration of the feedback we receive throughout the consultation period but this planning process was marked by transparency and engagement. We expect there will be widespread recognition of your work and the diverse outreach efforts.

Finally, thank you Tony Knerr and the AKA Strategic Team for helping us.

Closing (*Kim Wilcox*)

Thank you to everyone.

You have all done a great job and I just want you to think about how amazing it is to find a consensus vision among all of the minds on this screen and the dozens more in working groups. That is how we know this is a strong plan. Great work and I owe you a party in the Chancellor's backyard once things are open again!