

## Strategic Planning Implementation Advisory Committee

### Minutes of the December 13, 2010 Meeting

In attendance: Dallas Rabenstein (Chair), Ameae Walker, Shaun Bowler, John Levin, Steven Brint, Ken Baerenklau, Cindy Larive, Cynthia Giorgio (by phone), Scott Silverman

Other members of the Committee: David Herzberger, Tom Perring, Guillermo Aguilar

Staff Support: Bill Kidder

---

This was the first meeting of the newly-appointed Committee. EVC Rabenstein started the conversation by describing his goals for this Committee, which will focus on programmatic advice as distinct from budget issues. There will be a separate Budget Advisory Committee formed soon, but it was recognized that the Strategic Planning Implementation Advisory Committee's recommendations will naturally have resource implications and will be constrained by e.g., developments in the State Budget supporting UCR.

The issue of how to propel the UCR campus forward was discussed, including what large investments might have the greatest strategic impact. The need to double or triple competitive research grants was also discussed vis-à-vis the strategic goal of attaining the profile of an AAU institution. Some of the issues that EVC Rabenstein would like this Committee to delve into include:

1. UCR is lacking in large multiple-P.I. program/project grants (e.g., an exception is one recently secured in Environmental Toxicology).
2. Should UCR have an Honors College, given the campus commitment this would entail? This question would also likely be informed by a Task Force that would review the matter carefully.
3. How can UCR increase enrollment of graduate and professional students, and in what departments does it make the most sense to do this? Dean Childers is preparing an analysis that will look carefully at the carrying capacity for graduate students in each department/school.

The discussion then focused on the issue of reviewing strategic plans at the college/school level, including the need to ensure that these (5-year) plans align properly with *UCR 2020*. Other issues included the criteria for seed funding, upcoming task forces to study issues in-depth, using metrics to monitor UCR's progress in comparison to our AAU peer group, and establishing short-term priorities among those contained in *UCR 2020*. On this last question there was discussion of what would be the "ground rules" for assessment so as to avoid arriving at an unrealistic wish list.

In terms of the process and workload of the Committee, it is likely that meetings will be once a month with some level of “homework” in between meetings. The need for transparency was emphasized, since campus buy-in is critical. The Committee will have a website.

The issue of how to possibly reorganize the Research office (and related support services in departments) was noted as something that will need to be addressed by this Committee. Likewise, the need for greater budget transparency (primer, website, etc.) was seen as a necessary to the work of this Committee and to move the campus forward. The Committee discussed whether there are better systems of rewards to incentive the pursuit of multi-P.I. grants (e.g., course release, analyst support).

Committee members talked about what areas made the most sense in terms of future growth on this campus, including what considerations need to be a part of such strategic decisions (e.g., areas of strength on campus, future directions in U.S. research funding). Long-term priorities were also discussed, such as the School of Public Policy and the possibility of other professional schools down the road.

Committee members discussed whether there might be potential synergies between graduate offerings and professional school enrollments. For example, in certain departments would there be greater incentives for professional Masters programs if some of the fees were directed to support of graduate students in those areas? This discussion then broadened to the issue of campus-level funding incentives and reward structures for faculty (including academic personnel policies).

Committee members emphasized that the strategic plan and associated reports from the eight subcommittees and the working papers provide a set of latent structures that are helpful as this Committee moves forward with implementation of the strategic plan.

Finally, the Committee agreed that a next step should be requesting 5-year strategic plans from all the units on campus. For practical reasons, the first set of requests for strategic plans will go out to all the colleges and schools, plus the Graduate Division and the Research Office (e.g., 15 pages in length with possible appendices). [These request letters were sent out a few days later].